

# Report - CH2001 - 2023-05-16

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 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 seminars 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 on which 8 students answered.

---

**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.)**

The students were encouraged to give feedback on the content of the course during seminars. A meeting with the students was arranged to discuss a draft of the preliminary course analysis that was sent out to all students before the meeting. The course analysis was finalized after additional comments from the last meeting with the students.

---

**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. Some changes in the seminars have been implemented so that the focus to a greater extent is supporting the students in their ongoing work with the overall course assignment.

---

**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 too much based on the LEQ-answers.

---

**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?**

How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

20/21 active students have passed the course which no significant difference compared to previous course offerings.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

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

The students specifically appreciated the topics of the course, performing the project work and the seminar with Simon Elnäs. There were also high ratings on opportunities to get support during the course. Students expressed learning a lot from performing the course assignment including how to perform an intervention. The group supervision was also appreciated. Most needs for improvement were related to the performance of the project work. Additional improvement suggestions were to have more practical examples and leadership experts involved in the course and to be more flexible in if to use some of the mandatory literature (for example the literature on the Swedish legislation that was not relevant for international cases). There was overall a wish for more practical examples of how to apply the theories taught in the course. It was also pointed out that there was a need for some students to get basic knowledge on management and organization for being able to better deal with and understand the course content.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Overall ratings of the course were positive, LEQ-answers ranged between 5,3-7 (7 = strongly agree = positive evaluation of the course). Several students expressed however challenges in understanding and how to tackle the course assignment.

---

**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 course has previously been an elective course and the students have previously been taking a course in change management before attending the course. After some changes in the structure of the master program the CH2001 became a mandatory course and was this year also given before the change management course. This was noticed to impact the students' experience of the course. The overall aim and the content of the course seem to be more challenging for the students compared to previous course offerings. Especially stress and unclarity were noticed in the beginning of the course related to selecting and performing the overall course assignment which includes to choose a case to work with during the course.

---

**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?**

---

Clarifying and supporting the students in performing the course assignment should be made in short term, until next semester. This means for example giving students more time to select a case and also to a greater extent supporting students in what methods to use when performing the case assignments. Article seminars should also be scheduled earlier in the course supporting the students to understand the basic theories for the course assignments. Also support in how to approach and introduced the project work to companies is requested. Overall opinions are also that it should be mandatory (not only voluntary) to hand in a half-way draft of the project work to get feedback on the ongoing work. A need to connect the content of the seminars more clearly to the assignment can also be seen. Some students were overwhelmed by the instructions of the course assignment and an attempt should be made to simplify the instructions. Some revisions in the content of lectures can also be seen including adding more practical examples. There is also a need for clarifying the grading criteria for the different grade levels. Students also wished for less scheduled time and more time to read and digest the course material and an overview of the course content will also be made considering what course content could be removed. However may external lectures with practical leadership experiences be added. Readings introducing basic principles of organization and management should be added to the course.

**DEVELOPMENTS IN LONG TERM**

The course needs to be compared with the change management course and the content should be developed so that the two courses connect to each other in a good way.

---

**OTHER INFORMATION**

**Is there anything else you would like to add?**

---

No

---