Course analysis template

After the course has ended, the course leader fills in this template. This is an important part of the quality assurance of the programme. The programme director decides whether the template should be supplemented with further information/questions.

Course code 5HI019	**Course title** User Needs, Requirements Engineering, and Evaluation	**Credits** 10 HP
Semester VT2024	**Period** 2026-01-19 – 2026-03-22	

Course leader Nadia Davoody	**Examiner** Nadia Davoody
Other participating teachers Sabine Koch, Aboozar Eghdam, Anders Thelemyr, Richard Whitehand, Leo Kowalski, Ulf Lesly, Natalia Stathakarou, Jamie Luckahaus	**Other participating teachers**

Number of registered students 47	**Number passed after regular session** 47	**Response rate for course survey (%)** 31.91%
Methods for student influence other than course survey The course consists of three moments/blocks. Throughout the whole course, the students were asked to provide feedback about the seminars and different parts of the course.		

Note that…

This analysis shall (together with a summary of the quantitative results of the students' course survey) be submitted to the LIME educational committee.

This analysis has been submitted to the LIME educational committee on this date:

1. Description of any implemented changes since the previous course based on previous students' comments

As in previous years, the literature and course materials were updated, and some outdated content was removed. The descriptions of all assignments and templates were revised for greater clarity. The structure of all seminars was revised to improve coherence and learning flow. Additional lectures were introduced, including more content on evaluation and the patient journey, along with dedicated Q&A sessions to better support student learning. Guest lectures from industry were also increased to strengthen real-world relevance. Furthermore,

additional problem descriptions were introduced, allowing students to work on a wider range of projects.

2. A brief summary of the students' evaluations of the course

(Based on the students' quantitative answers to the course evaluation and comments. Quantitative compilation and possible graphs attached.)
15 out of 47 students have completed the course evaluation survey. 13 students had a clinical background, and 2 had a technical background. For each question of the survey, the mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation, as a percentage, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of the students' evaluation of the course.

#	Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation (%)
1	The course was designed in a way that provided me with opportunities for active learning. For example: seminars with discussions, group work, projects, student presentations, role play, peer learning, practical exercises, laboratory work, workplace-based learning, etc.	5.3	0.7	13.6%
2	I felt included and respected during the course. For example: I was comfortable collaborating with other students, speaking in front of the group, answering teachers' questions, and I was listened to (not interrupted, ridiculed, or similar).	5.3	1.4	26.2%
3	The course as a whole was good.	5.2	0.9	18.1 %
4	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	5.5	0.7	23.6 %
7	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	5.1	1.2	23.1 %
8	The course was challenging enough for me.	5.2	0.9	18.1 %
	AVERAGE	5.26	**0.96**	**20.45 %**

Overall, students reported a positive and meaningful learning experience, highlighting that the course content was well structured, relevant, and closely connected to real-world health informatics practice. Lectures, seminars, guest lectures, study visits (especially the usability lab), and assignments were described as engaging, applicable, and valuable for building both theoretical understanding and practical skills. Many students appreciated the interactive seminar format, small-group discussions, stakeholder involvement, and opportunities to give and receive feedback. The teachers were described as supportive, patient, and approachable, contributing to a friendly and inclusive course environment.
At the same time, some challenges and areas for improvement were raised. The workload and pace were described as intense with tight deadlines. The exam was seen as relevant but too time-constrained given the complexity and number of questions.
Group work emerged as the most mixed aspect. While many students acknowledged that group assignments supported learning and mirrored real-world collaboration, some students reported stress, uneven contribution and interpersonal difficulties. Students suggested changes such as allowing self-selected groups, clearer role allocation, or shifting group assignments to pass/fail grading to reduce conflict and stress. Some students noted that course materials on Canvas were helpful but underutilized and suggested clearer reminders to use them during assignments.
In summary, students viewed the course as high-quality, relevant, and educationally rich, with strong teaching and effective seminar formats. The main improvements suggested

concern workload balance, exam time constraints, group work structure, and seminar facilities.

3. The course-responsible reflection on the course implementation and results

Course strengths:

- **Strong learning design and relevance:** The course was well structured, clearly explained, and closely connected to real-world health informatics practice through practical assignments, stakeholder involvement, and study visits.
- **Engaging seminars and teaching approach:** Small-group seminars, discussions, and feedback sessions were highly appreciated and supported reflection, peer learning, and active participation.
- **Supportive course environment:** Teachers were described as approachable, patient, and helpful, contributing to a friendly and inclusive learning atmosphere.

Course weaknesses:

- **Group work challenges:** Random group composition, uneven contribution, conflict, and workload imbalance for some students.
- **Logistics constraints:** Limited access to more rooms than the main lecture room during seminars.
- **High workload and tight scheduling:** The course pace was perceived as hectic, with closely spaced assignments, and insufficient preparation time for seminars and the exam.

3. Other comments

---

4. The course-responsible conclusions and any proposals for changes

(If any changes are proposed, please specify who is responsible for implementing these and a time schedule.)

The workload and pace are intentionally designed to align with the course's learning objectives and scope. To better manage workload and reduce time pressure, students are expected to begin working on assignments early and engage actively in group collaboration from the start of the course. With sustained effort over time and effective group work, both the perceived workload and time constraints should be manageable and aligned with course expectations. Regarding the exam, the allocated time (09:00–17:00) is intended to be sufficient. The exam assesses not only recall but also the ability to apply and synthesize knowledge, which requires that students have engaged with the course material continuously throughout the course. It is therefore expected that preparation, including familiarization with key concepts and relevant literature, has taken place prior to the exam day.
Regarding the group works more detailed information will be provided regarding expectations, assessment criteria, and individual responsibilities within group work. In addition, students will be given clearer opportunities and guidance to form their own groups, which may contribute to a more balanced distribution of work and a better overall learning experience. Furthermore, more information will be given about the course material on Canvas. Moreover, the students will be informed about booking student rooms during the seminars for their convenience if they prefer to not be in the main lecture room.