



Final report

HT2024_IEAD03_45163_Innovationsledning

First time registered students: 40

Answer Count: 6


Answer Frequency: 15.00%

The course evaluation could be answered during the period:

09/11/2024 - 23/11/2024

When collaborative courses, several course codes are shown below:

IEAD03 Innovationsledning, End date: 2024-11-10





Mean value for each question. Highest value = 4.


	Mean
Supportive Structure	3.2
Varied Teaching	3.3
Discussed the Subject	4.0
Challenging	3.5
Feedback Helped	3.2
Assessment Related to Teaching	3.7
Workload	2.0
Devoted Time	3.5
Prepared in Advance	3.2
Involved in Seminars	3.5
Involved in Lectures	3.5
Increased Interest	3.3

Results of learning


All in all, the course was valuable for me.

Courses that were considered valuable were related to personal development, acquisition of new knowledge and skills, understanding of something. Higher ratings can refer to students' perceived development (learned a lot, and it was useful). Lower ratings can refer to scanty development of knowledge and skills or not understanding certain themes or their parts, not understanding the necessity and significance of the course, problems in the learning environment.

	Mean
All in all, the course was valuable for me	3



How likely would you be to recommend this course to a friend or colleague?



Net Promoter Score (NPS) = 16.7

Promoters = 2 (33.3%)

Passives = 3 (50%)

Detractors = 1 (16.7%)

The Net Promoter Score (NPS) is a metric that measures student experience and predicts the effectiveness of a course. It calculates an NPS score based on a key question using a 0-10 scale, asking how likely students would recommend the course to others. Respondents are grouped into Promoters, Passives, or Detractors based on their score, and the NPS is calculated by subtracting the percentage of Detractors from the percentage of Promoters. The NPS is a core metric for course evaluation programs and is trusted by educational institutions to engage their students and improve their learning experience performance.



**KARLSTAD
UNIVERSITY**

Comments

Course supervisor's comments

Tyvärr var det bara 6 av 40 studenter som lämnade in utvärderingen. Detta gör det svårt att kunna dra några lärdomar från enkäten, speciellt den "statistik" som presenteras.

Det vi kan ta till oss är att se över fördelningen 70/30 mellan individuella och grupp uppgiften. Man skulle också kunna tänka sig att inkludera duggan som betygsgrundande vilket den inte är idag, Den skulle i så fall motsvara 20% av betygssättningen. Även om en student uttryckte att gruppuppgiften var "för bred" och "flummig" så är vår samlade bedömning att den höll mycket hög kvalitet. Detta har även återkopplats från programrådet. Den ger en bra förberedelse på den "breda och flummiga" verklighet som kommer att möta studenterna.