



Report - DM2720 - 2021-04-16

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):

Elina Eriksson (elina@kth.se), Aksel Bjørn-Hansen (aksbio@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.

The course have been evaluated through the LEQ survey, and through discussions with the students at seminars. Course responsible have also taken notes during the course of the things that worked well and did not work well during the course. After the course, course leader and teaching assistant discussed the course as well.

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.)

Every week the seminars were divided in two parts, in the first part that weeks lectures were discussed, and how the course work are going so far.

After the course a meeting with a student was conducted to discuss the course.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course consisted of a project, lectures and seminars. The seminars were based on reading related to the lectures. Some of the reading material was mandatory and the students had to hand in a short summary before the seminars.

The main aim of the project work was to investigate how an (ICT/Media) organisation today works with sustainability in their core business. Furthermore, the project work resulted in suggestions/recommendations on how the organisation could improve the sustainability focus of their core business.

The learning outcomes were examined through seminars, a project report (one per group) and an individual reflection assignment. To get a higher grade, an individual reflection assignment could be handed in at the end of the course. The final individual grade was a combination of the project report grade and the individual reflection grade.

The main change was a few new guest lectures.

All lectures and seminars were on Zoom due to the Corona pandemic.



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?

In the course evaluation the all respondents stated that they had put less hours than the expected 20 hours. It was a relatively large deviation and some of the respondents said that they could have read more. My conclusion is that they are at least not burdened too much by this course work.

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, and there is not a big difference regarding the grades compared to earlier years.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Note, only 3 out of 12 answered the LEQ.

They liked working with companies, one said the structure was great, one student had criticism regarding requirements needed to get a good grade.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The students seemed to enjoy the course, but doing it over zoom only did make it less interactive compared to earlier years.

In the meeting with the student after the course the same points as above, except this student thought it was very clear how to get a good grade and that the Canvas pages were well structured.

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.

Despite the Corona pandemic, it was possible to do the course with interaction with companies. The student seemed to enjoy the course.

There were quite many students registered to the course (21) but only 12 stayed after the first week. This was mainly due to clashes with other courses that were mandatory in their "track".

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?

Not possible to discern due to small group of students and respondents to the survey.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

I will most likely introduce a lecture on methodology (interviews, writing report etc) because this seems to be something they don't bring with them into the course.

I will also look into the possibility to make all the course reading mandatory.