



Report - AG2800 - 2020-02-05

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):

Anna Björklund, annab@abe.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 overall course design 2019 remains mostly the same as the previous year.

The course examination consists of the following parts:

- Written exam (2,5 hp), grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
- Project report (4,5 hp), grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
- Critical review (0,5 hp), grade scale: P, F

Scheduled learning activities

- Lectures: 18 h (Minor changes in lecture content)
- Computer labs: 12 h (2 hrs more than last year)
- Supervision meetings with project groups: 4 h

Own studies, estimated time

- Attending lectures and studying course literature: 1 week
- Completing home exam: 5 h
- Project work: 3.5 weeks
- Critical review and final revision of report: 0.5 week

This year about 75 students attended the course, more than usual. This required some re-planning. We had double computer lab sessions, which meant that fewer than normal attended each sessions, plus students that fewer wanted to could attend both to get more time in the lab with a supervisor. This was good for the work environment in the lab!



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?

65% spend a reasonable time on the course (12-20 hrs/week). 10% spent much more than that, which matches my impression that some students are very ambitious. The remainder between 5-11 hrs/week. 5 hrs is impossible, since attending compulsory course meetings and working in projects (with low ambition) would require at least a few more hrs per week. I suspect that it is an underestimation. If students work according to course design, the workload is reasonable.

Comment from student working 12-14 hrs/week: "Personally, i really enjoyed the way the course was structured. The working hours in the course was attributed to the hours spent in the lab trying to make oneself comfortable with the software and the datasets included in it. The course was also oriented towards learning the software as much as possible which was really enjoyable"

Comment from student working 18-20 hrs/week: "This course has the prospect of continuous learning wherein you do not peak or dissolve with what you have learnt. Instead, due to the prospective of practical applications, you always learn different methods and challenges."

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?

Similar to last year. High average results (B). There is reason to question if the course requirements are too low. Compared to some years ago, however the impression is that students actually do perform better. This may be a result of better instructions, more frequent computer labs, and introduction of more peer review assignments, which have been the major improvements in course design over time.

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?

The scores in the polar diagram are high (5.9-6.5 out of 7). Only one question scored less ("I had opportunities to influence the course activities"). This is of course true (the course design is set) but on the other hand some students express that this is not a problem. Also, they like being able to design their own projects, so this is not a major concern.

No significant difference between male/female or Swedish/international students in this regard.

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?

Comments from students:

Strong: teaching and assignments in regular intervals to avoid "peaks", close supervision in computer labs, positive to select own projects, positive atmosphere, well-structured course, quick feedback

Weak: uneven distribution of work in projects (always a challenge in projects, we try to address this through close supervision, compulsory attendance, follow-up when students do not show up, written agreement between students in project groups), perceived unfair grading (no actual individual grading of projects, maybe unclear grading criteria in the view of students), stressful situation when choosing projects (we are aware of that, students get very little time to prepare)



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?

- Students ask for better access to Simapro (for instance on student computers). This cannot be solved. We have solved it in the best possible way.

- Some negative feedback on how groups were formed (own choice). It's a trade-off between flexibility and predictability. We will stick to the current format.

- One negative comment on how topics were selected. Wants more input from teacher, less free choice. On the other hand, many students appreciate this, it's a trade-off. Possibly, we can ask students to prepare more before proposing topics, so that the brainstorming session to find topics is better planned and students are more well informed about what may be good LCA topics. However, most important is to emphasise to students that the topic per se is not important, the learning experience is not dependent on the topic.

- One student writes that the final grading is not reasonable. Without further explanation it's hard to know in what way. Next year, the course is slightly redesign with "målrelaterade betygskriterier", which may improve this aspect.

- Comments about supervision is very contradictory. The majority are very positive, while one student complains the he/she got no good help. It's hard to know the reason for this. It may be a student expecting more precise instructions, while in LCA and this course it is much about choosing perspective, arguing for and against, seeking information on your own.

- According to one student, unclear wording and new terminology in the home exam resulted in unfair grading. Go through this carefully next year.

-

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The course plan has been revised for next year, with "målrelaterade betygskriterier". This will hopefully change the perceived unfair grading. Other than that, no major changes are planned. For the most parts students are very happy with the course and results show that they are learning much.
