

Report - AH1025 - 2023-04-10

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):

Erik Jenelius, jenelius@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 course evaluation survey following the LEQ template was sent out to the students after the end of the course. The response rate was 6 out of 29 students (6/29 = 21%). The template distinguishes between gender and disabled students and displays results if the group is sufficiently large. In addition, a student representative gathered thoughts from the students which were presented and discussed with the course responsible and teaching assistant after the course end.

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.)

A meeting was held with the student representative (Maja Karlsson Wickman) on February 21 2023 after the completion of the course.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course consists of two main parts: a set of lectures and a project assignment. The lectures are split into a basic block and an advanced block. A written exam on the basic block is given halfway into the course. An oral exam on the advanced block is given at the end of the course. The project assignment is reported in a written report and an oral presentation.

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?

The students report a wide range of workloads, with median 12-14 hours/week. Overall the workload appears reasonable.

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?

The students in general have good results on the course, in line with typical years.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The best aspects of the course:

- Project assignment, which allows own planning work
- Interesting lectures and project, study visits were the most interesting

Things to improve:

- More teaching assistants
- Some lectures could go more in-depth
- Project could be restructured to speed up getting started

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Overall the student comments are positive. Suggestions for improvement mainly concern the project assignment, to help getting up to speed earlier. The survey response rate was very low (21%), which makes ratings unreliable. Highest scores are given to the statements "I worked with interesting issues", "I felt togetherness with others on the course", "My background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course" and "I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others". On the other hand, the open-text responses are well aligned with the feedback from the student representative.

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 offering was generally successful. There were significantly more students than previous years, which we take as a sign of good teaching quality and reputation. On the other hand it put more demand than usual on the responsible teacher and teaching assistant in the project assignment, which is reflected in some student comments.

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?
-

Female students gave significantly higher scores on all questions in the survey, but the low number of respondents makes the difference non-significant. There are still things in the project instructions and support that can be improved.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The project support can be further developed and tuned, depending on the number of students. There is room for going more in-depth in some topics without becoming too advanced according to course survey.
