



Kursanalys - KTH¹

Formulär för kursansvarig.

Kursanalysen utförs under kursens gång.

Nomenklatur: F – föreläsning, Ö – övning, R – räknestuga, L – laboration, S – seminarium)

KURSDATA Obligatorisk del ²

Kursens namn	Kursnummer
New Urban Sociology and Environmental Psychology for Urban Design 6.0 credits	AG2184
Kurspoäng och poäng fördelat på exam-former	När kursen genomfördes
6.0 credits	VT18
Kursansvarig och övriga lärare	Undervisningstimmar, fördelat på F, Ö, R, L, S
Pernilla Hagbert	21 F/S
Hélène Littke	18 F/S
Inbjudna gästföreläsare	
	Antal registrerade studenter 18
	Prestationsgrad efter 1:a examenstillfället, i % 88%
	Examinationsgrad efter 1:a examenstillfället, i % 83%

MÅL

Ange övergripande målen för kursen

- To infer the key forces that accelerate the growth and diversity of cities such as migration, globalization, inequalities and others as well as to gain knowledge by extrapolating different ways in which various social, class and ethnic groups settle and interact in cities and neighborhoods.
- To comprehend correlations between housing and gentrification, public life and ethnic neighborhoods, city districts and social relations and how all these interactions between diverse groups produce new cultures, ideologies, and physical and social mobilities and mobilizations.
- To savvy the complex link of urban form and human behavior, i.e. the role and impact of architecture, urban planning, town planning and urban design and landscape architecture on human behavior.
- To understand and study the complex structures, dynamic processes, transformative changes and emergent problems of an urban area and by doing so provide inputs for planning and policy making.

Ange hur kursen är utformad för att uppfylla målen

The course is based on a series of seminars relating to various topics within Urban Sociology and Environmental Psychology, that give the students an opportunity to familiarize themselves with key literature and theories or phenomenon (as described partly in the learning outcomes) through literature assignments and lectures, and train their ability to critically analyze and discuss the implications of these for urban planning and design through reflection papers written for each seminar, in discussions with their peers, as well as in formulating a final paper.

Eventuellt deltagande i länkmöte före kursstart

Synpunkter från detta

No connection meeting with other teachers;

¹ Instruktioner till kursanalysformulär sist i dokumentet

² Rektors beslut: <http://www.kth.se/info/kth-handboken/II/12/1.html>

Kursens pedagogiska utveckling I

Beskriv de förändringar som gjorts sedan förra kursomgången. (Berätta även för studenterna vid kursstart)

This was the third time the course was given, the second time by the involved teachers. It tried to integrate the two parts (Urban Sociology and Environmental Psychology) more, following up on comments from last year that the two strands should be better connected. This year, both of the course parts followed the same format, with assigned readings, reflections papers and seminars (with an initial lecture by an invited guest lecturer or by the respective teacher, followed by discussion). This structure made it clearer that the course covered a range of topics within the two strands, even though there was a slight emphasis on Urban Sociology with 5 seminars compared to 4 seminars on Environmental Psychology. The strict chronology (starting with one strand and then moving on to the other) was broken, to instead allow for more flexibility in the order (and to allow for scheduling of external lecturers).

The introduction of reflection papers addressed the observed issue last year of students not necessarily coming to the seminars prepared or having read all the assigned readings. By asking students to write a 1 A4-page reflection on the literature for each seminar, this gave the teachers an opportunity to see that everyone had at least familiarized themselves with the texts in some way. Another way of trying to ensure student engagement introduced this year was to assign students (in pairs) responsibility for introducing and leading the seminars. This meant that even students that are not necessarily as comfortable in speaking up in class are given an opportunity to show his/her reflections in writing, and/or formulate topics for discussion. The grade scale for seminar attendance was also changed to P/F, to put less emphasis on performance in terms of speaking a lot.

Finally, the home exam was replaced by a final essay, to better connect the course learnings and theory with the students own interests and future thesis project or professional role.

Kontakt med studenterna under kursens gång

Studenter i årets kurs-nämnd:	Namn	E-post (lämnas blank vid webbpublicering)
	Marins Hettinga	

Resultat av formativ mittkursenkät	Half Way Course Evaluation was not done, instead peer discussions in class served as a way for the teacher to pick up on comments and questions.
---	--

Resultat av kursmöten	A course evaluation board meeting was held after the conclusion of the course, with the responsible teachers (Pernilla Hagbert and Hélène Littke) as well as a students representative (Marins Hettinga). The results from the course evaluation were presented and discussed, as well as some inputs from the previous course analysis from last year. The discussion pointed to an overall satisfaction with the course, and moreover that the student representative appreciated the responsiveness of the course responsible teachers in taking in the results of the course evaluation and the discussion at the evaluation meeting. Reflections on positive as well as negative feedback from the students, along with proposals for further improvements were discussed openly and are outlined below.
------------------------------	---

Kontakt med övriga lärare under kursens gång

Kommentarer

No continuous contact with the teachers of the parallell course, however scheduling issues etc were synched through the assistant program director. This should be improved for next year, but also depends on a continuity of the teachers involved in the course, to keep in contact with other teachers in the program and get a better overview of e.g. the course load and time requirements for each course, as well as the progression of topics.

Kursenkät; teknologernas synpunkter Obligatorisk del ³

Att komma ihåg:

- 1) Uppmana, mha kursnämnden, till ifyllande av kursenkät i anslutning till / just efter slutexaminationen
- 2) Delge kursnämnden enkäten
- 3) Publicera enkäten under en kortare tid

Period, då enkäten var aktiv	Handed out to students at last seminar
Frågor, som adderades till standardfrågorna	QC2 Course Analysis
Svarsfrekvens	13 out of 18 students
Förändringar sedan förra genomförandet	-
Helhetsintryck	Overall positive - the students rated the course as a whole an average of 4,4 (out of 5), and 4,2 compared to other courses in the program. The lowest score was the balance between theory and practice (3,0) and the creative content of the course (3,1), which is also reflected in the recurrent comments (this year as well as last) that the students would have wanted more concrete examples, cases and clearer links to urban design and planning - but is still not below 3 (good), which should be considered in that it is primarily a theoretical course.
Relevanta webb-länkar	-

Kursansvarigs tolkning av enkät

Positiva synpunkter	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good organization and management of the course was raised by several students, including the use of Canvas, and communicating what was expected from the students• The literature assignments (makes you read the articles, but not too much work)• Competency and engagement from teachers• Good selection of topics/lecturers, showing the wide range and plurality of questions• Encouragement and good atmosphere for students to express themselves
Negativa synpunkter	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Several expressed a wish for a clearer connection between theory and urban planning and design, more application, showing concrete cases in the lectures, or even going on field trips/using different built environments to explore the concepts raised in the course.• Suggestion for students to bring their written reflections to the seminars to allow students who aren't as comfortable to speak up to read from and engage in the discussion more. Also comments about wanting more structured discussions.• Regarding particularly the sociology part, there were comments that some topics were repetitive, as several topics (e.g. gentrification) are already discussed within the program (e.g. within the first course).• Would be good to get feedback on the literature assignments throughout to help students• Single comment regarding the quality of lectures being poor.
Var kursen relevant i förhållande till kursmålen?	3,9 average according to students. This can be compared to 4,7 last year.

³ Rektors beslut: <http://www.kth.se/info/kth-handboken/II/12/1.html>

Syn på förkunskaperna	OK. The students are used to reading texts of this caliber. There is however a great variation in how equipped they are in writing academically, with some not understanding how to reference correctly. As this was not a learning outcome of the course as such, it was not part of the curriculum to teach academic writing, but rather it was assumed that students at a master's level will have the basic tools for academic writing. This is something to consider, as many of the students have backgrounds where this might not be the case (disciplinary backgrounds such as architecture are less inclined towards writing academically, if at all). Language was also an issue for some students, where English is not their first language and they have had difficulty expressing themselves.
Syn på undervisningsformen	The lectures and seminars were appreciated in different ways, and the use of literature assignments/reflection papers to get students to actually read seems to have worked. The call for more practical examples, and the suggestion to use field strips however indicates that the more academic lecture-seminar-discussion format might need to be complemented by experiential learning opportunities, or that the practical implementation can be raised further in the lectures/discussions following on the often more theoretical/academic texts.
Syn på kurslitt/kursmaterial	Overall students found it well-selected.
Syn på examinationen	The students consider the assigned work and different tasks very reasonable (4,2), and the main assignment level of complexity very good (4,1)
Speciellt intressanta kommentarer	<p>The need for connecting theory and practice more and the suggestion to use more concrete cases or even field trips</p> <p>Continuous feedback on written assignments is important to consider, as this will help students to develop their writing and reflections further</p> <p>Structure of discussions - how to allow students to show they have prepared, without steering too much, while at the same time instigate discussion.</p> <p>Review the topics - how they can be seen as progressing rather than repeating already covered issues within the program as a whole</p>

Synpunkter från övriga lärare efter avslutad kurs

Vad fungerade bra	-Not Relevant Here-
Vad fungerade mindre bra	-Not Relevant Here-
Vad fungerade mindre bra	-Not Relevant Here-

Resultat av kursnämndsmöte efter examination

Studenternas sammanfattn.

Students found the course well organized and appreciated the way Canvas was used: students knew what was expected of them and what they needed to deliver. The reflection papers were a good way of preparing for the lectures, although some sort of feedback on the writings could be helpful leading up to the writing of the final essay. The amount of work and workload for the course was good, the discussions/seminars were appreciated by the students: students found it helpful and the atmosphere was respectful, supportive and inspiring. The combination of sociology and environmental psychology and the topics covered in the course matched the interests of students. Overall, the students really appreciated the course a lot as being part of the master program.

Some topics covered in the course were repetitive to the topics that were covered in earlier courses of the master program. In general, the connection between the main topics and the application of the theories on urban planning and design were missing. There was a need for more specific examples, and the theories could be more applied to practice. Sometimes the group discussions could be more meaningful and the structure of these discussions/ seminars could be considered further.

One of the options to make sure that some topics covered in this course would be less repetitive could be dealt with by better communication / aligning with other staff members of earlier courses (for example with the course of challenges of metropolitan areas). Some topics that were found repetitive are simply topics that are part of urban sociology and can't be taken away from the course. Giving personal feedback to every student would be too much time consuming, but could be made possible by assigning students to give each other peer reviews on written reflections. In this way, it could also benefit the students themselves to have a look at how academic writing should look like and learn from each other writing styles. Also, it puts a bigger pressure, in a positive way, on students to write well thought true reflections, because they know they will receive feedback from other students on it. Learning how to write in an academic style simply doesn't fit in this course since it is not part of the learning outcomes and is a skill that is expected of the students to have. It could be helpful when in earlier courses (for example the course challenges of metropolitan areas) there would be a bigger focus on academic writing style. Bringing the written and peer-reviewed reflections of students to the lectures could contribute to the (structure of) discussions/seminars. To make sure that the need of a more practical and applied approach to the topics could be met in the upcoming years could be done by having that as an input/aspect of the final essay and be part of the weekly reflections. Relating the theories to a specific place could bring the spatial element more to the course, by applying the theory to specific places and/or cases. For example: in what way can you find or not find the factors that would improve walkability mentioned in the article back in your case study area/on your way to KTH? In this way, the balance between theory and practice and putting more creative content to the course can be improved. It would be good to adjust the course evaluation form a bit more, to find out which articles students found interesting or less interesting. More diverse readings about gender and culturally diverse backgrounds could improve the course readings even more.

Förslag till förändringar

Better coordination between program teachers to avoid repetition, but also to ensure that tools for academic writing are anchored already in the beginning of the program (the first course) and not waiting until the spring term.

Peer-feedback on literature assignments/reflections.

Integrating more practical perspectives and implementation of theory into urban design and planning.

Länk till kursnämndsprot.

Kursansvarigs sammanfattande berättelse

Helhetsintryck	The students were engaged and interested in discussing. They showed capacity to handle critical questions and raise questions regarding their own practice and the direction of urban planning and design.
Positiva synpunkter	The clarity in structure and assignments was good in giving everyone a clear conception of the course load and scope. Discussions were engaging and the guest lecturers seem to have contributed in inspiring and inciting different reflections regarding the topics at hand, and one's future professional role.
Negativa synpunkter	The students that failed or came close to failing course moments showed very little understanding of academic writing, which is problematic. The ability and tools to formulate own ideas and synthesize needs to be improved. This is clearly linked to the comments requesting more feedback on reflection papers. Some of the topics found to be repetitive are essential to the urban sociology field, but better coordination between courses in the program is needed.
Syn på förkunskaperna	Good mix of educational and cultural backgrounds. However, the wide range in familiarity with and skills in academic writing, as well as varying language skills is a problem for a course based on reading, writing and discussing.
Syn på undervisningsformen	Need to reflect again upon how to stimulate for all to participate. Mixing written and oral ways of expressing themselves could be developed. Good to give responsibility to students to lead discussions, and for them to force themselves to read in order to write a reflection paper. However, as always in discussion-based theoretical courses, how to make it relevant is a question that should be developed further.
Syn på kurslitteratur/kursmaterial	Can be further revised with regards to gender perspective, but also with regards to cultural/geographical spread. The topics should be revised to better fit the program progression.
Syn på examinationen	The final essay seemed hard for the students to grasp, with varying results. It was kept relatively open, for them to choose a topic and relate to their own interests, but using literature from the course. As the two grade scale (A-F) course modules were both in regards to writing (literature assignment/reflection papers and final paper), there is perhaps a discrepancy, particularly since no feedback was given on the individual reflection papers, so they have no opportunity to learn and improve this throughout the course.

Kursens pedagogiska utveckling II Obligatorisk del ⁴

⁴ Rektors beslut: <http://www.kth.se/info/kth-handboken/II/12/1.html>

Hur förändringarna till denna kursomgång fungerade

The use of the reflection paper and the designation of responsibility for leading seminars seems to have had some positive effect on getting the students to actually read and reflect on the readings, and not just show up to the seminars and talk more generally.

The use of a coherent structure for all of the seminars was a major improvement, making it clear for the students and creating a better balance between the input from the texts, invited lecturers and student discussion. However, by taking away the grade scale for this module, perhaps made students less motivated to actively prepare and participate after all?

The use of the final essay to replace the home exam can also be reflected upon. The home exam used last year did not allow for the students to necessarily make relevant connections to their practice, whereas the essay was seen as a way to allow students more freedom to themselves choose a topic and develop in relation to the themes addressed in the course. The format of the final paper as an essay however seemed too open, as shown in the wide range of formats and content of the papers. This will have to be looked over for next year.

Förändringar som bör göras inför nästa kursomgång

Better coordination with other teachers in the program to ensure topic progression rather than repetition.

A suggestion is to try to develop the connection to practice in the form of more concrete urban design/planning cases. Field studies, as suggested in student comments on the course evaluation, could be integrated into the course, as thematic explorations done by the students themselves. For example, it should be clearly stated in the intro to the course that students should start thinking about cases and places - inspiring them to go to an urban area (or reflect on the area where they live or visit) and assessing it from different perspectives raised in the course. This could be framed as the basis for the final assignment/paper as well, for students to choose an area/city to implement or reflect on some of the theoretical perspectives/frameworks/tools discussed in the literature, lectures and seminars in relation to a concrete example. For the final paper next year, students should be asked to draw from both course aspects (i.e. both Environmental Psychology and Urban Sociology). A suggested formulation could be: "Concretizing urban sociology and problematizing environmental psychology in a specific urban case". The students could then use the reflection papers to approach the case and explore it.

The use of the reflection papers in themselves could be developed further, to allow for the students to learn and improve their writing, while changing the grade scale from A-F to P/F. Particularly if the final module is a text-based assignment (which still appears relevant in relation to the course content as primarily a theoretical, academic course to complement the other design studios and courses within the program). Improvements are needed for next year to make sure the students are all aware of the basics of academic writing (referencing, style and of course, no plagiarism), e.g. in making sure this is addressed already in the first course of the program. A suggestion that came up during the course evaluation meeting was to use peer-review as a way of allowing students to learn from each other and avoid spending teaching resources on individual feedback in assignments that might be more general. Students could be asked to hand in their reflections on the assigned readings the night before the seminar. Teachers could assess them on a pass/fail scale. And a system be devised for assigning students' texts for them to read each other's work and comment. Students should also be asked to bring their reflection paper to the seminars, to stimulate discussion from their own reflections - and what they have read from their peers' reflections.

Adjust learning outcomes to make them a bit more specific. E.g. "To formulate in text and orally..." "Analyze and problematize...".

Update course evaluation: remove repetitive questions, use it to suss out more specifically what literature students find useful and what could be exchanged.

Övrigt**Kommentarer**

Instruktioner till kursanalysformulär

- 1) Kursanalysformuläret fylls i interaktivt; fälten expanderar automatiskt.
- 2) Fyll i fälten inom en månad efter kursens slut. (Viktigt krav från KTH!)
Skicka sedan till studierektor (som vidarebefordrar till prefekt och programansvarig).
- 3) Försök att ge så kompletta uppgifter som möjligt.
Tänk på att kursanalysen är ett hjälpmedel inte bara för teknologerna, utan även för Dig som lärare.
- 4) Med ”prestationsgrad” avses antalet presterade poäng hittills på kursen (inlämningsuppgifter, projektuppgifter, laborationer etc.) dividerat med antalet möjliga poäng för de registrerade studenterna. Med ”examinationsgrad” avses antalet studenter av de registrerade, som klarat samtliga kurskrav.
Kurssekreteraren hjälper gärna till här.
- 5) Kontakten med studenterna:
 - Etablera kursnämnd under kursens första vecka (minst två studerande, gärna genusbalanserad).
 - Lämplig bonus till kursnämndsdeltagarna är fri kurslitteratur.
 - Om kursnämnd ej kan etableras, skall sektionens studienämndsordförande (SNO) kontaktas genast (se www.ths.kth.se/utbildning/utbildningsradet.html för kontaktuppgifter).
 - Kursnämnden skall sammanträda under kursens gång, exempelvis i halvtid. Har mittkursutvärdering genomförts, skall den diskuteras då.
 - Kursnämnden skall även ha ett möte efter det att studenterna har besvarat kursutvärderingen och kursnämndens studenter fått tillgång till resultaten. Undantaget är kurser i period fyra, där mötet bör ske direkt efter examinationen är avslutad för att analysen skall vara klar innan sommaren.
 - Under det avslutande kursnämndsmötet bör studenterna föra protokoll. Detta protokoll skall kursansvarig få senast en vecka efter mötet.
 - Det är kursansvarigs ansvar att kalla till kursnämndsmöten.

Slutligen, tänk på:

- det är viktigt att kursanalysen tydligt *visar utvecklingen av kursens kvalitet* från ett läsår till nästa.
- möjligheten att lägga ut kursanalysen på kurshemsidan.
- spara kursanalysen till förberedelsearbetet inför nästa kursomgång.