

Course analysis report – AF2611 Geotechnical Engineering, Advanced Course HT 2022

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):

Stefan Larsson, stefan.larsson@byv.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.

A number of students interviewed by the course representatives.

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.)

See above.

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

The course includes 11x3 hours of lecturing and 11x4 hours of workshops. The teachers in the course come from the industry, have research training and are national leaders in the field.

One assignment is handed out during the course. The assignment is solved in groups of 2 students and one written report consisting of two parts "Simulation of a triaxial test in Plaxis" and "Laboratory report of Triaxial test". The assignment is examined with grades Pass-Failed.

The main focus in the course is on a project work that is carried out in groups of 2 students. This report consists of three parts that should be handed in according to the schedule. The submission of the project in three parts is introduced this course offering. The project report is assessed with the grading scale A-F and constitutes the final grade of the course.

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?

7.5 credit is considered reasonable for the workload.

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?

All students have Passed so far.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS What does students say in response to the open questions?

Students are generally satisfied with the course, as it was practice oriented on important skills for the carrier. The students would, however, appreciate clearer communication, perhaps mainly via Canvas so it reaches everyone. This would also make it easier for the teachers as it is clear to each one what the others have said and the risk of the students receiving conflicting messages is reduced. The comments of partial reporting of the project could differ somewhat from different teachers, which created some confusion. Information about the submissions, formats, etc. was given orally to certain students who ask but differ depending on who the student was talking to. Information in the course-pm could differ.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Summary made in previous question. (The interview only had open questions).

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 students are generally satisfied with the course content and think it's relevant to their MSc studies. The examiner feels that the students' results and experience vary mainly depending on somewhat different perceived guidance. However, the final quality of the project report is high quality both with regard to technical content and the structure and layout of the report. It is generally easy to follow and thus correct and reflect on the content.

For this year, we have made some changes, for example by including another teacher in the course, so sometimes our information can inevitably differ from each other. We should describe the project and the course-PM in even more detail. However, it is not optimal to prepare too detailed templates for everything as this is a project course where a real complex construction is to be analyzed. We show the procedure and the equations and the students solve and submit the analyses. We then give feedback.

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?

Too few students and too small course to make this detailed analysis.

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

The learning platform Canvas should be used more actively and the different teachers check with the continuous information to avoid different guidance and information. We synchronize the teachers so that the guidance takes place equally according to the course-pm and the information on Canvas.

OTHER INFORMATIONIs there anything else you would like to add?

N/A.