

# Course analysis AK2030 period 1 2021

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail): Adam Lundström Ramírez, adamlr@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 have 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.

## **COURSE DESIGN**

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

The main learning activities are video lectures and seminars. There are also 10 online quizzes associated to the lectures. In this period most seminars were held on campus as opposed to the online versions (video meetings) that were used the previous semester. One time slot each week was online to accommodate students with special reasons to be careful (see previous course analyses for more details on pandemic-related changes). The content and structure of the seminars remained largely the same. Some collaboration was done with other course codes (e.g. AK2036 and some doctoral courses) in the form of online discussion forums at the beginning of the course and Q/A sessions (video meetings) towards the end. We also allowed for some flexibility in the seminar groups, allowing students to take the seminars with another course code if needed to fit their schedule.

## **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?**

Six out of 14 respondents report to study 5 hours per week or less. We suspect this to be an underestimation. None report to study more than 11 hours per week, whence we have no reason to suspect that the course is too time consuming.

## **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?**

Only four out of 59 students didn't pass the exam (7%). We see this as a good result. Apart from that, the general trend of D being the most common grade continues from previous periods.

Grade	Students, nbr	Students, %
A	6	10%
B	6	10%
C	7	12%
D	22	37%
E	14	24%
F	3	5%
Fx	1	2%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

Passed: 93%. The student receiving Fx passed the Fx-assignment, bringing the final percentage of passing students to 95%. Ten of the students who submitted a part 3 didn't reach the threshold on part 1 and 2 to get it corrected.

## STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

### What do students say in response to the open questions?

Some students were not satisfied with the format of the multiple choice questions on the quizzes during the course as well as on the exam. It was decided during the meeting to increase the effort on updating and improving these questions.

There were written complaints about students cheating on the exam. Possible solutions to this were discussed and will be evaluated further for future course offerings.

## SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Average score around 5 on most questions (which corresponds to +1 on a scale from -3 to +3). Question 4 (*the course was challenging in a stimulating way*) has an average of 4.6. Question 16 (*the assessment on the course was fair and honest*) has an average of 4.2. Comments under question 16 together with answers to the open questions suggest that some students were not satisfied with the format of the multiple choice questions. International students were on average more satisfied with the exam compared to Swedish students. For the future, this should be compared with previous evaluations to decide whether it is a trend.

## 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.

Nothing in particular was said about this. No larger changes have been implemented since the previous period.

## 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?

The learning environment seems to be strong generally. All course material is continuously improved, but there are no particular weak areas.

**Are there significant differences in experience between:**

**- students identifying as female/male?**

Female students gave an on average higher score on most questions. However, we don't have data about female students on all questions, meaning that less than three female students answered some of the questions.

**- international/national students?**

International students were on average more satisfied with the exam compared to Swedish students.

**- students with/without disabilities?**

No data on students with disabilities (too few such respondents).

### **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

The main course text will be improved and a new version will be made available during the next course offering. As mentioned above, quizzes and MCQ part of the exam will be improved.

### **OTHER INFORMATION**

**Is there anything else you would like to add?**