

Report - AH2173 - 2023-01-03

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.

Only 4 out of 38 registered students completed the survey, which makes it difficult to draw representative conclusions from the results.

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, things were back to more or less normal after the Covid-19 pandemic. In other words, teaching was done on campus and the written exam was also done on campus. The traditional study journey was also carried out. However, it was not possible to arrange any study visits due to restrictions at companies and authorities.

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 most common response (50%) is 15-17 hours per week, which is about expected.

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 to previous years. There were more students than previous years, which means that the range of grades can be expected to be larger.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

One comment is that the workload was low in the beginning but high at the end.
Compliments to interesting course, good guest lecturers and good teaching assistant (Jonas H).
One comment on uninteresting exercises, another comment on non-informative slides.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

While the response rate was very low this year, the average scores are similar to previous year. On most questions the scores are slightly higher this year. Overall the students' opinions are positive (score ≥ 4.2 for all questions except number 4), but there are things that can be improved. Compared to last year, the question (4) "The course was challenging in a stimulating way" received a lower score. Meanwhile for example questions (5) "I felt togetherness with others on the course", (6) "I could practice and receive feedback without being graded" and (13) "I understood what I was expected to learn in order to obtain a certain grade" received higher scores. The outcome for questions (5) and (6) are likely partly effects of the return to normal teaching after the pandemic.

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. Some aspects of lectures and exercises may be possible to improve in future offerings. The low response rate 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. 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. Since last year, we worked on clarifying the grading criteria for the exam and in particular the project. The higher score on question (13) shows that this has had a positive effect.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Revisit exercises, seek to reinstate a study visit.