General Course Analysis AL2161 2023

0. **Author** Sofia Lingegård, sofia.lingegard@abe.kth.se

1. **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.

KTH's standardized questionnaire was automatically sent out to all participants to gather information for the course analysis. The course committee meeting provided additional in-depth information and feedback from the students. In addition, feedback on the course was continuously received from students during supervision meetings. Moreover, in the individual reflection assignment, students reflected on the work process and their learning outcomes regarding designing, planning and performing a group project for an external organization.

2. **Description of meetings with students**
Describe which meetings that have been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

Each student group participated in two supervision meetings, as well as a final seminar where feedback on the work process was provided. The course committee meetings mid-course and in the end of the course provided additional in-depth information and feedback from the students.

3. **Course design**
Describe briefly the course design, the constructive alignment (intended learning objectives, learning activities, assessment, and how they interact), and the development that has been implemented since last course offering.

The overall aim of the course is to generate knowledge and skills regarding approaches for management for sustainable development and change in companies and other organizations due to an increased focus on sustainability.
The course is mainly project-based and the projects are defined and performed in collaboration with companies and other organizations. Each project group also has an academic advisor/supervisor from KTH. The projects are presented in a written report and an oral presentation. The project groups also read and comment on each others' work (in writing and orally) (peer review). In addition to the project report, each group member also conducts an individual written reflection. The reported grade and the grade of the individual reflection generate the course grade (provided that the other mandatory course components are all approved). This year, the projects were conducted in groups of 2-3 students.
Early in the course, a method seminar focusing on scientific methods and gender and diversity aspects was held. The aim was to reflect on formulating research questions, how to use methods, and how data is presented from different perspectives and to integrate this into their project methodology.

4. **Students' workload**
Are the students working to the expected extent in relation to the course credits? If there is a significant difference from the expected, what can be the reason?

Based on feedback the students' workload varied but the time was deemed adequate for developing the project. The fact that there are few scheduled teaching activities (only course introduction, method seminar, supervision and final presentations) and the students themselves have a great responsibility to plan their work probably impacts the time spent.

5. Students' results on the course
How have the students succeded in the course? If there is a significant difference compared to previous course offerenings, what can be the reason?

The students performed very well this year overall. The project portion of the course accounts for a large part of the grade, and the majority of the projects were of good quality.

6. Students' answers to open questions
What does students say in response to the open questions?

Only 4 students answered the questionnaire. The students generally appreciate the course and its content. They highlight the opportunity to work with companies and to get real-life experience. Some students find it challenging to manage company expectations and adhere to the course objectives. Other groups, it is challenging to take responsibility for plan and performing the activities.

From the course committee, the choice of interesting projects was highlighted and the possibility to apply knowledge in projects. They suggested more peer review, making it even clearer that the supervisors could be contacted between meetings and more specific instructions for AI use.

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

The students appreciated getting real-life experience and collaborating with companies - even though it can be complex and challenging. The students found the supervision meetings helpful and appreciated the constructive support. Some students suggest more support in between supervision meetings and also adding more peer reviews to support each other.

The student emphasized the importance of good planning, a thought-through methodology and good communication within the group and with the company.

8. 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 students were generally satisfied with the course. Several projects were of excellent quality, the majority of good quality, and a few of poor quality. This likely reflects the ambition level of the students since the grades on the projects align with the performance of the individual reflections. They have gained knowledge not only in content-related subjects but also important lessons in project management, communication, and collaboration. Students from programs where report writing is not usual, struggled with the process.

9. 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 for these be? Are there a significant difference in experience between:
- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

In general, among the students from the Master's programs, no significant differences were identified. However, international students and students from programs where report writing is not usual did struggle.

10. **Prioritized course development**
What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in the short and long term?

Look into adding a peer review session mid-course.
Communicating better the possibility to reach out to supervisor between meetings.

11. **Other information you want to share**