Course analysis AK2030, AK2036 & AK2050 period 2 2020-2021

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail): Johan Berg, jgberg@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.

Students have been asked to fill out the LEQ through the central KTH system. This also investigates aspects regarding gender and disabled students. A 12 questions LEQ template was used without additional questions.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion.

Students were invited to send representatives to the course analysis meeting. Student unions were also asked to send representatives. None accepted the invitation.

COURSE DESIGN

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

General: differences between courses

AK2030 and AK2036 and AK2050 takes the same main lectures. AK2050 takes these lectures during period 1.

AK2030, AK2036 and AK2050 all take the same seminars. AK2050 takes these seminars during period 1.

AK2036 and AK2050 take a project part. For TMLEM students this consist of three lectures and two seminars, ended by a home assignment. For other students, this consists of three tasks where student work in groups with an article from their field.

Given that these courses are similar, it is useful to discuss these evaluations together. Note: below only changes from period 1 are described. See that analysis for further pandemic-related changes.

Lectures

All of the main lectures for these courses were given through pre-recorded video. The TMLEM project part lectures were given through Zoom. Compared to period 1, an additional eleventh lecture was added, which had been cancelled in period 1.

Seminars

There are four seminars in this course, normally given as campus seminars. This period, all seminars were given through Zoom.

Exam

The course ends with an exam. This exam was given through Canvas, during the scheduled exam hours. No particular changes was made with the exam during this period. However, the Fx exam for the grade E was changed into a task where students were to improve their already submitted answer. Previously, a new home exam had been sent out.

Project part: AK2036 (except below)

This part of the course was already without physical interaction, and was not changed during the period.

Project part: AK2050 & TMLEM AK2036

Lectures and seminars were given live through Zoom.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

In general, students study less than the expected level. As has been discussed in previous analyses, there are many possible reasons for this, such as students putting in the effort only to pass the course or other courses requiring more time than they should. It could also be that students are making incorrect assessments of their time spent on the course. Some notable exceptions from the average, where students reported spending more than 40 hours per week on the course, could be a further indication for this. The participants in the course analysis meeting considered that the amount of time reported was reasonable given these uncertainties, and did not suggest any particular change.

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?

2020	AK2030	AK2036	AK2050	Totalt	%	2019
A	5			5	4%	24%
B	7	2	1	10	8%	12%
C	15	8	11	34	29%	21%
D	15	8	12	35	30%	12%
E	10	6	4	20	15%	6%
F	1		2	3	1%	17%
FX	2	7	2	11	9%	8%
Tot	**55**	**31**	**32**	**118**		**89 stud.**

67% of the students with the grade C could have received a higher grade if they had submitted the part for the higher grade, but did not do so. Last year 25 % of students got F or FX, whereas now it was only 10 %. If this difference is significant, the exam format with open book is presumably the reason.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The videos receive some compliments, in particular regarding the high production value. The quizzes in themselves are great, some students claim, since they allow students to determine that they have the required knowledge. However, the questions are formulated in a bad way; it might be hard to determine if you do not know or if it is a trick question. However, continual improvements are made, based on student feedback.

The seminars received praise, and several state that they were the best part of the course.

For AK2050, there was some requests for more feedback during the project part. For the general project part, there were some requests for making the instructions clearer.

There was a suggestion of drop-in office hours and more Q/As.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Generally, have a favourable impression of the learning environment in this course. On this scale, zero equals an average of -3 and 7 equals on average +3, while 4 being neutral. Students taking AK2030 rate all aspects of the learning environment between 5,8-5,8 (14 responses). Students taking AK2036 rate all aspects of the learning environment between 5,9-6,7 (9 responses). Students taking AK2050 rate all aspects of the learning environment between 4,3-5,9 (10 responses). None of these aspects of the learning environment stands out in particular for these courses. For AK2050 the answers pointed towards some problems with meaningfulness. Excluding the possibility that this is statistical variance in respondents, the most apparent possibility is that the issue is with the matching between the course and the master programme, however since some students taking AK2036 are also from the TMLEM-programme, it is hard to draw any clear conclusions.

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 teachers' overall impression is that students, in general appreciated the course.

The exam was discussed at length, both structure and content. Students could be offered more opportunities to practice for the part 3 of the exam. A question could be included in future evaluations: did you submit part 3, if not why not?

The project part for AK2050 and AK2036 for TMLEM students was discussed. One aspect for improvement could be to give quicker feedback on assignments.

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 be?

There is no aspect of the learning environment that sticks out in either direction, the courses taken as a whole. The general structure of the course in functioning well and fills its purpose. Improvements can be made to particular aspects, such as quizzes.

Are there significant differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female/male?

- international/national students?

- students with/without disabilities?

There were too few students who answered to allow for any particular interpretation regarding these aspects.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- The remaining video should be transcribed.
- The transcriptions should be edited further.
- The quizzes should be given an overview, to ensure consistency.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?