Course analysis for CH2012 Spring 2024

carried out by (name, e-mail):

Catherine Trask, ctrask@kth.se Together with Bengt Johansson benjohan@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.

Mid-course evaluation was done in the middle of the course in form of a web-survey with open ended questions on what has been working well/ not been working well within the course. Invitations to give feedback on course content was made following case study seminars. Course Reflections were discussed in class following projects presentations on the last day of class. An LEQ-evaluation was performed in the end of the course including categories on gender and disabilities.

A meeting with the student representatives for the masters program was also arranged in the autumn after they had a chance to review the draft analysis

COURSE DESIGN

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

OVERALL CONTENT OF THE COURSE
1. Theories on acute and long term health effects for noise and vibration
2. Work environment regulations for noise and vibrations
3. Methods for exposure measurement and risk assessment for noise and vibration, including sampling strategies
4. Interpreting risk assessments for noise and vibration, and identifying priority areas
5. Proposing and evaluating intervention strategies for noise and vibration
FORMS OF EXAMINATION
Group project
Individual assignments for seminars and labs
Written examination

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)?
If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

With some variation between students, the students' workload corresponded more or less the expected level.

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?

12/13 active students passed the course; one student arrived late to the exam and will do the re-exam. This is only the second time offering the course, but is similar to last year and on par with other courses in the same Masters program.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The overall impression was that students were content with the course. LEQ-answers ranged between 6-7 on average (7 = strongly agree = positive evaluation of the course). The lowest grade of 6 came from item #15: "*I could practice and receive feedback without being graded*"

Positive opinions included positive evaluations/appreciation of:

- The applied aspects of the course including labs and case studies
- The teaching expertise and quality of the feedback
- Realism of scenarios

Requests and suggested improvements were made regarding:
- More case study calculation and addition of mini-quizes to practice
- Double-check schedule dates for course schedule and assignments on Canvas to make them consistent throughout the course information

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Overall the feedback from surveys and in-class discussions was positive. Most of the requests were for additional learning opportunities and highly-specific refinements to aspects of the course Canvas, labs, and case study assignments. In general students expressed engagement and interest in the course material and felt it was relevant to their professional goals.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

This course was very successful for a second-time offering after making some refinements after the first-time offering last year. Overall the students demonstrated good mastery of the course content, and only minor refinements are needed.

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 be? Are there significant differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female/male?

- international/national students?

- students with/without disabilities?

Unfortunately too few students responded to have a disaggregated analysis for gender or International student status. It was possible to view the scores for disability status, and since they did not differ substantially from the whole-class line I am interpreting that there are no major discrepancies with respect to disability.

Summarize changes

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

Changes of the course before this course offering (max 2000 characters)

Canvas improvements:
Following a student suggestion, we plan to put all of the course Media into one 'gallery' page on Canvas (to consolidate all videos and powerpoints etc for study and review purposes).

Case study improvements:
- This year it was great to have support from TAs to give feedback on the Case studies. We plan to continue this whenever resources allow.

Lab-specific improvements:
- Propose combining the lab reports to be a group assignment (students were already encourage to work in groups and submitted very similar lab reports within a group). To help control the participation, the lab report will include a mandatory contribution statement outlining the role of each member.
- A step by step manual for the noise dosimeter, like the ones for the vibration meter, should be produced
- Pre-lab equipment preparations:
    - check that the instruments displays correspond with the information in the measurement manuals (i.e. that the correct display windows are shown before starting the measurements)
    - deletion of all existing files from measurement equipment before the lab starts,
    - setting the correct date and time

- ensure that dosimeters enable only LpAeq, LpAFmax and LPCpeak to be read from the display after the measurements (to avoid confusion)
- Students could get more out of the lab with some instruction on the top 10 typical functions for graph options, windowing data, selecting metrics, etc. We can start the lab at 9 instead of 10 and use the hour to have a software workshop, as another course does with statistics software.
- The free software does not work on Macs, so we will request it to be added to the campus computer labs, and remote desktop. We will also create lab groups based on who has a PC, to make sure that each group has at least one PC laptop.