



This form is filled in by the course director after completed course and **sent to the programme director/coordinator of the doctoral programme in question** (who can later include specified data in the programmes's annual reporting).

Course number HT23-5301	Course title Methods for design and formative evaluation of eHealth interventions	
Higher education credits 3.0 credits	Time period 2023-11-06 2023-12-01	
Course director Maria Henström		Other contributing teachers Sabine Koch - examiner and main teacher Leonard Mauco Nadia Davoody Aboozar Eghdam - guest lecturer
Link to course evaluation report (full version) https://survey.ki.se/Report/5yiBDLrMoS9		
Link to course evaluation report (short version) https://survey.ki.se/Report/6OodRtKJiFU		

Applicants

Enter the number of applicants for the course via KIWAS or via late applications.

	KI doctoral students (or equivalent)	KI postdocs	Doctoral students from other universities	Master's students ¹	Other	Total
Applicants via KIWAS	7					7
Late applicants	3	1	1			5
Total	10	1	1			12

Admitted

Enter the number of applicants who have been offered admission and accepted.

	KI doctoral students (or equivalent)	KI postdocs	Doctoral students from other universities	Master's students	Other	Total
Number	9	1	1			11
Late dropouts <30 days before course start		1				1

Result

Ange antalet som deltagit i kursens alla obligatoriska moment, inklusive den summativa examinationen.

	KI doctoral students (or equivalent)	KI postdocs	Doctoral students from other universities	Master's students	Other	Total

¹ Applies to courses given in collaboration with master's programmes where the master's students follow their own syllabus, and admission and reporting of results is done separately from the doctoral course.



Number	9		1			10
--------	---	--	---	--	--	----

Analysis

Any implemented changes since the previous course occasion

Minor adaptations were made to the course based on feedback from the course evaluation at last occasion (ht21). These adaptations included: more focus on formative evaluation methods, which was now extended to a full-day lecture instead of a half-day; changes in the schedule for supervision sessions, to introduce supervision earlier and offer online drop-in supervisions; and dates for assignment submission, to give enough time for students to prepare for peer opposition. The peer review of another student's work included an oral opposition, but no written feedback. This was to give focus on the peer-to-peer learning through the discussions at the examination seminar, which all students took part in.

Short summary (in own words) of the participants' feedback on the course

Based on the course evaluation report and any other feedback.

Seven of ten participants answered the evaluation survey (70%). In general, students reported they were highly motivated and were happy with the course. They believed the course design as well as the teaching and learning activities facilitated achievement of the ILOs (all to a large or very large extent), and all respondents agreed that they had developed valuable expertise/skills during the course to a large or very large extent. For most evaluation questions the students in this course scored higher on average compared to all doctoral courses evaluated at KI during 2021. Students highly appreciated the design of the course with lectures held primarily in the beginning, followed by the individual assignment where they could focus on one method, applied on their own PhD project.

The course was held completely online, which worked out well and also enabled students that were not located in Sweden to attend. Students mentioned in the evaluation that the regular breaks during online sessions were appreciated. However, the day on formative evaluations was a bit long and suggested to be spread out over two days next time. Other suggestions for improvement included to introduce even more breakout-room activities and exercises during lectures, as these were very much appreciated and useful. The students expressed usefulness of the individual assignment and the oral examinations with discussions as these facilitated their learning and created a better understanding of the potential use of the methods learned. However, in addition to reviewing another student's work with a similar method focus as themselves, several students would have liked to review also a second assignment, that focused on a different method/stage in the design process than the one they were writing about. They believed this would have been useful for them to learn even more.

Reflections on the course and the results of the course evaluation

Strengths, weaknesses, possibilities, limitations.

In general, as communicated both in the written evaluation as well as during a short oral evaluation session at the end of the course, the students perceived the course as valuable to their studies, having a clear design regarding both structure and content. As last time we ran the course, the main



strength of the course was that it was directly applicable to the students' own research projects, and they gained valuable knowledge from discussing with each other. We did not perceive any major weaknesses or limitations.

Conclusions and suggested improvements

It seems the course was needed and appreciated by the students. As last time, we held the entire course online (Zoom), which worked out well and turned out to be valuable as we had several PhD students that were located outside Sweden during parts of the course. The course will only need minor adaptations for next time, such as dividing up the formative evaluation lectures on two days, introducing more exercises and practical learning activities in each lecture, and add a second peer review.

Written feedback to the course director on the course analysis is given by the doctoral programme in question that is responsible for the quality assurance of the course. The feedback can be appended to this course analysis.