Report - AG2811 - 2019-02-03

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 course includes lectures, literature seminars, two study visit and project work which is examined by seminar participation, home exam and project work reporting.
Following the evaluation of HT2017 course round we diversified the design of the seminars and used several different methods for peer discussions, we updated the course content by adding more international examples, more relevant literature using an urban planning perspective and we introduced grading criteria that are outcome based and well aligned with the ILOs.
The new course plan has been approved where the ILO's have been updated.

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 survey A and B the majority of the respondents used 11-26 hours/week where 20h/week equal 50% study pace. None of the respondents use more time than expected, however some less, which might be related to the inter-disciplinary content of the course, where some have more background understanding of the topic and others less.

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 finished the course with grade E or higher, which is similar to previous years.
Similar to HT2017 one issue of importance was the number of students that had troubles with scientific writing as applied in the home exam. This despite our efforts in providing clear information about these specific requirements and special course material regarding this as well as explanations in class. We are not sure what else we can do and have contacted the program leader to address this issue in the whole program.
In HT2017 some students disagreed with the grading, which was not the case this year. This is because we have updated and clarified the grading criteria for all parts of the examination.

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?

Meaningfulness: The respondents seem to find the course meaningful with average scores 5.2-6.4 for questions no 1-6
Comprehensibility:
- The respondents seem to find the course comprehensive with average scores 4.8-6.2 for questions no 7-11
- When it comes to constructive alignment and feedback the average scores are lower 2.9-5.6 for questions no 12-16. The most significant low score is for question no 14 regarding regular feedback.
Manageability: For question 17-19 and 21 the average score is 5.6-6.2 which is high, whilst for question 20 and 22 it is lower 3.7-4.5. The latter questions regard the opportunity to influence the course activities and to get support when needing it.
Differences: Overall there is an agreement in the responses across gender and student groups. One important deviation is the lower average scores from international exchange students for question 17-18 that concerns sufficient background knowledge and spending the time to reflect on their own learning.

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?

Our course is strong in providing a meaningful learning environment where the content is well presented by explanation and discussions (Q1-11). It gets a very high score for open and inclusive atmosphere (Q6) which is something that we carefully think about in the design of learning activities. The perception of how the ILO's were helpful varies a lot (Q7) as well as the requirements for each grade (Q13) which is very likely related to the fact that this year the course was in the phase of getting approval for updated ILOs. The average score is also high for learning in different ways (Q19) and this reflects the high ambitions for providing this diversity in the course. The course main weaknesses are the opportunities for feedback (Q14-16, Q22) and the limited opportunities to influence course activities (Q20).

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?

This part of the analysis is also based on the oral evaluation discussion during the course final seminar.
• The respondents appreciated the course structure, the inter-disciplinary project work and the diverse ways of learning that were provided.
• The respondents suggest more interaction with the whole group during the project work, e.g. in workshop format, and that the project will benefit from being introduced earlier.
• The advice includes: start reading early, make sure to document from lectures, seminars and field visits to be used later in the course, plan the project work carefully to find times where the whole group can meet.
• The respondents among other things want to add: more lectures esp from practitioners, rethink the use of the workbook for the projects.
• The respondents appreciate three women as course team, them being good role models for young females in higher education at KTH.

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

• Identify how regular feedback can be provided during the course and within the course budget. How can, for instance, student peer review feedback be combined with teachers feedback.
• Further improve the communication, explanation and alignment of ILO's to activities and grading criteria.
• Regarding content: investigate how the project work can be introduced earlier, evaluate and suggest what common tool to use for the project work.
• Find ways to at a program level increase the student's understanding of correct scientific referencing

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

For this round of the course, there was a mistake made when trying to extend the time for accepting answers for the evaluation. As a result, there were two separate evaluations created in the system. The system administrators could not find a way to merge the results from the two evaluations. Therefore, I created one report including the results from the two evaluations. The report is also uploaded twice in the system, each one linked to one evaluation. In total there were 23 responses 13 in the first and 10 in the second. This means that 62% of the students responded.
In addition to the written evaluation, we collected a lot of feedback during the oral evaluation discussion at the final course seminar October 12, 2018.

AG2811 - Planering för resiliens, HT 2018

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2018 v.35
Kursen slutar:	2018 v.43
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	PRO1 - Gruppinlämningsuppgift, 2,5, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
	SEM2 - Seminarier, 2,0, betygsskala: P, F
	TEN3 - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Sara Borgström <sarabor@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Rebecka Milestad <claram@kth.se>
Lärare:	Sara Borgström <sarabor@kth.se>
	Nathalie Becker <nibeck@kth.se>
Assistenter:	

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	0
Totalt registrerade:	37

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad[1] [%]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*
Prestationsgrad[2] [%]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*
Betygsfördelning[3] [%, antal]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*

1 Andel godkända studenter
2 Andel avklarade poäng
3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter

Report - AG2811 - 2019-02-03

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 course includes lectures, literature seminars, two study visit and project work which is examined by seminar participation, home exam and project work reporting.
Following the evaluation of HT2017 course round we diversified the design of the seminars and used several different methods for peer discussions, we updated the course content by adding more international examples, more relevant literature using an urban planning perspective and we introduced grading criteria that are outcome based and well aligned with the ILOs.
The new course plan has been approved where the ILO's have been updated.

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 survey A and B the majority of the respondents used 11-26 hours/week where 20h/week equal 50% study pace. None of the respondents use more time than expected, however some less, which might be related to the inter-disciplinary content of the course, where some have more background understanding of the topic and others less.

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 finished the course with grade E or higher, which is similar to previous years.
Similar to HT2017 one issue of importance was the number of students that had troubles with scientific writing as applied in the home exam. This despite our efforts in providing clear information about these specific requirements and special course material regarding this as well as explanations in class. We are not sure what else we can do and have contacted the program leader to address this issue in the whole program.
In HT2017 some students disagreed with the grading, which was not the case this year. This is because we have updated and clarified the grading criteria for all parts of the examination.

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?

Meaningfulness: The respondents seem to find the course meaningful with average scores 5.2-6.4 for questions no 1-6
Comprehensibility:
- The respondents seem to find the course comprehensive with average scores 4.8-6.2 for questions no 7-11
- When it comes to constructive alignment and feedback the average scores are lower 2.9-5.6 for questions no 12-16. The most significant low score is for question no 14 regarding regular feedback.
Manageability: For question 17-19 and 21 the average score is 5.6-6.2 which is high, whilst for question 20 and 22 it is lower 3.7-4.5. The latter questions regard the opportunity to influence the course activities and to get support when needing it.
Differences: Overall there is an agreement in the responses across gender and student groups. One important deviation is the lower average scores from international exchange students for question 17-18 that concerns sufficient background knowledge and spending time to reflect on their own learning.

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?

Our course is strong in providing a meaningful learning environment where the content is well presented by explanation and discussions (Q1-11). It gets a very high score for open and inclusive atmosphere (Q6) which is something that we carefully think about in the design of learning activities. The perception of how the ILO's were helpful varies a lot (Q7) as well as the requirements for each grade (Q13) which is very likely related to the fact that this year the course was in the phase of getting approval for updated ILOs. The average score is also high for learning in different ways (Q19) and this reflects the high ambitions for providing this diversity in the course. The course main weaknesses are the opportunities for feedback (Q14-16, Q22) and the limited opportunities to influence course activities (Q20).

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?

This part of the analysis is also based on the oral evaluation discussion during the course final seminar.
• The respondents appreciated the course structure, the inter-disciplinary project work and the diverse ways of learning that were provided.
• The respondents suggest more interaction with the whole group during the project work, e.g. in workshop format, and that the project will benefit from being introduced earlier.
• The advice includes: start reading early, make sure to document from lectures, seminars and field visits to be used later in the course, plan the project work carefully to find times where the whole group can meet.
• The respondents among other things want to add: more lectures esp from practitioners, rethink the use of the workbook for the projects.
• The respondents appreciate three women as course team, them being good role models for young females in higher education at KTH.

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

• Identify how regular feedback can be provided during the course and within the course budget. How can, for instance, student peer review feedback be combined with teachers feedback.
• Further improve the communication, explanation and alignment of ILO's to activities and grading criteria.
• Regarding content: investigate how the project work can be introduced earlier, evaluate and suggest what common tool to use for the project work.
• Find ways to at a program level increase the student's understanding of correct scientific referencing

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

For this round of the course, there was a mistake made when trying to extend the time for accepting answers for the evaluation. As a result, there were two separate evaluations created in the system. The system administrators could not find a way to merge the results from the two evaluations. Therefore, I created one report including the results from the two evaluations. The report is also uploaded twice in the system, each one linked to one evaluation. In total there were 23 responses 13 in the first and 10 in the second. This means that 62% of the students responded.
In addition to the written evaluation, we collected a lot of feedback during the oral evaluation discussion at the final course seminar October 12, 2018.

Kursdata 2019-02-04

AG2811 - Planering för resiliens, HT 2018

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2018 v.35
Kursen slutar:	2018 v.43
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	PRO1 - Gruppinlämningsuppgift, 2,5, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
	SEM2 - Seminarier, 2,0, betygsskala: P, F
	TEN3 - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Sara Borgström <sarabor@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Rebecka Milestad <claram@kth.se>
Lärare:	Sara Borgström <sarabor@kth.se>
	Nathalie Becker <nibeck@kth.se>
Assistenter:	

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	0
Totalt registrerade:	37

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad[1] [%]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*
Prestationsgrad[2] [%]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*
Betygsfördelning[3] [%, antal]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*

1 Andel godkända studenter
2 Andel avklarade poäng
3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter