

# 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 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.

## **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 in the previous period. 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. AK2030 students got their own online course room (Canvas page) instead of one that is shared with other course codes as previously used. Some collaboration remained with other course codes (e.g. AK2036, AK2038, AK2040) 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 these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?**

As in previous periods, most respondents report studying less than the expected 12 hours per week. Very few report more than 12 hours. It was discussed during the course analysis meeting that period 1 can be particularly stressful since there are no holidays or other periods for students to catch up. This in combination with the workload in other courses could be a reason why some students spend less than the recommended time per week. It was also proposed that students might view non-mandatory material (e.g. lecture quizzes) as mandatory, although this would arguably increase the study time rather than the opposite.

In previous analyses it has been proposed that students might underestimate the time spent each week. Therefore, in this period students received information during the course about the expected workload and how to calculate the time spent on the course. It is unclear whether this had an effect on their reported time.

## 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?

Fewer students received the highest grades (A, B) compared to previous course offerings. This is an expected result of the new exam format. The new format only allows bonus points collected during the course to be used on part 1, meaning that they cannot help the student to reach above grade C.

Furthermore, it is open-book and has a separate part only for students who aim at grade A or B, which some students don't submit although they have fulfilled the prerequisites on parts 1 and 2.

The question was raised during the analysis meeting whether one can gather further information about the students getting F to find out possible reasons. This will be investigated further.

Grade	Students, nbr	Students, %
A	8	7,62%
B	8	7,62%
C	14	13,33%
D	42	40,00%
E	13	12,38%
F	7	6,67%
Fx	13	12,38%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

Passed: 81%. Five Fx students passed the Fx-assignment, bringing the final percentage of passing students to 86%. 25 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?

Many comments show appreciation for the on-campus seminars in contrast to the distance parts of the course. Some students want improvements on the quizzes and the MCQ on the exam, but others think they are good. There are many comments about the terminology being difficult with a lot of new, complicated words to learn. Some find the exam unfair due to the part 3 threshold being too high. There are also suspicions about the questions being unequal in terms of difficulty and about students collaborating during the exam (as well as the lecture quizzes).

It was discussed during the meeting whether the quizzes are a good enough indication of the students' learning, given that we cannot prevent them from collaborating. It was also discussed whether the bonus points should be used in the way they currently are. No conclusions were reached about this.

## SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Average score above 5 on all questions (which corresponds to +1 on a scale from -3 to +3). No particular areas that deviate. No students were present on the course analysis meeting.

## **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 impression was that students mostly appreciated the course. The new structure with a separate Canvas page for this course seems to have worked well.

## **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?**

No significant differences.

**- international/national students?**

No significant differences.

**- 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 online exam is the primary area of development. Extra focus will be on analyzing which students get F and see if they can receive extra help during the course in the future. The main course text, which now covers all of the lectures, is in need of improvement and corrections.

## **OTHER INFORMATION**

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