

Course analysis AK2030 period 4 2022

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. Nine out of 61 students answered the survey. The answer frequency was unusually low with only 11% (9/82) of the students answering the survey.

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. Unfortunately, none were able to attend.

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, seminars were once again held on campus after a temporary return to online seminars in period 3. 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?

Seven out of nine respondents report to study 11 hours per week or less, with one student reporting to study 18-20 h/w. If this reflects the rest of the students, it is an expected result.

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?

Nine out of 75 students did not pass the exam (12%). This is better than period 3 (15%) but worse than period 2 (5%). As in the previous periods, D is the most common grade, although only 32% of the students got D, as compared to the usual frequency of about 40%. Out of the six students that got Fx, four reached the grade E on the additional Fx-assignment.

Row Labels	Count of Final Grade	Count of Final Grade2
------------	----------------------	-----------------------

A	4	5%
B	11	15%
C	17	23%
D	24	32%
E	10	13%
F	3	4%
Fx	6	8%
Grand Total	75	100,00%

Passed: 88%. Note that this is before Fx assignments are assessed.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What do students say in response to the open questions?

There were few comments and few students answering overall. One Funka-student commented on some confusion about the exam hours. This will be relayed to the KTH Funka section.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The average score was above 4 on all questions and above 5 on more than half of them (scores of 4 and 5 correspond to +1 and +2 respectively on a scale from -3 to +3). No particular conclusions were drawn from this since the overall answer frequency is low.

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 seemed satisfied with the course offering and their performance.

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 too little feedback on the survey to draw any conclusions about this. There were a few comments about the quizzes, but they were about known issues that we are already working on solving.

Are there significant differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female/male?

Some differences, but considering the low answer frequency, it is not enough to draw any conclusions.

- international/national students?

Some differences, but considering the low answer frequency, it is not enough to draw any conclusions.

- 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 lecture and seminar quizzes are currently being updated and improved to keep up with the rest of the course material (an ongoing project since last course offering). All lecture quizzes were updated before this course offering and the results will be evaluated for future course offerings. Seminar quizzes will be updated before the next course offering. The main course text is continuously being improved. The question banks for the exam ought to undergo a larger update soon and then be updated more frequently in the future.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?