



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 5HI022	Course title Scientific Research Methods	Credits 7.5
Semester VT2026	Period 23/3/2026 – 1/6/2026	

Course leader Leo Kowalski	Examiner Nadia Davoody
Other participating teachers Henrik Ahlenius, Ulrika Lögdberg, Emma Eliasson, Henrike Häbel, Samuel Wiquist	Other participating teachers

Number of registered students 46	Number passed after regular session 45	Response rate for course survey (%) 41.30% (19 respondents)
Methods for student influence other than course survey Students were continually asked during the course for their needs, preferences, and other adjustments to improve the course as much as possible.		

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

A primary change this year was to decrease group sizes from five people per group to four in the group project. This was due to many comments previous year that the group was unnecessarily big for the project and it created a lot of "free-rider" problems where some students got away with not contributing much to the work.

Also the grading scheme was changed to not provide as many "easy points", so that the points given better reflect the understanding and quality shown from students.



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.)

19 out of 46 students have completed the course evaluation survey. 17 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	5.4	1.2	22.6%
2	I felt included and respected during the course.	5.4	1.2	22.6%
3	The course as a whole was good.	5.3	1.2	23.6%
4	Teaching was based on real examples to develop students' professional knowledge.	5.1	1.2	23.4%
5	My previous knowledge was sufficient to follow the course.	4.7	1.3	28.5%
6	The course was challenging enough for me.	4.3	1.6	36.5%
	AVERAGE	5.03		

The overall quantitative results are very promising with most students providing high values on the questions about course quality.

Looking at the qualitative responses it seems that students enjoyed the teaching style, benefitted from the hands-on workshops, and appreciated that it was not only about theory but actually trying things out in practice as well as discussing and thinking about the course topics. They liked the combination of group and individual work as well as the overall organization behind the course.

On the improvement side of things it seems the structure of the course could be improved such that the final exam falls at the very end rather than before the due date of the last assignment. As such, students get more experience and feedback in preparation of the exam. In a similar vein, having a structure where the peer review is before the submission of assignments would achieve a similar goal. Also regarding course structure and timing, there was some discontent that this was happening in parallel with the SU course.

Regarding guest lecturers, it was also a bit confusing with having many different lecturers and workshops instructors that were sometimes disorganized and not aligned with the overall organization of the course. This plus sometimes large time gaps in between sessions made the course a bit chaotic and difficult to follow at times.

Some comments that all mandatory sessions/workshops should count towards the final grade as these also required significant time and effort on the students that should be rewarded.

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



Course strengths:

- Good with interactive workshops providing practical hands-on practice
- Engaging teaching style that made content more fun and easy-to-understand
- Group project was very appreciated

Course weaknesses:

- Disorganized with some guest lecturers, could be more streamlined and interactive
- Timing of course content can be improved, e.g., peer review before submission
- Large time gaps between lectures/workshops, in part due to running in parallel with the SU course

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.)

Changes will be made to the structure of the assignments and examination in the course. For instance, the final exam will be scheduled after the last assignment, preferably after students have received feedback on it. Also try to figure out a way in which assignments can be submitted after the peer review rather than before, or at least get a second submission after the peer review process.

Consider if the mandatory sessions can be part of the grade rather than simply pass/fail for showing up. No concrete suggestion for now but will give it thought how this could work.

Coordinate better with the guest lecturers to ensure that all course material is aligned (e.g., not needlessly doubling information) and also encourage them to include interactive elements in their sessions.

See if one can do anything about the large time gaps between sessions, but also difficult due to SU course going on at the same time.