



Report - AL2608 - 2022-01-28

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):

Anna Björklund, annab@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.

All students were invited to be part of the course committee. Three students volunteered for this. The course committee has met once during the course with the course coordinator, and will meet once after the course evaluation is completed to discuss the course analysis. Students were also invited to give feedback directly to the course coordinator and there has been possibility for students between and after lectures to ask, discuss, give comments about the course. At the end of the course, a course evaluation form (LEQ) was distributed to all students (response rate 27/69; 39%).

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.)

- One course committee meeting in the middle of the course period.
- One meeting planned after completing the course evaluation, to discuss the course analysis
- All students have been able to meet with the course coordinator between and after lectures

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course was run as a digital course this year, using the same format as was developed because of covid in 2020. A few supervision meetings have been held on campus. Some elements of this may remain in coming years.

The course examination consists of the following parts:

- PRO1 - Project work, 5,0 hp, grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
- TEN1 - Home exam, 2,5 hp, grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Scheduled learning activities

- Lectures: 20 h (added one to cover uncertainty, all in zoom, recorded and posted on canvas)
- Computer labs: 6x2 h (using remote lab)
- Supervision meetings with project groups: 4 h/group (on campus or in zoom)

Own studies, estimated time

- Attending lectures and studying course literature: 1 week
- Completing home exam: 5 h
- Project work: 3.5 weeks
- Critical review and final revision of report: 0.5 week

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

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

About 70% spent 12-24 hrs/week, which is reasonable. A few claim to have spent 27-32 hrs per week, and a few as little as 3-11 hrs /week. This is mirrored by the variety of comments from students in the course evaluation, where some find the course moderately demanding and some say that it should be worth more than 7.5 credits.

This may be OK if it simply mirrors the different ambition levels of students, but it is problematic if it means that some project group members have been "free riders" and letting others do the main body of the work, while still getting the benefit of a good grade. The course design tries to prevent and minimize that risk, but most time is spent outside class and planned independently by groups, so this is difficult to supervise. Different ways to collect information for individual grading in projects have been considered over the years, but none have been deemed fair and efficient. Still, if the "extremes" in estimated work load are seen as an indicator of uneven responsibility and work load in projects, quite few students are affected by this. Nevertheless, more effort can be taken to reduce this.

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?

Student performance is similar to previous years, which is a good achievement under the certain circumstances of distance learning



STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

COURSE DESIGN

- more numerical examples would be good
- lectures could be connected more to projects
- tutorial is too long
- very engaging and challenging
- practical, not just theoretical

WORK LOAD & SCHEDULE

- a bit stressful
- pretty demanding course
- work load was high
- lot of deadlines
- recommend adapting schedule to other courses
- well organised and interesting
- one of the most organised courses at KTH
- it was clear from the beginning what needed to be done

PROJECTS & PROJECT GROUPS

- start of the course was overwhelming, group building was messy
- smaller project groups would be good
- let supervisors suggest topics
- it would be nice to have more guidance in the beginning of projects
- the project is very useful
- supervision meetings were fantastic
- having a dedicated supervisor was very useful
- grading each other was good

COMPUTER LABS

- impossible to finish labs on time
- use time in computer labs 1&2 in a better way to teach students what they really need to know

HOME EXAM

- liked the home exam
- home exam did not correspond to what we had seen in lectures

LECTURES

- lectures were great

INCLUSION

- course is non gender discriminatory
- very open and inclusive
- there is room and support for all in the event of a disability

One notable comment is about two group members that acted disrespectful against a third students, with examples given of typical master suppression techniques. The student writes that she did not know where to turn to ask for help in this situation

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

A lot of feedback from students is very enthusiastic, both concerning teachers /supervisors, course design, work environment, and what they learned from the course.

The course is perceived by some as stressful. However, most students do not work more than 20 hrs per week, which should be the expected work load. Some elements of the course see unnecessary to students (peer review, some work on the tutorial).

While many comment that the course is very well organised, some perceive the course design and canvas as confusing

The project selection processes and start up of projects is mentioned by several as very stressful. Still, many appreciate to be able to choose topic and to work with something that interests them



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.

Comments from students, positive and negative, remain to a large extent the same as previous years. Despite some concerns and desired changes, the overall impression is that of a well functioning course in most aspects and for most students

Most comments about things that could be improved have been considered in earlier course rounds and priorities have been made with regard to resources and the overall design of the course. Some concerns require changes/development that are indeed desirable but that would require more resources that are not available (smaller groups, developing new course material) unless some other work efforts in the course are reduced. Concerns about scheduling are not solved at course level.

Until next year, it should be considered if the selection of projects can be improved, as well as what types of projects can be selected. This must be done without creating new negative effects, as overall the flexibility is very much appreciated by students and is thought to be good for learning.

A final note about the comment from one student about disrespectful behavior from a couple of students. In order to prevent this in coming year, it is important to talk more about group dynamics, potential problems that may arise in groups, what is unacceptable behavior, and where students should turn if they experience problems. This is already brought up in the course in the introductory lecture, when forming groups, and through a group agreement when groups initiate their project work. Apparently more can be done in this regard.

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?
-

see comments above

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

All comments will be reviewed before next course round to prioritize areas of improvement
