



Report - CH2001 - 2020-04-01

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):

Andrea Eriksson, andrea4@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.

A fishbone workshop was performed the 19th of November 2019. The workshop meant that the student in the course listed stressful factors in the course. In the end of the workshop the course leader (Andrea Eriksson) and the students together decided on measurements for reducing stress in the course.

Oral evaluation of the course were performed after each mandatory seminar which meant that the course leader asked the students on their thoughts of the course and especially what could be improved.

A written LEQ-evaluation was made after the students had received their grades.

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.)

Meetings with students are taken place during lectures (voluntary) and seminars (mandatory)

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 2019 offered for the first time.

The course is divided into two parts that build upon each other:
RED1 - Assignments, seminars, 3.5 credits, Grading scale: P, F
RED2 - Action plan report, 4.0 credits, Grading scale: P, F

During RED1 the students choose a "problem area/case" for the course and make assignments where they relate relevant theories/scientific knowledge to the problem area. This is examined in written assignments and orally in seminars.
During RED2 the students develop an action plan targeting the problems addressed in RED1. The action plan is examined through a written report and orally at a seminar



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?

Yes but there were some deviation from this. One student put less effort and one more. It is hard to speculate on the reasons, but the students had different pre-knowledge in the field which could have impacted how much effort was needed for managing the course.

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 passed the course with grades A-B

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students only expressed positive opinions towards the course in the open ended answers. See below for examples of the positive things written.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Clear instructions. Positive learning climate.

Very good leadership of the course

Good lectures and seminars

It is very positive that the assignments are building on each other and that the literature and lectures are well connected to the assignments. Everything is following and building on each other.

This course should be an example for other courses at KTH

Tiring with long course days.

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.

The students were very content with the course and students were also very motivated and interested in the topic of the course and thus performed well. This is illustrated by that almost all questions in the LEQ-course evaluation scored top values (almost 7) The following two questions scored slightly lower (5-6): 17. My background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course and 20. I had opportunities to influence the course activities scored top values (almost 7). Open ended questions said that they did not feel the need to influence the course activities as the course was so well organized.

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?

No, too few answers.



PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Only smaller adjustments need to be made like clearer organization of course material on Canvas and not to long days of lectures and seminars. However did some of the students appreciate that lectures and seminars were focused to specific days so it is a balance to organize the course so that it suits for students travelling from other parts of Sweden.
