

Course analysis AK2038, period 3 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.

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 3 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, to a great extent given at campus (if not for pandemic-related reasons). AK2038 takes a project part; this 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 average is not so low so that any particular changes 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 no particular differences in the grade distribution compared to last period. Only three participants took the exam this period, and one cannot conclude anything interesting from this sample size.

AK2038

| | |
|----|-----|
| A | 0% |
| B | 0% |
| C | 0% |
| D | 66% |
| E | 0% |
| F | 0% |
| Fx | 33% |

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

A course evaluation was sent out to the students after having taking the exam. Unfortunately, the extremely low amount of course participants in AK2038 in this period resulted in no answers on the course evaluation.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

See above.

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.

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 (which is something we continuously have been working on during period 3).

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 we will change the exam structure somewhat until period 1 2022.

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 really 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.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?