

Course analysis of the CH2001, Leadership and sustainable work

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 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 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 but only one student responded to the course which means that that no course evaluation report was created.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion.

The students were encouraged to give feedback on the content of the course during seminars. The preliminary course analysis was sent out to all students including an encouragement to give feedback on the content. A meeting with the students to discuss the preliminary course analysis was also arranged.

COURSE DESIGN

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

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. No major changes have been done since the last course offering.

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?

It seems not deviate, although too few have answered on the course evaluation conclude on the students opinions.

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?

3 of 6 students have finalized the course in time. Those who did not finalize the course have not handed in the final reports for RED2. Reasons seems to include lack of time due to combining work with studies.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Good course structure with good visual management

Well-designed assignment – learnt a lot from the topic by how the assignment was designed.

One student would have liked more practitioners with their experiences.

Good external lectures

OVERALL IMPRESSION

Overall the course seems to have worked well

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 students have answered for making this kind of analysis.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The course will be made to a mandatory course in the master program of Technology work and health in 2023. This will mean that more students will take the course which will contribute to giving better opportunities for peer learning during the course. In connection to this more emphasis will also be given on how to do a literature review as part of the first assignment. This will hopefully give students a better basis for the interventions they are suggesting in their assignments. A workshop on how to develop action plans will also be added to make the course more practical oriented.

DEVELOPMENTS IN LONG TERM

The course has been developed and re-fined over the last two course rounds and has overall received positive feedback from students. The most important development areas are described above.