

# Course Analysis AK2030, Period 4 2023

Course analysis carried out by Helena Björnesjö, [helena.bjornesjo@abe.kth.se](mailto: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 have been asked to fill out the LEQ through the central KTH system. This also investigates aspects regarding gender and disabilities. A LEQ template was used. The report covers answers from 12 respondents out of 74 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 4 2023 has been held to which program- and student representatives were invited. No student or program representatives were present on the meeting however. The meeting was a joint meeting with courses similar to AK2030. Much of the information 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, two 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.

## 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 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. In contrast, some students report spending much time on course quizzes.

## 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 overall pass percentage in Period 4 was ca 91% which is on a par with previous periods. Students receiving grade D was somewhat higher relative to previous periods.

AK2030, Exam results Period 4:

A: 3  
B: 3  
C: 15  
D: 33  
E: 7  
F: 4  
FX: 2

## **STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

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

Opinions are mixed with some respondents expressing overall enthusiasm about the course, and others expressing overall negative feedback.

Seminars receive positive feedback for being a helpful and engaging learning environment. Group discussions is emphasized as being a helpful learning format.

Video lecture quizzes receive positive comments for being a helpful practice format. Especially the feedback function receives appreciation. In contrast, some comment that the quizzes sometimes feature unclear questions, causing frustration.

Suggested improvements include more live, on campus, activities, such as flipped classrooms and seminars. Some comment that the exam is too strict and instructions somewhat confusing.

Advice for future students include to complete video lecture quizzes according to the suggested scheduling, as well as to read the course material.

Students reported flipped classroom sessions being useful. Interaction with other students and with the lecturer was especially highlighted.

## **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Respondents gave relatively low scores (equal to or below 4.0) on LEQ statements “the course was challenging in a stimulating way”, “the intended learning outcomes helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve”, and “the course activities enabled me to learn in different ways”.

Respondents gave relatively high scores (4.9 or above) to LEQ statements “understanding of key concepts had high priority”, “I could practice and receive feedback without being graded”, “I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others”, and “I was able to get support if I needed it”.

The average LEQ scores varied from 3.6 to 5.6.

Respondents give overall positive scores (+1, +2 or +3) on most LEQ statements. Responses to LEQ statements “the assessment on the course was fair and honest” and “the course activities helped me to achieve the intended learning outcomes efficiently”, “the course was challenging in a stimulating way”, and “I was able to learn from concrete examples that I could relate to” display more spread. A few respondents gave overall low scores (-3 or -2). Due to the small sample (less than three respondents) and no free text answers giving indication of reasons for the low scores, no conclusions are drawn from this.

## 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.**

Aside from what has been mentioned in the previous section, teaching staff note no particular deviations compared to prior course evaluations.

### Analysis

The relatively varied score on "I was able to learn from concrete examples that I could relate to" is neither expected, nor unexpected. Given the contents of- and the objective of the course as an introduction to general scientific methodological reasoning, intuitively, the course could foreseeably be experienced as somewhat removed from the specifics of one's particular field of study.

Students' feedback on intended learning outcomes are difficult to interpret. In particular, it is unclear if low scores indicate that the intended learning outcomes are unhelpful, or that respondents have not read them. Similarly, it is unclear if scores on the statement "understanding of key concepts had high priority" is understood as a positive, a negative, or a neutral statement. For example, it is unclear if this is perceived as a strength such that the course targets key concepts successfully, or if the perception is that the course focuses excessively on key terminology, or if the statement is understood in some other way.

Relatedly, feedback on LEQ statement on fair assessment is difficult to interpret since respondents submit their evaluation before grading of examination.

**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?**

As in previous periods, the interactive learning activities receive overall positive feedback and appears to be a perceived strength of the course. Quizzes receive mixed feedback. Expressed criticism point to tedious work, whereas positive feedback present the quizzes as a helpful learning tool.

Weaknesses include perceptions of exam format as convoluted and excessively challenging. Respondents also give relatively low scores to the LEQ statement "the course activities enabled me to learn in different ways". It is unclear if responses are based on comparisons to other courses, or if the course is considered in isolation. All course activities include lectures, readings, factual and reasoning quiz questions, seminar discussions and case exercises, and flipped classroom activities.

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

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

No breakdown.

- **international/national students?**

International students show a more favorable view of the course than national students. This is different from previous course rounds and followed by no free text comments. No conclusions are therefore drawn.

- **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?**

Since interactive, live activities receive overall positive feedback, an optional practice session series will be tested in upcoming period(s). The sessions are intended as a forum for students to be able to approach course contents interactively with support from peers and teaching staff without being graded.

Video lecture- and seminar quizzes are updated for clarity and, in some cases, with a more extensive feedback function.

The examination format is under revision.

Flipped classroom interaction formats are under revision.

### **Other Information**

None.