

# Course analysis AK2040, 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.**

AK2040 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). AK2040 takes a project part; this consists of four lectures (non-mandatory) and ends in an examination devoted for the philosophy of mathematics. Students individually write a home assignment about some of the central questions that have been brought up during the lectures. 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 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 major differences in the grade distribution compared to last period. If something is different, we would say that is the relatively high amount of the A and B grades. Of course, if something is to be different, this is something we would like to be different. The meeting concluded that the grades follow something like a vague bell curve and that the percentage of students with F or FX was about what could be thought of as reasonable.

#### AK2040

A	21%
B	29%
C	12%
D	9%
E	15%
F	9%
Fx	5%

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

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

Students seem to be satisfied with the the seminars (some students want them to be longer). To be critical against the course's seminar part, students expressed that an improvement could be that the content is better applied to their specific academic background.

It was also reported that students want to have the seminar on campus (as compared to online). Due the pandemic-related reasons, this is something we try to implement as much as possible while still meeting general restrictions as well as some students' need for having education online.

### **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Generally, students had a mixed impression of the learning environment in this period of the course. On this scale, zero equals an average of -3 and 7 equals on average +3, while 4 being neutral. Students taking AK2040 rate all aspects of the learning environment between 2,8 - 7 (4 responses). This is a very mixed result over all aspects, and nothing particular stands out. However, it is noticeable that only 4 students answered and graded the learning environment, thus making the results somewhat unreliable.

### **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. Since it was identified that students seem to think that the seminar part could be more adjusted to their academic background, we discussed whether it would be a good idea to have specific seminars only devoted for AK2040 students (normally, students from different course codes are mixed together in the seminar part). The idea then was that these seminars could be better applied to AK2040 students. This would require some work from our side, but it might be done in the future. One possible change that was discussed is that students feel that the relevance of the project part could be better. How to improve this is somewhat unclear, but it is something that we are aware of.

## **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?**