Report - EH2070 - 2024-12-03

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):

Elias Flening flening@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.

I have given student ongoing opportunities for giving feedback to the course by actively inquiring how the course was going in the various lectures and activities. I asked individual students when appropriate. I encouraged students to discuss and give feedback in a facilitated fashion on the courseroom Canvas discussion board.

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.)

I met students regularly to discuss the course, asking for feedback both from groups and individuals in an ongoing manner, and not only reactively when an issue was brought to my attention. It was also baked into the final part of the course, as to evaluate the project environment (a part of the intended learning process) for their projects, which in the case of this course was the course environment in general. This allowed for very useful discussions in a safe and informal manner, which is imporant for the quality of student answers and discussions.

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

The course maintained its previous design of a combination of lectures and continuous examination via oral and written submissions. Please see the previous course memo for course design details. Key componentss included project planning, risk analysis, and guest lectures. Notable activities which were liked by the students were the reflection seminar and the Project Manager Interview. No major changes were made from the last course offering, but improvements were suggested for deadlines and clearer instructions for assignments.

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?

An ok spread, avarage a bit under 50% load, with some outliers.

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?

The students did well, getting an average Course Grade of 88.4%, and the previous year was 85.5%, so no difference. They perceived themselves as very positive on all relevant LEQ items (1, 4, 7, 11, 12).

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

Students highlighted the course's structured design, iterative feedback system, and practical tools like EVM and WBS as major strengths, with one describing it as "designed to teach us in a good way." The reflection report and oral discussions were particularly valued for insights. Guest lectures were generally well-received, especially those by Henrik Kniberg. However, students suggested improving clarity and consistency in assessment: "assessment needs to be clearer and more equal,". They advised future participants to start early, emphasizing that the course is most demanding at the beginning. Voluntary activities and reflection exercises tied to guest lectures were seen as valuable additions, enhancing the overall learning experience.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Students rated key aspects of EH2070 highly, with such as understanding key concepts (6.8/7), achieving learning outcomes (6.4/7), and fairness of assessment (6.5/7). The students reflectected the answers from the previous question above. Overall, students found the course meaningful and well-structured, though refinements to task sequencing and communication could further enhance the learning experience. Clarity in assessment and instructions remains a nuanced issue, as the course design encourages students to manage ambiguity and develop self-directed problem-solving skills, balanced with ensuring fairness and transparency in grading.

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 saw a significant rise in all measured questions with a similar response frequency. Please see the survey the data. Most answers this year were around 6.8/7, compared to around 6.1/7 for last year. The main difference was that this year I gave the course from beginning to end myself (last year I came into it in the middle), which increased consistency (last year was somewhat messy), and this was the second time I gave the course. So I have also learned alot.

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?

None identified from the data, even though experience tells me that groups with a big internal difference in cultural background can sometimes be difficult. But it is hard to draw any clear conclusions on this. The course is taken by many master students around KTH, so the backgrounds vary significantly in relation to the concepts being taught.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

I bring with me some clear items to address for next year, pertaining to streamlining the grading for equality and fairness between graders, like introduce yellow highlighting for changes after the first formative feedback for each submission, or extend checklists for TA's, as well as to add/change some activities in the beginning of the course. The project planning part will be extended, and some guest lectures will be added and maybe changed around

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?

No