



Report - AE2503 - 2021-02-01

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

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.

One student was acting a course representative, to gather feedback from others and bring up any issues that need attention. Most of the evaluation was however based on LEQ. Gender aspects were not specifically investigated, and disabled students were encouraged to get in touch with the course responsible.

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.)

No meetings were arranged during the course. The course evaluation is discussed on the programme level.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course is given as 8 computer labs (including 1 short field exercise) and 8 lectures or workshops. During the computer labs the students work in groups of 2. Most of the exercises are followed by obligatory report submission (6 group reports, 1 group data upload, 1 individual report). The reports are graded according to the grading criteria outlined in course-PM, and contribute to the final grade. There is an anonymous written open-book exam at the end of the course.

Implemented changes: most of the lectures were replaced by workshops where exam questions from previous course rounds were discussed. Students were able to send in questions related to each topic, which were then answered in Canvas. Glossary of terms was compiled and published at the beginning of the course, and was appreciated by the students

THE STUDENTS' 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 estimated workload centered around 12-14 hours a week, which is reasonable and does not deviate from previous years.

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 student results are very good, with over 50% of students receiving grade B or A.



SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The response indicates that that course is generally working well and students are satisfied with the learning environment. Computer labs were most appreciated, and the fact that these were offered at the campus (approximately 2/3 of the students participated in the labs on campus while 1/3 were working online).

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 impression is that the course is quite well established regarding the general setup and works well for most of the students. The final quiz that replaced the written exam needs to be developed further and grading criteria clarified.

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?

There is no difference regarding gender of students with disabilities. However, international students are consistently more critical than Swedish students. This might connect to the fact that this course is one of the first elective courses the new international students can take, and covid-19 situation might have influenced this group more. Maybe not only because a part of the course was online for the first time, but also getting used to a new learning environment and social context. Generally half of the course participants are Swedish and half international students, but it is not possible to know how many international students were represented in the LEQ answers (a total of 15).

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

More clarity regarding final quiz and grading.

Stress even more the importance of working in groups.

Offer more scheduled occasions for questions and receiving feedback without grading.

Develop lectures, balancing between recorded videos and interactive scheduled workshops.

As some of the suggested improvements from 2019 were not implemented due to covid-19, development regarding introduction of QGIS software and small learning quizzes will start.

Some datasets will be upgraded or alternative datasets offered for same exercises.