

Course Analysis AK2030, Period 1 2022

Course analysis carried out by Helena Björnesjö, helena.bjornesjo@abe.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 were asked to fill out an anonymous course evaluation using a LEQ template through the central KTH system. The form factors in gender, disabilities, and national/international student. The report covers answers from 45 respondents out of 201 students.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

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

A course evaluation meeting for period 1 2022 was held and to which program- and student representatives were invited. The meeting was a joint meeting with courses similar to AK2030. Some of the information (analysis and course development) in this report is based on said course evaluation meeting.

COURSE DESIGN

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

AK2030 features nine pre-recorded video lectures, three campus lectures, and four campus seminars designed to cover the main areas of the course. Course examination consists of a 4 hour digital open-book exam in 3 parts designed for assessing different competencies specified in the course curriculum. Part I of the exam is a multiple choice question part with a time limit, whereas part II and part III are essay style questions with free text answers. Part III is only required for grades A and B, and conversely, an exam submission comprising only part I and part II can maximally result in the grade C.

No major changes since last course offering.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

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

Nothing to remark on other than the majority of respondents reporting working less than expected. There are multiple possible explanations for this and because of little indications from free text comments, it is difficult to draw conclusions. Among free text comments, several respondents reported they deemed the workload reasonable, whereas some felt they spent too much time on the course, especially on completing quiz activities.

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 number of course participants taking the designated period 1 exam was significantly higher compared to that of period 1 in 2021. Similar to period 1 in 2022, the previous period 1 course round saw an accumulation of grades D, but saw a lower rate of instances of E and a higher rate of FX and F. Due to increase in number of students taking the exam, and since the overall grade distribution pattern is roughly similar and with a pass rate above 80% for both course offerings, it is difficult to draw particular conclusions on course offering comparisons.

P1 2022:

A	6 %
B	7 %
C	16 %
D	36 %
E	22 %
F	4 %
Fx	8 %

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Several respondents deemed the course contents interesting and valuable. Video lectures and seminars receive positive feedback from several students, as well as course structure and teacher contact, although the latter topics received mixed reviews. The course received positive feedback for being well-structured and for featuring weekly announcements on study planning.

Among free text answers, there were also expressions of opinions that lecture/seminar quiz system is excessively demanding and sometimes features ambiguous or otherwise unclear questions and/or answer options, that more exam study material would have been helpful, and that the exam is demanding with comments made on difficulty to meet expectations on independent writing and on a strict grading format (with part III being graded conditional on that part I and II have yielded a score corresponding to a grade C). Flipped classroom activities received overall positive feedback in the text comments, although multiple respondents reported having chosen not to participate on the flipped classroom sessions.

Respondents advised future students to actively participate on the seminars, to complete lecture and practice quizzes, and to work at a continuous pace throughout the course.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Opinions were mixed but respondent feedback was overall positively tilted. Respondents gave an average LEC score above 4.5 and with ratings on the LEQ statements varying from 4.3 to 5.7. Looking that the bar charts in the summary statistics, the question "I worked on interesting issues" received a predominantly positive rating.

LEC statements that received a comparatively high average score (above 5.5) were "My background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course", "I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others", "I was able to get support if I needed it", and "I could practice and receive feedback without being graded". LEC statements that received a comparatively low average score (ranging from 4.3 to 4.8) were "The course was challenging in a stimulating way", "The intended learning outcomes

helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve”, “The course activities enabled me to learn in different ways”), and “The assessment on the course was fair and honest”.¹

Female respondents gave overall somewhat lower score than male respondents did. In particular, female respondents gave a lower score on “The intended learning outcomes helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve”, and on “My background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course”. Text answers give no clear indication as to what possible reasons for these deviations might be. A few respondents reported not having read the intended learning outcomes, and one student reported that they believe they would have struggled with the course if they had been less proficient in English.

Similar differences in average score were found for national versus international students, where international students gave an overall somewhat lower average score, aside from “I was able to practice and receive feedback without being graded” for which the average score was higher for international students.

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.

Teachers note no particular or significant deviations from prior course evaluations.

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?

Stronger learning environment areas appear to include seminars and flipped classroom activities which students report appreciation of with student feedback interpreted as seminars being perceived to be inclusive and to offer a platform for collaborative learning with fellow students and to receive feedback and support. Additionally, students report appreciation of video lectures on the basis of accessibility, and of quality of video lecture recordings.

Weaknesses with respect to learning environment areas appear to include experience of high workload with excessive focus on learning concepts and definitions and completing many activities, and of quizzes and exams as being somewhat convoluted and demanding, and with a bonus point system considered unclear by some.

Are there significant differences in experience between...

- students identifying as female/male?

See “Summary of Students Opinions”.

- international/national students?

See “Summary of Students Opinions”.

- students with/without disabilities?

¹ It should be noted that course evaluation was distributed before grading of exam. The ongoing course featured pass/fail seminar activities. Text comments indicated that at least some respondents appeared to have had exam grading in mind when answering the question about assessment on the questionnaire.

No breakdown.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- Examination and grading formats will be put under review and development (*short- and long-term development*).
- Lecture- and seminar quizzes will be improved by reviewing formulations and adding clarifications, examples and quiz question feedback (*short- and long-term development*).
- The main course text will be updated to add clarity, conciseness and illustrative examples, and improve overall readability (text stems from lecture transcripts) (*short- and long-term development*).

OTHER INFORMATION

None.