

# Report - AL2608 - 2023-03-13

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@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. Two students volunteered for this. The course committee 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 26/82; 32%).

---

**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 course committee meeting 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 on campus for the first time in three years. A simple hybrid solution (non-interactive) was offered to allow students to join online. Lectures were not recorded. Project supervision was also possible to join in zoom. Computer labs were held on campus, but with one supervisor joining remotely.

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
- Computer labs: 6x2 h
- Supervision meetings with project groups: 4 h/group

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 there is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?**

---

The majority of students report to have spent between 12-23 hrs/week, which is within a reasonable range, depending on ambition level of individual students. Out of 26 respondents, two students spent 30-35 hrs/week which is unreasonably much, while 5 students spent only 6-11 hrs/week. Some students write in the evaluation that this is a time demanding course, while the majority seem to think it is reasonable. It is difficult to see any correlation between reported time spent and individual answers students. It is reasonable to believe that those spending much time are also those with very high ambitions.

---

**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?**

---

The student group as a whole performed roughly equal to previous years. No major change.

---

## STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

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

---

#### \*Positive\*

Positive feedback remains roughly the same as previous years. Students appreciate the following things

- balance theory and practice
- hands-on practice of LCA tool
- getting to choose project topic on your own
- nice atmosphere, helpful teachers and supervisors
- well organised lectures
- exercises integrated into lectures
- well structured course
- relevance to future work
- the exam
- course organised to make students work continuously

#### \*Negative\*

Students are critical about the following:

- Too much mandatory reporting (e.g. status reports)
  - Not enough time to learn simapro
  - Supervision in zoom was not optimal
  - lack of old exams as examples
  - perceived uneven supervision between supervisors, wish for more accessible and involved supervisor
  - want more hands-on supervision in simapro
  - very intense
  - unclear expectations in projects, difficult to know if group is on track and on time
  - would rather have the course a full semester, to avoid stress
  - some parts repetitive (e.g. 3 peer reviews)
  - anonymous grading should be implemented in exam
  - work individually on tutorial instead of in pairs
  - exam takes longer time than communicated
  - 5 students/group is too much, smaller preferred
  - be more careful and critical about explaining moral issues of weighting and normalization
  - guide students better when choosing projects (what is a suitable project)
- 

## SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

---

The feedback is similar to previous years. Overall very positive evaluation of the course, but critique of some specific aspects of the course design. It seems that a few individual students had other expectations than what the course offered, or had bad experiences of group work or supervision. A recurring comment is always that the course is time demanding and stressful, but still most students seem to think that it was worth the effort.

---

## 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?
- 

#### Weaknesses:

- It is not ideal to have projects done in groups of 5. This is by necessity, as we cannot afford to supervise in smaller groups. The trade-off of making smaller groups would be less time to supervise each group, which is not desirable.
- Some students want more hands-on supervision of LCA software and less individual "learning by doing". This is also by necessity, we cannot afford more supervision. However, we also expect that students at master level have the skills and abilities to do tutorials and read/view instructions to learn software.
- Some students ask for better coordination between supervisors. This is a legitimate comment and we should make efforts to improve this
- Some students ask for better structure of supervision meetings. Such a structure exists and is communicated orally and in written form to students, but efforts will be made to communicate this better
- Some students say that there are too many submissions in the course. This is a consequence of course design to encourage students to work continuously during the course. Still, we will look into the possibility of simplifying the format of submissions, plus communicate better the purpose of submissions
- Some students complain about the number of peer reviews (3). This is intentional, as peer review is a good way to learn from others. We will look into ways to better communicate the purpose of peer review in the course.
- International students are slightly less satisfied with assessment (fair and honest). No explanation to this can be found in the answers.
- Some students ask for possibility to view recorded lectures. This improves accessibility, but requires texting (by law) which cannot be prioritised because of lack of resources

#### Strengths

- Students raise strengths such as well organized, good teachers, good lectures, meaningful project. The course has a rather well thought through design. It requires good and competent staffing, and being accessible to students. This is rather resource demanding, and comes at the cost of some of the things that students complain about, as a consequence of necessary priorities.
-

## **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

Summary of prioritized course development, based on the above and outcome of second course committee meeting

- Strive for better coordination between supervisors, both in terms of supervision meetings and feedback on reports.
  - Communicate better the intended structure of supervision meetings.
  - Communicate better the purpose of continuous submissions in the course.
  - Look into ways to simplify submissions
  - Communicate better the purpose of peer reviews
  - Reconsider if lectures should be recorded
  - Explain and communicate better why we do certain things in a certain order, as a way to reduce stress in the beginning of the course
  - Consider if simapro should be introduced more before selecting projects.
  - Consider if students should select projects the second week instead of first week
  - Find ways to improve supervision meetings, e.g.: Focus more on what needs to be solved than what has been done, Communicate better what groups how to prepare for supervision, Focus less on the status reports, more on content and challenges, It helps if the supervisor takes more initiative
  - Encourage students to organize project work better, e.g.: Talk more about project management and splitting work tasks, Maybe provide example of how project work can be organized in an efficient manner
  - Exam: Change information about time demand (roughly a full day), Emphasise that questions can be asked in canvas, Hand out one example of an old home exam
  - Consider ways to handle 5 students per group (which is a bit large), e.g.: Important to split and share work in a good way, Consider online simapro solution, Find ways to reduce "congestion" in computer labs
  - Implement anonymous grading in Home exam
-