Report - AG2811 - 2017-12-15

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):
Sara Borgström, sara.borgstrom@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 analysis is based on the respones of 16 students (total number in the course #30) = 53,33% and an oral evaluation discussion at the final course seminar.
The course includes lectures, literature seminars, one study visit and project work which is examined by seminar participation, home exam and project work reporting.
No significant changes were made between the course round HT2016 and the present one (HT2017).
The course plan is currently in the process of revision, mainly regarding intended learning outcomes.

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?
According to the survey answers 7/16 students reported that their workload was between 15-23 h/week (20h/week is what the course is planned for).
They reported that the workload was very high in the beginning (until the home exam) and less during the project work, which many appreciated.

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, but one, finished the course with grade E or higher. There is no signification difference in the student's results.
One issue of importance was the number of students that had troubles with scientific writing as to be applied in the home exam. We have provided support for this in various forms, but clearly need to improve this further, especially since this is a preparatory course for the degree project planning.
Some students were unsatisfied with the grading, which was very likely due to unclear grading criteria and not due to examination mistakes.

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?

For all aspects the scores are from 5.1 and higher, with most around "6". This indicates that overall the students are very satisfied with their learning experiences and environment.

Differences between groups:
Overall there is an agreement across gender and type of students. A slight deviation can be seen for:
- aspect 3 (try our own ideas) and 16 (fair and honest assessment) where female respondents did disagree to a larger extent. Of importance to look into is whether we provide equal opportunity to try own ideas across gender.
- for many aspects the international students (mastersstudent and utbytesstudent) the score was lower. A plausible reason is that the lecturers are predominantely conducting research in Sweden and therefore uses Swedish cases in their lectures, and that the project work is conducted in a municipality in Stockholm.

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?

The lowest scores were for aspect 3 (try our own ideas), 10 (learn from examples I can relate to) and 14 (receiving regular feedback for progress).
For aspect 3 this relates to the background of the student, if this course content clearly link to core interests of theirs. Since the course is very diverse in terms of student background the score of 5.1 is reasonable. For aspect 10 a plausible reason is that the lecturers are predominantely conducting research in Sweden and therefore uses Swedish cases in their lectures, and that the project work is conducted in a municipality in Stockholm. For aspect 14 this is due to the capacity of the course teachers in terms of hours to be spent for individual feedback, which is very limited.

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?

Key messages from open question answers:
- The structure of the course works very well with intensive reading, mid-course home exam and then project work
- The study visit is very inspiring and clarifying
- A need to improve the timing of interventions during the project work, e.g. supervision and pre-hand in
- A need to add more diversity of cases

Advices to future students:
- Read the course literature from the start and try to start reading even before the course introduction
- Be aware that there will be massive new content in the beginning but that this will be digested through literature seminars, study visit and project work.

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

- Clarity in grading criterias for a more transparant grading process.
- Add more international cases to the lectures and make better use of the international experience of the class.
- Increase capacity for supervision to support the project work

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?

For HT2018 we are in the process of revising the ILO's for the course and will develop detailed grading criteria for all examinations.

Course data 2018-03-06

AG2811 - Planning for Resilience, HT 2017

Course facts

Course start:	2017 w.35
Course end:	2017 w.43
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	PRO1 - Group Project, 2.5, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F SEM2 - Seminars, 2.0, Grading scale: P, F TEN3 - Exam, 3.0, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Sara Borgström <sarabor@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Rebecka Milestad <claram@kth.se>
Teachers:	Sara Borgström <sarabor@kth.se> Peter Brokking <brokking@kth.se> Jacob von Oelreich <jacobvo@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	29
Total number of registered:	30

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate[1] [%]	96.60%
Performance rate[2] [%]	100.90%
Grade distribution[3] [%, number]	A 11% (3) B 18% (5) C 54% (15) D 21% (6)

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