



# Report - AH2173 - 2022-02-03

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):**

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 questionnaire based on the LEQ format was carried out after the end of the course. The respondents could indicate their gender and disabilities, allowing for studying differences in responses.

**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.)**

No meetings were arranged during or after 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 forms of examination, a written exam and a project examined through oral presentation and written report. Learning activities consist of lectures, exercises intended to give hands-on training with the theory, a workshop discussing current topics, and two study visits. This course offering, both learning activities and examinations were significantly affected and adjusted due to Covid-19. The study visits and study journey were cancelled. Lectures and exercises had to be carried out remotely over Zoom. The written exam was carried out remotely with supervision over Zoom.

**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 average reported workload is around 15-20 hours/week. This is similar to previous offerings. The variation is smaller than previous year, but this may be due to a lower number of respondents.

**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 results were overall similar but slightly better than previous year. Previous year it was observed that Covid-19 put significant restrictions on the learning activities and have affected the general situation of the students negatively, which can impact the results. The improvement this year could reflect that students have adapted a bit to the situation.

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

Many students are positive about the course, lectures and exercises. The teaching assistants get much appreciation for their assistance. The project is highlighted as the best part of the course. Some have negative experiences with the lectures which they felt lacked interactivity. Some thought information about the exam came too late.

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Overall the students' opinions are positive (score > 4 for all questions except number 13), but there are things that can be improved. Compared to last year, the question (13) "I understood what I was expected to learn in order to obtain a certain grade" received a lower score. Meanwhile for example questions (14) "received regular feedback that helped me to see my progress", (15) "I could practice and receive feedback without being graded" and (17) "My background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course" received higher scores.

**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 students are in general satisfied with the course. The project assignment and exercises including the teaching assistants are highly appreciated. The lectures suffered from the online format due to Covid-19, but can in general become more interactive. The online format seems to have been a slightly less negative issue this year. The low response rate (9/24 = 37,5%) makes it difficult to draw too strong conclusions from the responses received.



#### **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?

---

Strong aspects of the learning environment include the project and exercises. Weak aspects include unclarity of grading criteria. There are no clear differences between male and female students. The responses do not allow for a distinction between international/national students or students with/without disabilities.

---

#### **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

Grading criteria for the project should be clarified.

---