

# Course analysis AK2038, period 3 2023

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 2023. This is meeting is held together with other very similar course version given in the same period. 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 extend given at campus. 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. 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 no particular differences in the grade distribution compared to last period, mainly because the low amount of students (7) doesn't allow one to say anything of significance. 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.

AK2038

A	0%
B	0%
C	14.3%
D	14.3%
E	14.3%
F	0%
Fx	57.1%

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

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

Students seem to be very 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 further quiz-related thing that was concluded during the meeting was that we should try to improve the feedback quizzes generate for students.

## **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Nothing can be said here about AK2038 in particular since too few students responded to the survey in order to generate any results.

## **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 possible change that was discussed is that students feel 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. It was noted that students are free to choose articles (but the time is tight). We invite PAs to suggest articles and/or students' ex theses which we can implement (if we receive such suggestions) until next period. This actually happened in AK2038 this course offering.

## **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.

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 flipped classrooms. In the future we should try to book venue E1 in period 1, while booking D1 in the other periods.

At last, a further suggestion that was brought up, which we also will try out next fall, is the implement some kind of open study sessions for students to attend during the course. Some students express their feelings that they would have wanted to have more opportunities to discuss particular topics which they found difficult/confusing/etc.

**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.
- 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?**