

# Course analysis AK2030 & AK2036, period 4 2020-2021

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail): Johan Berg, jgberg@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.**

No meeting with students has been arranged for period 4 2021 due to the course evaluation being completed during the summer vacation.

## COURSE DESIGN

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

### General: differences between courses

AK2030 and AK2036 takes the same main lectures and seminars

AK2036 take a project part; this consists of three tasks where students work in groups with an article from their field.

Given that these courses are similar, it is useful to discuss these evaluations together. No changes were made from period 3. See these analyses for further pandemic-related changes.

## 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?**

In general, students study less than the expected level. As has been discussed in previous analyses, there are many possible reasons for this, such as students putting in the effort only to pass the course or other courses requiring more time than they should. However, the participants of the meeting agreed that the average is not so low so that any particular changed needed to be made, but rather indicated that there is some headspace for students who do need to study more to complete the course.

## 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?**

There are differences in the grade distribution compared to one year ago, which is due to the exam being different in format. There are no particular differences in the grade distribution compared to last period. The meeting concluded that the grades follow a vague bell curve and that the percentage of students with F or FX was about what could be thought of as reasonable.

### **AK2036**

A	13%
B	7%
C	14%
D	25%
E	20%
F	14%
Fx	4%

### **AK2030**

A	8%
B	4%
C	15%
D	40%
E	19%
F	6%
Fx	6%

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

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

**Undervisningsstil: Tänka på att berätta vad seminarierna är.**

**Projekt: Mindre kommentarer tidigare, vi ger dem verktyg och stöd. Många gör individuellt – Kanske minska detta, hitta en gemensam "general interest" article, om du verkligen inte vill kan du göra själv.**

**Tre långa kommentarer om betygssättning från studenter som arbetar lite. Där har vi ett pågående arbete.**

**14/15 var tuft. Låg motivation annars att ta in videon.**

**Art of doing science – man läser dubbelt. Vi skriver in det som "Further reading".**

A few students report dissatisfaction with the discussion climate in some of the seminars. It was discussed in the meeting that we should make clear that one will not be failed for the seminar just because one gets a question wrong, and that one can "opt out" of answering if one doesn't know without consequences. The seminars are a learning opportunity.

The AK2036 project receives relatively fewer critical comments compared to previous periods which is a good thing, and might be due to increase in feedback and that the feedback is delivered early. Several students are doing individual assignments, which often end up being of a lower quality. It was suggested that "general interest" articles could be found which students from different masters programmes could work with together.

Three long comments addressed the grading, all from students who self-reported working a lot less than the recommended amount. However, the participants of the meeting agreed that the grading scheme could be improved and that there were important points brought up by both these and previous students. However, the new scheme would need to be carefully designed and it might take some periods before it can be implemented.

Several students reported that it was hard to get 14/15 points for the quizzes. The meeting did not consider that this in itself was an indication that something should be changed, rather that the quiz questions should be continually improved based on feedback.

The course text “The Art of Doing Science” is to be moved to the “optional reading” or “further reading” section of the literature list on Canvas, to indicate that it is not required.

## **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Generally, students have a favourable impression of the learning environment in this course. On this scale, zero equals an average of -3 and 7 equals on average +3, while 4 being neutral. Students taking AK2030 rate all aspects of the learning environment between 3,8-5,9 (16 responses). This is lower than normal. Students taking AK2036 rate all aspects of the learning environment between 4,9-5,9 (14 responses). This is about the same as previous periods. AK2030 rate “The assessment on the course was fair and honest” notably lower (3,8). This might be to that several students were dissatisfied with the grading scheme for the exam.

## **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 teachers saw a general positive trend for the course and its development. We are now in the area of fine tuning most aspects of the course, rather than drastic changes. One more substantial change on the horizon is the new grading scheme. One task now is to reach students who are not performing as well and motivate them.

The teachers agreed that they want to continue with an online exam even after the pandemic and changes in the course plans are therefore needed.

## **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?**

**Ett svagare element är Quizar, hur de är utformade, hög gräns, flertydiga frågor. Tydligare syfte. Vakande öga, ständig förbättring.**

**“Jag har svarat ett antal frågor, inte alla, kolla gärna, och om ni får gärna ta med kvarvarande frågor till seminarierna”**

There is no aspect of the learning environment that sticks out in either direction, the courses taken as a whole. The general structure of the course is functioning well and fills its purpose. Improvements can be made to particular aspects, such as quizzes.

One weaker element might be the grading of the exam. In the same area, the video quizzes might be improved. Here the meeting decided that “keeping a watchful eye” was the best strategy, with continual improvements when issues are brought up.

The meeting also discussed the previously titled “flipped classrooms”, which will continue as discussion forums during the autumn. It was agreed that students should be encouraged to bring questions to the seminars as well.

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

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

No breakdown.

**- international/national students?**

Generally, exchange students had a less favourable view of the course than the Swedish students. However, since the number of respondents from each category is not known, no particular conclusion can be made.

**- 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?**

- Grading system will be further discussed and developed by the teachers.
- The quizzes will be continually improved.
- The course text will be completed.
- Transcriptions of videos from course text might be transferred into the videos as captions.

**OTHER INFORMATION**

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