

# Report - AL2511 - 2023-11-24

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):**

Rebecka Milestad, claram@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.**

All students were invited to submit an LEQ after the course was finalised. 16 out of 40 active students answered the LEQ, which leaves many students out.

In addition, all students present during the final seminar (the majority) were asked to give oral opinions on the course: what would I keep doing next year and: what would I change in the course.

Mid-way into the course, a meeting with a course committee (three students + teachers) was organised to get feedback from the students while the course was running.

There were no students with disabilities in this course round.

Gender: all students are given the same speaking time in the oral evaluation. The course committee was a mixture of female and male students.

---

**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.)**

Course committee mid-way into the course

Final seminar incl oral evaluation

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

Part 1: Lectures, literature seminars (examination), home exam (examination) incl study visit

Part 2: Project work in groups, project workshops, final seminar incl project presentations (examination)

Two minor changes from last year: the first week was seminar-free and instead focused on lectures, exercises and reading. We also introduced two project workshops instead of group-tutoring

---

**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?**

One group seem to spend the expected 20 hours/week on the course, but another, larger, group spend less than this. One reason could be that the course is somewhat less work intensive in the last phase (if the group members get along well and have a good learning environment with each other). Another reason could be that the program students are used to studying at this point in their education, and thus are able to prioritize their time better.

---

**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 that take active part in the course have passed the course. Some of them will have to complement hand-ins due to being absent during compulsory parts, one student did not pass the home exam (but the other parts). This is in line with other years. This year we had five life-long learning students registered for the course, but only two showed up.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

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

They give very positive feedback on the course. Most of them like to have the reading and lectures and the home exam in the beginning of the course. They liked being introduced to a new concept and to be able to use it in planning contexts. They liked the seminars and the discussions, and also to learn a tool and get examples from different contexts. The major critique was in relation to the Wayfinder tool, to which students would have liked to have a more in-depth introduction.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

All answers in the LEQ ranged between 5,8 and 6,9. The answers were very similar between female and male students. The international exchange students (less advanced than the program students) had a slightly harder time to follow the course. As mentioned, most comments on the course were positive. The students thought that they learned a lot, they felt being in a safe learning environment and they enjoyed all different parts of the course. As always, students wished for more lectures, a lighter work load in the beginning of the course, and more detailed instructions, including a larger word range in the home exam.

---

**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.**

We are a bit surprised that so many students spent 9-14 hours/week on the course and not more. The presence of students at seminars, lectures and workshops was high, and most students showed a large engagement with the course and the theme of the course. Almost all students passed, but not so many obtained the highest grade. Still, we think that the work load is ok considering the diversity of students' backgrounds. If the course would be even more work intensive, we do not think that international exchange students would be able to cope. Many of them study in English for the first time and some of them struggle with the language.

**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?
- 

As mentioned, exchange students struggle more and are less experienced in learning in the way the master program students are. No difference between female and male students. We offer different types of learning styles in the course: individual reading, group discussions, individual writing, group processes and writing and illustration. Overall, all students master most types of learning and examination in a very good way. Some students wish for more detailed instructions, more introductions to new topics. We think this due to some students being very conscious about examination and grades, and also being used to strict instructions from earlier studies. We think that it is our task to train students in more ambivalent and open-ended tasks as well, and we tell them this during the course.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

For the next course round, we will:

introduce a new teacher, complementing the teacher team with new knowledge

make a more in-depth introduction of the Wayfinder tool, and aligning the project workshops more to the project instruction

---