



---

## Report - AL2511 - 2020-03-30

---

Respondents: 1  
Answer Count: 1  
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

---

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

**Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):**

Sara Borgström, sara.borgstrom@abe.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.**

The course includes several ways for the students to provide feedback to the course. At the final seminar, we spend quite a substantial amount of time for full class evaluation discussion where each student is given the opportunity to express their opinions regarding strengths and weaknesses. This is combined with an online, anonymous course evaluation including 22, LEQ based questions. These questions include aspects of gender and students with functional variations. 18 of 33 students responded to the online course evaluation.

---

**DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS**

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

Within the course curriculum, we meet the students at least once a week. At the beginning of those meetings, we always invite the students to share their thoughts and questions regarding the course. As stated above we also have a final course evaluation discussion at the final course meeting.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

The course includes lectures, literature seminars, study visits, and project work, which are examined by seminar participation, home exam and project work reporting in written and spoken form. This course round followed the new course plan for AL2511 that replaced the course plan AG2811.

Based on the course analysis from 2018 we added one class meeting for the project work where we discussed the workbook in a workshop format and we also changed one of the feedback occasions to peer-to-peer format. The project was also introduced earlier. For the course round 2019, the grading criteria have been revised into an outcomes based format to ensure alignment between ILO's, activities and assessment as well as improve the clarity of expectations.

---

**THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD**

**Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If there is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?**

The expected workload is 20h/week (which equals 50% study pace). 2/18 respondents answered that they spent more than 20 hours on the course, whereas most spent between 10-20 h/week. No specific comments regarding workload were expressed during the class meetings. However, this course round suffered from several unexpected overlaps in the curriculum which were very hard for some students to handle. For the coming course round, we have very clearly expressed that overlaps between this course should be avoided.

---



## 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?**

All students finished the course with grade E or higher, which is similar to previous years.

This year none of the students had issues with plagiarism in the home exam, which was a great improvement compared to previous years. The two measures we have taken are to highlight this issue to the course leader of the SUPD course regarding scientific methods, and also being very clear in describing what scientific writing implies, what correct referencing is, what we expected in relation to the grading criteria and also providing written instructions and online tutorials.

## STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

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

The best aspects of the course were: the content in terms of combining theory with application, structure and organization, the feedback, the teachers and the open atmosphere. During the evaluation discussing many stated that this was one of the best courses they have taken, which was also expressed in the answers to the question about additional comments.

Suggested improvements: the majority of the responses concern division of time to different parts of the course, where generally they suggest more time spent on the project. The other topic raised in the responses is about adding more concrete examples to the theory section of the course.

Advice to future students: take the course it is great, read the literature before the seminars, do the project together it is not wise to divide the work too much.

## SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The overall results from the questionnaire are very positive where most, 20/22, questions get a score above 6 on average. This is a large improvement from previous years and shows that the changes we have made are for the better and impact the learning environment in a positive way.

Meaningfulness (Q1-6): The average score was above 6 for all questions which indicates that the course provides a stimulating and challenging learning environment. In the comments, they also expressed appreciation for the conscious meeting design where groups were mixed and the high ambitions for an open atmosphere.

Comprehensibility (Q7-16): Except for Q10, the average score was above 6 indicating that the course is comprehensible. Regarding ILO's (Q7) the average score was 6.1 indicating that they still are a bit difficult to grasp. However, the average score for Q13 is 6.6 indicating that the expectations in relation to different grades are clear to the students. The average for Q10 regarding concrete examples was 5,8 and relates also to comments from the students in class about the need for more concrete examples. The average scores for Q14-16 about feedback are all above 6, indicating that the improvement of course elements for feedback is appreciated. This is an improvement compared to previous course rounds.

Manageability (Q17-22): For all questions except Q20 about the ability to influence the course activities, the average scores were above 6 indicating that the students find the course manageable. The average score for Q20 is 5.5, which is similar to previous course rounds.

## 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.**

Our impression is that after 2 years of incremental changes including the design of seminars, selection of literature, instruction clarity, the timing of module instruction, increase feedback elements, as well as revision of grading criteria, the course is very much appreciated by the students.

## 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 significant difference in experience between:**

- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

The two areas with a slightly lower average score and hence indicating areas for improvement are concrete examples (Q10) and the opportunity to influence the course (Q20). There were no significant differences in the responses depending on the respondent being an international or national student or based on gender. No respondents to the online survey marked that they had a disability. The main challenge for the coming course rounds is to keep this high-quality learning environment.



#### **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

##### **What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?**

---

Based on this very positive course evaluation we need to develop strategies for how to sustain the good quality even under changing circumstances, such as changed course budget and changes in the teacher team.

Ahead of the next course round, we will explore how to improve the opportunities for the students to influence the course activities and put an emphasis on concrete examples in relation to the theoretical content.

---