

Course Analysis AK2030, Period 2 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 10 respondents out of 64 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 2 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.

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 free text comments and a relatively small survey sample, it is difficult to draw conclusions.

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 2 exam was similar to that of period 2 in 2021. Although the percentage of students receiving higher passing grades A and B was slightly lower in period 2 2022, the distribution of passing grades was divided more evenly over the grade

spectrum than in period 2 2021 where e.g. grades D and E comprised a larger portion of passing grades.

P2 2022:

A	6 %
B	6 %
C	28 %
D	28 %
E	6 %
F	11 %
Fx	15 %

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Several respondents deem the course contents interesting. The course received positive feedback for being well-structured and for featuring weekly announcements on study planning.

Seminars received credit for being a helpful and collaborative learning activity. Video lectures were appreciated on the basis of being available online at any time and for being high quality recordings.

Among free text answers, there were also expressions of opinions that lecture/seminar quiz system is frustrating and demanding, that more exam study material would have been helpful, that bonus points for exam are calculated according to a scheme that is not straightforward to grasp, and that exam instructions lack in clarity regarding expected time for and length of free text exam answers. Flipped classroom activities received mixed feedback, with students finding them somewhat useful.

Respondents advised future students to plan ahead and to complete lecture quizzes and other bonus point activities.

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 5 with ratings on the LEQ statements varying from 4.3 to 6.6. LEC statements that received a comparatively high score (above 6.0), were “I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others” and “the course activities helped me to achieve the intended learning outcomes efficiently”, whereas “the assessment on the course was fair and honest” received an overall comparatively low score of 4.3.¹ Although a majority of respondents reported strong agreement with the statement “my background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course”, female respondents gave an overall somewhat lower score on this statement.² Female students also gave a comparatively low score on the statement “understanding of key concepts had high priority”, and gave comparatively high scores to “I was able to learn from concrete examples that I could relate to” and to “the intended learning outcomes helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve”.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

¹ It should be noted that course evaluation was distributed before grading of exam. The ongoing course featured pass/fail seminar activities. Due to ambiguity in question formulation and no free text respondent comments, the reason for the score cannot be determined.

² Due to small sample, no general conclusions are drawn from this observation.

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 which students report appreciation of; feedback interpreted as seminars being inclusive and collaborative learning with fellow students, higher learning retention, opportunity to interact with teacher and 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 include perceived lack of clarity in exam instructions with respect to time estimations and expected answer length for the two free text exam modules, the lecture and seminar quiz system with randomised questions was considered frustrating and too extensive by some respondents, and, finally, the bonus point system used in the course was considered unclear by some.

Are there significant differences in experience between...

- students identifying as female/male?

See "Summary of Students Opinions"

- international/national students?

No breakdown.

- students with/without disabilities?

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*).
- Examination instructions will be clarified with respect to information for FUNKA students, and with respect to expected workload; time and answer length estimate on part II and part III of the exam (*short-term development*).
- Lecture- and seminar quizzes will be improved by 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.