



---

## Report - AE2401 - 2021-11-09

---

Respondents: 1  
Answer Count: 1  
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

---

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

**Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):**

Johan Spross, spross@kth.se

---

**DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS**

**Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.**

Two student representatives were elected at the second lecture (1 male/1 female). They were available for other students to contact throughout the course, and they could then forward opinions to the course responsible. A course survey was held after the final exam. A course evaluation meeting was held, analysing the survey. The course responsible and the student representatives attended. Statistics were generated by the survey based on gender and students with disabilities (but the latter were too few to show any results in the survey).

---

**DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS**

**Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)**

Main evaluation meeting was held after the completion of the course.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

**Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.**

Lectures are mainly pre-recorded videos, complemented by 5 on-campus lectures. Exercises were held in classrooms. A field exercise was completed off-campus. A visit to NCC's rock laboratory. A small project of producing an engineering geologist's report for a tunnel project. A final written exam (open-book) in classroom.

Since last time, we are now back to some on-campus activities, but we intend to keep some of the online material that was developed during covid.

---

**THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD**

**Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?**

The students report a slightly higher workload than expected, where the average is around 20 hours, meaning that many reported more than 20 hours per week for this half-time course. Discussing with the student representatives, the reason seems to be that the time spent on reading varies between students. This course has likely a heavier reading assignment than other courses in the program.

---



### **THE STUDENTS' RESULTS**

**How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?**

---

The final exam results were a bit more scattered than last year, but it is difficult to compare, because the students had more allowable aids last year.

---

### **STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

---

See attached survey. In general they liked the course, especially its structure and clarity about the weekly tasks.

---

### **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

**Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.**

---

The comments were generally positive, with some constructive comments on possible improvements.

---

### **OVERALL IMPRESSION**

**Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.**

---

The course generally functioned well this year. Some details on assignments instructions were implemented in the field exercise, reducing the confusion about the task. The student quizzes should be reconsidered for next year, as some questions felt too detailed and not really relevant. The video-presentations for Exercise 1 were appreciated as a better alternative to presentations in classrooms.

---

### **ANALYSIS**

**Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:**

- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

---

The course functioned well both for on-campus students and students who preferred to study from home as much as possible, according to the survey. The number of students are too few to make any detailed analysis for different student groups.

---

### **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

**What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?**

- 
- Better follow-up on "Engineering questions" on the exercises.
  - Faster grading of exercises expected, to make feedback feel relevant.
  - Reconsider structure of student quizzes. Fewer questions? Mandatory / non-mandatory? better teacher's review of questions before publishing?
  - Re-focus NCC's lecture to be more about test methods.
  - Double check project instructions regarding tunnel support measures. What is expected?
  - Less time for Ex 2 and more time for Ex 4.
-