

Course analysis AK2038, period 1 2022

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail): Henrik Lundvall, henrik12@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. However, too few students responded to this questionnaire in order to generate any results (i.e. lesser than 3 students responded). Due to this, much of what is said in this report is based on prior experience about AK2038 as well as results from, and a discussion about, similar course codes.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

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

A meeting for course evaluation where student representatives and PAs has been arranged for period 1 2022. Much of the information in this report is based on that meeting.

COURSE DESIGN

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

AK2038 has eleven video lectures and four seminars that covers the main areas of the course. The seminars are given at campus. AK2038 takes a project part which consists of three tasks where students both work individually and in groups with an article from their field. The examination is a 4 hour exam which consists of 3 parts. It is given online and is an open-book exam, but no supervision is demanded and it can be taken from anywhere. No changes were made from period 4. 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 it 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. A possible explanation is that the new course text enables students to learn the material in a more "classical" way and thus reduce their spent time. However, the participants of the meeting agreed that the reported workload was, this period, more or less on the expected level.

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 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. However, we discussed whether there might exist reasons for the observed distribution that are unwanted, and it was decided that we need to extract statistics that can say more before we take any actions.

AK2038

A	5%
B	5%
C	11%
D	34%
E	17%
F	17%
Fx	11%

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Generally, students seem to be satisfied with the video lectures and their quality, and also with the seminars (some students want them to be longer). They also report that they enjoy the opportunity to plan the schedule for themselves, since the video lectures are available from day one and can be watched whenever.

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.

A polarization issue was also raised by one of the attending PAs. Basically, it was hypothesised that the reason for the somewhat polarized (those students that think that the course is good think that it is very good, whereas those that think that it is bad think that it is *very* bad) attitudes toward the course could be because of our “non-standardized” way of teaching our subject. This was something that the attending philosophy personnel were interested in hearing more about, and it was decided that we would have a further meeting with the respective PA in response to this.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

As noted above, no quantified outcomes could be generated for AK2038.

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 thing that was discussed is that students have previously expressed that the relevance of the project part could be better – either that they could choose articles or that they could do the project on previous students' ex theses.

However, we observed that this kind of critique was much less frequent during this period, which we see as a good sign for the positive effect of the changes we have made to make this part of the course more relevant.

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 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.

The meeting also discussed the flipped classrooms which we took back in its original form during this period (for pandemic-related reasons they were previously given online as a “discussion forum”). It was observed that the students generally seem to appreciate these sessions and we concluded that we will definitely keep putting energy into making these activities even better.

Are there significant differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female/male?

No breakdown.

- international/national students?

Generally, exchange students usually have a less favourable view of the course than the Swedish students. However, this period this attitude couldn't be seen in students' attitudes (which we take as a positive sign).

- 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 updated.
- Transcriptions of videos from course text might be transferred into the videos as captions.
- Flipped classrooms back to their original form (and are being improved).

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No.