

Report - DM2720 - 2024-04-15

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)

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.

Despite the reminders sent from LEQ and two reminders from the course responsible, the answer frequency of the students were low (5/11 students)

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.)

Questions regarding the course were raised during the seminars. The course responsible asked for a student representative but nobody volunteered.

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, and an update on the report instructions.

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 15-17 hours or less per week on course work. Some had commented that they thought the work load was well-balanced.

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. The grades are similar to previous course offerings.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

In general that that they are very happy about the course. That they wish they had read more early and had started to take the project work seriously earlier. This is the only clear suggestion for improvement, to force them to work on the project earlier (by demanding hand-ins). The seminars are the highlight of the course, as exemplified by this quote:

"THE SEMINARS I LOVED THE SEMINARS - probably the first seminars that were the highlight of my week (i loved the seminars)"

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

That the students really like the course, especially the seminars. They also appreciate to work with companies, although sometimes project work is difficult.

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.

This course is in a good place, so to speak. The students like it and as a teacher I really enjoy teaching it.

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 - not anything clear from the LEQ or discussions with students.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

There are an issue that this course will be mandatory in the upcoming master Sustainable Digitalisation. That will make the student numbers go up significantly, which can lead to a problem finding companies for the project work.