Course evaluation BB200X in 2018 VT and HT

The goal of this evaluation is to get information from you in order to improve the course in the future. Since the course is new, your opinion is especially important for us!

Please note that we want to hear your opinion primarily about the course format, not about the actual project and supervision. At the end of this form there is an open question where you can relate your opinions also about the project and supervision.

It is OK to skip questions if you can't/don't want to answer!

Our comments:
We have received 13 evaluation forms out of 31 students giving a response rate of 33.3%. In the future, we will do the course evaluation in the classroom after the oral presentation instead of Canvas to increase the rate of response.
We present below all the comments offered by the students in their course evaluations together with our comments.

1. To what extent do you think you have achieved the stated course goals?

Very large	Large	Fair	Small	Very small
7	5	0	0	0

Comments:

Our comments:

The students generally think they reached the stated course goals to a high degree, 7/12 (58.3%) to a very high degree. Thus, the course has been generally successful.

Notably, this correlates very well with the evaluations from the supervisors, which are generally very positive, as well as the opinion of us examiners who find the theses to be of generally very good quality.

2. How many working hours per week have you spent on the course and your project?

<35	35-37	38-42	43-45	>45
0	1	4	6	2

Comments:

Our comments:

All students have spent more than 40 h per week except for only one spent 35-37 h. This is also reflected by the excellent outcome of the final master thesis reports of the students.

3. To what extent do you feel that you understood how the course was organized and what you were expected to do.

Very large	Large	Fair	Small	Very small
5	5	3	0	0

Comments:

I think that the course was well organized, and it was quite easy to find instructions in the course-PM.

The only thing I think would make the course better is if all iformation was gathered in a single document. Some parts were a bit scattered.

Our comments:

Out of 13 students, 10/13 (76.9%) think that they understood the course information to a large/very large degree, and 3/13 (23.1%) only to a "fair" degree. This is better than previous year 2017. However, there is still further work to do. We can make some links in the course PM to those extended information in the course PM supplement so that the information won't looks scattered.

4. What do you think about the general format of the course, with start-up meeting, half time meeting and oral presentation/opposition? Was this a good format? Could it have been performed in a better way?

Comments:

It was a good format over all, especially with the smaller groups during the final presentation of 4 people.

I don't have any complaints at all regarding the format of the course. I think that the three meetings that we had are enough for this course. In my opinion the half-time meeting with the examiner and the supervisor was the best meeting. For me it was important to hear the supervisor thoughts on whether I was fulfilling the requirements for the course (Student evaluation).

I thought it was a good format. I would just have needed some extra explanation about some of the parts that were supposed to be included in the half time plan, e.g. SWOT analysis since I have not taken any courses in Project Management before. From the information about this course, I have interpreted that a fulfilment of such a course was not a requirement.

It was a very good format! However, I would have wished forclearer information about when the start-up meeting was to occur and that the main supervisor should be present. It was only mentioned in one of the three documents (BB200X-Information-2018VT.pdf, Course PM 171011.pdf, and Course PM supplement 171011.pdf) we got at the course information lecture in December, so I missed it and missed to tell my

supervisor in advance. Also, the appointments for the half time meetings could have been given at least 3 weeks before.

It was a very good format with very clear deadlines which made the overall organisation of the course easy to follow, I don't think these 3 moments in the course needs to be altered in any way.

I think the new format is really good for the students, providing security and assistance if needed. The student does not feel alone throughout the project.

I think the format worked well, the structure with deadlines in terms of project plan, meetings etc was good in order to keep up continuous work with the course. If anything, the first meeting could have been scheduled earlier during the autumn semester. Many questions that we now felt the need to email about could have been answered by having an early information session(as early as September/oktober).

Good overall. Start-up meeting was not very useful, and I think it's too much to ask the supervisors to come for that.

I think it was a really good format since it gave an indication if you were on the right track or if you had to change something.

I think it was a good format, but I think Canvas could be easier to handle if the dates for handing in tasks and assignments were not correct. It is also difficult to access Canvas, maybe it's just me having this problem. I have to search for it on KTH's platform. But in general this course is amazing! The examinator is ready to help any time and give good advise and constructive criticism.

I liked it. I would have appreciated having another student read my report before the final hand-in, otherwise I have no comments.

The format was good generally speaking. The only doubt I have is about the half-time meeting. I do not think it was absolutely necessary for the completion of the course.

I think the format of the course was good, especially with the clear deadlines, then you knew what was expected from you and when you had to deliver it. Only negative was the short time to do the opposition report, which was quite hectic.

Our comments:

We are very happy that all 13 students liked the course format. The students mentioned the following Pros and Cons regarding the format of the course.

Pros:
– Clear deadlines.
– Smaller group opposition.
– Student evaluation in half-time meeting.
– Easy to follow.
– The student does not feel alone throughout the project.
– Keep the student on right track.

Cons:
– One thought short time for opposition report.
– One student found it difficult to do SWOT analysis.
– One complained about the presentation of main supervisor in the start-up meeting.
– One wanted information earlier in September/October.

We will keep the course format. The student performance on project plan is improving since most students have taken the project management course. We will slightly increase the time for opposition although not much room for us to increase. The presentation issue of the main supervisor in the start-up meeting is now more flexible. Indeed, we should have information meeting in September/October. We are now having it in May, it is perhaps too early.

5. Do you have any comments about the project plan?

Comments:

Without the project plans from earlier students it would have been hard to make the plan. The different parts to include could be clearer.

It was good that the project plan was a mandatory task. It helped me get organized and prioritize my work.

Not really. I think it was a very good idea to include, since it gives a good opportunity to think through and plan the project.

It was good both in order to learn how to plan a project for the futureand to get an overview and control of this project. Especially, the WBS and time schedule was nice to have. When the project plan was "passed" (godkänd), it also gave me the feeling that the project followed the requirements of the course, which was important to know. However, for this type of project, it may have required a bit too much information. It felt like the same things were repeated but with different words in different sections. I think "objectives" could be changed to "objective" and "methods". Also, I think that we should have had a clearer course in how to do respective part in a previous course of all parts are to be included. The engineer skills course was performed 3 years before this project and it did not include all parts that we had to do in this course. For example, we have never done a MoSCoW analysis, stakeholder analysis and Risk Evaluation Assessment before.

Some of the things we had to write in the project plan felt quite repetitive and didn't add new things. For example listing objectives, experimental milestones, WBS, and a time plan directly after each other felt like a re-telling of the exact same thing four times in a row with a slightly different focus each time.

Maybe only one project plan would be sufficient. With a delivery date at around February-March.

The project plan is a good idea and the parts I valued most were the background (since this was a good way to start writing on the thesis) and the gantt schedule, which me and my supervisor consulted continuously. However, I think that there were too many parts and that many of them overlapped(e.g. both gantt schedule and milestones felt redundant). Maybe in the next round of the course the students could be able to choose what tools they want to use?

It is a good exercise but its not worth spending so much time on it. Perhaps it could be shortened or simplified. For example keeping the Gaant and SWOT analysis but not keep the business case. And perhaps keep only one of the two plans.

In general ,I think that the project plan was good to have, especially the time plan and WBS, to give an overview of the project before it started. However, I think that some parts of the project plan were a bit repetitive, for example Milestones and MoSCoW.

The project plan was a good thing to have. Maybe it easily becomes too big, with all diagrams and charts. But it is good for me as a student to organize it.

Not really.

The project plan was useful for the project as it was a way to organize the whole time-frame and stay on time.

I think the project plan was OK, the Swedish students understood the concepts since they had had a course that explained them. However, exchange students were unfamiliar with all the analyses and terms, making it quite difficult for them in the beginning. Maybe some compulsory course at KTH master's programme should include some of the concepts and analyses so everyone is familiar with it. Since, at least for me, the supervisors and co-supervisors were also not familiar with the terms.

Our comments:

The examples of project plans from previous students were helpful. Later on, we shall consider to prepare more detailed guidelines for project plan. We shall take a discussion regarding the structure of the project plan with GA and PA.

6. What were the strengths of the course?
Comments:

The ==communications with examiners were great==! Always fast response.

The general format of the course and that everything was well organized.

The possibility of being creative and set up a project yourself.

==The deadlines and time limits.== It made it easier to tell the supervisors that we had to plan and have meetings in time and stay to the time-schedule.

Allowing us to freely focus on a scientific project over the course of 20 weeks with access to help if needed, it was a great final examination at KTH and taught us a good scientific workflow both for academia and industry.

Constant help and assistance from examiners and supervisors. Also really good to know exactly when we present and it helps international students with their planning as well.

I really liked the reasoning that the new course was designed to make it "safer" for the students, because it felt very controlled and safe. The examiners felt involved in the course.

==Compared to the old course code it forces the student and supervisors to plan and structure the thesis, and also to finish it over a defined amount of time.==

Some parts of the project plan (mentioned above) and ==the half-time meeting==. I also liked the format of the oral presentations, having 3-4 students at one occasion.

The freedom of planning and implement your own project.

I really like the new course, especially that there is ==a fixed date when you will finish==. It seems to be more structured than the old one.

The main strength was that it provided the students with the opportunity to work in real situations and in a laboratory, while gaining working experience which is valuable for the future.

==The very clear deadlines.==

Our comments:

We are very happy that our hard work as examiners were really appreciated by the students. They liked the course format with clear deadlines.

7. What were the weaknesses of the course?
Comments:

Deadlines and milestones could be clearer.

I don't see any problems/weaknesses with the course that need be fixed.

When a project was executed outside KTH, I don't think it was fully clear for the main supervisor at KTH what his responsibility was, at least not in my case. *(who?)*

At the start of the course, the project plan felt quite repetitive at times and took far more time than needed, see question 5.

The fact that it is only Pass/Fail. I think it would be good to add another scale, Pass with distinction. This would help students who really put a lot of time and effort to their project to actually be able to use this distinction when applying for PhDs, jobs etc. I think it is important to reward good efforts. The lack of distinction is also something that could potentially cause problems with future employers, who need to see a grade or something similar, in order to distinguish applicants.

Personally I would have liked to have a little longer time to work on the project.

It felt like unnecessary work to do two project plans. I also think it would be better to have an examiner that knows about the subject and can give good feedback and actually review, question and improve the standard of the work. It is not normal that the course starts with the examiner saying that everyone will pass anyway. It feels like there is no standards on the quality of the work, the fact that the examiner is not specific to the subjects adds to that feeling. It is not really motivating and does not force the student to do his best.

Some parts of the project plan (mentioned above).

The weakness of this course is mainly the supervisors. Since you choose them on your own, you really don't know what you get. Maybe, the examinator should have a skype-meeting/meeting with the external supervisors before the project starts to verify that they really can receive a master student doing their degree work.

It would have been nice to have a few more days to read the opposition report. Alternatively that the opponent could read (and comment) a few weeks before the final hand-in. This way, you would already be familiar with the subject when it became time for the opposition.

Missing information regarding the project-plan analyses.

Our comments:

We need to discuss the following two issues with GA and PA.
1. Students doing master project externally. We need to refine the responsibly of KTH main supervisor.
2. Possibility from Pass/Fail to A-F grading?

8. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve the course?

Comments:

Use dates instead of weeks when explaining the deadlines.

No because it is already good in all aspects.

Students who founds projects outside KTH, should be recommended ==a local main supervisor at KTH who knows the course requirements==.

A slight streamlining of the project plan is in my opining the only thing that needs to be done in order to improve the course.

Introduce new scaling system: Pass/ Pass with distinction/Fail& Only one project plan

My main suggestions are the ones regarding the earlier first meeting and the project plan. Apart from that I think most parts worked fine.

-More flexibility in the start and end dates of the course-One project plan instead of two-An examiner that knows about the subject-More flexibility in the allowed subjects and to more possibilities to collaborate with other schools at kth.

Maybe remove some parts of the project plan to make it less repetitive.

I liked the course

Include some description of the project-plan analyses. Extend the time needed for the opposition report.

Our comments:

We will consider the fowling suggestions by the students for improvement.
- Actual dates instead of weeks.
- Further discussion on the structure of the project plan.
- Increase time for opposition report.

9. How was the overall quality of the course?

Very good	Good	Acceptable	Fairly poor	Poor
8	4	1	0	0

Comments:

One of the best course I had during my time a KTH. Very well organized.

10. Other comments, regarding your project and supervision?

Just positive things to say about my supervisor Cristina Al-Khalili. Although I did my work somewhere else I felt that she guided me very well during the few meetings that we had. I always learned something from her. She is a very inspiring person and that was the reason why I wanted her to be my supervisor. I would definitely recommend her to other students If they were looking for a competent supervisor.

I have felt that help and support always have been available for me from my supervisors and examiner.

In the middle of the project I was unsure what the requirements regarding the practical part of the course was –in particular how much help one was allowed to get from the external supervisor. When I asked the examiner, he said that I should ask my main supervisor who told me to ask the examiner again.

Overall, I am really happy about the course.

Not really, apart from that I really enjoyed this course and my project!

As I mentioned above; my supervisor have not been engaging in the project, and giving me wrong information about what I can do during my period of stay at the lab. There has been many miscommunications between us, which has lead to many changes in the project plan.

Thank you so much for a great course and an awesome spring term!

None, my project and supervision was excellent! Would only have liked more time to work on the project.

Thanks a lot for your help!