Report - AE2503 - 2018-03-12

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):

Katrin Grünfeld, katring@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

The short oral presentation in groups of 2 (on a chosen topic related to the lectures and exercises) was not included 2017. Partly because the large number of students ,students arriving after the first week of the course, and limitations in scheduled time. The evaluation from 2016 did not point out the presentations as needed for learning more/better.
This time the exam was written in computer rooms using online assignment tool in Canvas - this saved a lot of time during correction stage.

THE STUDENT'S WORKLOAD

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

The workload varies a lot, from 3-5 hrs to 39-41 hrs per week, with a mode at 18-20 hrs. Reasons could be varying background knowledge when starting the course, and different ambitions regarding the grade (and what one thinks would be needed timewise). Maybe also different learning strategies.

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?

Compared to previous course round the grades have improved (with more As and Bs). More motivated students?

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

Meaningfulness: over 5; the lowest response-4.6- regarding "I was able to learn by trying out my own ideas", which can be explained by course content: there are no open projects where students can choose the content. Swedish students seem to react more regarding this aspect.
Comprensibility: generally good, the lowest scores concern "I understood what teachers were talking about". As GIS might be a completely new tool for many, this is understandable.
Manageability: generally good, the lowest: I had opportunities to choose what to do". There is not much to choose since the course includes exercises that all need to go through, for practicing the tools. No variations other than ambition level.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

Understanding subject matter would be one of the weak areas. It is not easy to start exploring a new subject and learn new terminology so fast.

Variation and choices is also one of the weakest areas, one might feel that all exercises/data types/tools are not equally interesting. From the other side, the statement "I worked with interesting issues" has the highest scores.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

The exercises are considered the best aspect of the course, and lab reports help learning as well. At the same time lab instructions are regarded as needing improvement - even if development of instructions is done every year.
A glossary of terms was suggested.
Lectures are considered too difficult or not pedagogical by some students.
One student suggested having an exercise before the related lecture, so the practical experience can beter be linked to the theory.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should primarily be developed? How could these aspects be developed in the short or long term?

A glossary of GIS-terminology might be a good idea since a lot of specific terms are used from day one.
Concept maps will be introduced to explain how terms are related/connected.
Examination needs to be developed, it is good to have online submission but since one student lost the answers this has to be made more safe.
Maybe organize the exam as a quiz?
Long-term development includes making lectures digitally available. It is not sustainable to offer the explanations related to different subjects only during specific times (lecture hours). It would be better to upload lectures and offer seminars/discussions instead. Listening/looking at the lecture before the exercise and any time would make the material more available for learning.
Regarding lab instructions through testing before the lab occasion is needed. And maybe explaning the role of instructions - where the students can expect detailed guidance and where they have to make their own decisions.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Computer labs are appreciated but many times there are issues with computers or software. Students feel that more assitance is needed but this is not economically possible. Course assistants need to understand the overall learning activity and different assistants have to give same information to students, to avoid confusion. Frustration due to computer issues or software (error messages) is unfortunately quite common.

Course data 2018-03-12

AE2503 - Environmental Data, HT 2017

Course facts

Course start:	2017 w.35
Course end:	2017 w.43
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	LAB1 - Laboratory Work, 3.0, Grading scale: P, F TEN1 - Examination, 4.5, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Ulla Mörtberg <mortberg@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Katrin Grünfeld <katring@kth.se>
Teachers:	Robert Earon <earon@kth.se> Katrin Grünfeld <katring@kth.se> Milan Horemuz <horemuz@kth.se>
Assistants:	Xi Pang <xip@kth.se>

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	48
Total number of registered:	52

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate[1] [%]	95.80%
Performance rate[2] [%]	97.90%
Grade distribution[3] [%, number]	A 22% (10) B 54% (25) C 24% (11) D 2% (1)

1 Percentage approved students
2 Percentage achieved credits
3 Distribution of grades among the approved students