

Report - DD2430 - 2020-03-27

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):

Danica Kragic, dani@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.

Students have been emailed an anonymous questionnaire and we also ask for their opinions during their oral presentations. Regarding gender and disability, we made sure all students were treated equally in terms of giving the feedback and also it was possible to meet with the course responsible outside regular hours.

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 work in the course was performed in groups and each groups had a responsible teacher that students could meet regularly with. There was also a possibility to ask for a meeting with the course responsible outside regular hours. Some students used that.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The number of students doubled from the previous year and that generated more need for supervision times. We have still implemented group work in groups of 4 to 5 students. We allowed 5 students per groups since we did not have enough supervisors for the group and we concluded that 5 was too many for being able to work effectively. This year we have also tested involving industrial supervisors and one groups worked in a company. This resulted in an excellent projects and the plan is to continue with more of this next year. We have also introduced half-time evaluation of the group work to make sure that all groups have initiated the work on time and had a good start. We also made sure that the final report writing was not left for the end but was something that it was worked on during the whole course.

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?

Most students stated that the workload on average corresponded to the expected level but that it was hard to spread it uniformly during the course of the project.

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?

Most of the students completed the course and this is in line with the previous course offering.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Students lift the fact that choosing the project was not completely free and that they did not get to work on the project they wanted. They wanted also to see more topics and the possibility to choose topics themselves. They also feel that in groups that they did not build themselves, there is an uneven distribution of the workload. It is clear that we need to communicate the expectation better in the beginning of the course.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

See answer to the previous question.

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.

There are some serious comments and criticism made by the students in the anonymous questionnaire and these will be assessed carefully in the course planning.

There have also been positive comments about the course, so a good balance needs to be made between what is changed and what is kept the same.

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?

Working in groups is a challenge, especially when groups are made of students that did not work together before. There are also language challenges as well as cultural differences that in some cases have generated problems. We will spend more time on making plans for how the supervision should be conducted and how the teachers can help students in a more optimal manner.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

More projects topics, more supervisors and more flexible supervision for those students that need more supervision.
