

Report - EH2720 - 2024-02-09

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 important 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 HT2023 course memo for course design details. Key components included project planning, risk analysis, and guest lectures. Notable elements were the Agile Workshop and the Project Manager Interview, both well-received by students. 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?

Although the overall workload aligns with expectations for a 50% course (mean week-workload 19.2 h, SD 7.4h), the initial weeks are crucial for setting up workflows and managing early deliverables. Students who invest additional time early in the course can mitigate workload pressures later, a pattern reflected in the data and comments (e.g. "Put more work into the course in the beginning, and the rest will follow smoothly."). Perception of Workload tended to go along with a significant portion of students viewing the course as intensive but rewarding. Those who successfully managed their time in the beginning weeks found the workload more predictable and aligned with expectations: "With a consistent workload, this course is a delight. The allotted time is more than sufficient; there's no reason whatsoever to rush through the material." A foundational part of the course-design allows for variation in how group dynamics drive workload: Students who struggled with incompatible partners or uneven contributions reported spending more hours to compensate, which contributed to a higher perceived workload. This is an ongoing point of instruction and discussion in the course, and a key part of the learning goal of group dynamics and learning to work in groups.

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 performed well overall, with results consistent with previous course offerings. Key metrics from the LEQ survey show strong agreement on understanding key concepts (average score of 5.9/7) and constructive alignment of activities with learning outcomes (5.7/7). The continuous feedback system was highly praised, with one student stating, "The feedback was always on time and continuous, which I liked," reflected in the strong score for fair and honest assessment (6.0/7). Practical assignments like the Agile Workshop and risk analysis received positive feedback for their applied learning value, with comments such as, "The Agile Workshop is really good!" However, challenges in early assignments were noted; one student remarked, "The first deadline for the project plan was very early...half a week more would have helped," highlighting that the frontloaded workload may have impacted some initial performance. However, this is by design, and the first assignment is difficult on purpose so that students get used to the double-submission structure of the course... that the first submission is for formative feedback, and work is not finished in the first round of feedback.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Students appreciated the practical focus of the course, emphasizing its real-world relevance. One student highlighted, "It was a very good simulation of project management; many parallel tasks with dependency on external people." The Agile Workshop and risk analysis were commonly strongly praised for enhancing understanding through applied learning, with one remarking, "The risk analysis assignment especially [helped]." Suggestions for improvement included better organization of course materials and deadlines, as another student noted, "A lot of information...is stated at numerous different locations," causing confusion. Access to the course book was also a recurring concern, with some requesting, "Please provide us with the book, it's very hard to get." Group work received mixed reviews: some students valued the collaboration, stating, "Partnering up and doing group work [helped me] meet great people!" while others found it challenging, commenting, "I was not very happy with my group...maybe it could have been less [work] with better collaboration." Again, this is by design, and seeing both experiences expressed in the students show that the intended range of learning experiences existed in the course. Dysfunctional groups are of course not something desired, but its possibility is necessary and there is much for the students to learn from such "failures". Especially after the experience having sunk in a bit.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Students rated key aspects highly: understanding key concepts (5.9/7), achieving learning outcomes (5.7/7), and fairness of assessment (6.0/7). Practical elements like the Agile Workshop and risk analysis were praised, while challenges included early workload intensity (30% reported >20 hours/week) and limited book access. Group work received mixed feedback, with some valuing collaboration but others citing uneven dynamics. Overall, students appreciated the course's relevance and practical focus, though refinements to clarity and workload distribution were suggested. Clarity is a complex issue, however, since the course has ambiguity built in per its design, to teach students to elaborate and proactively search for clarification. Not in basics and basis of grading, but otherwise.

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 was the first time I gave the course, and as such the I cannot make own comparisons, but in debate with colleagues who has given the course previously, the course needs to be improved in relation to the initial project planning lectures, with extension. A few more guest lectures 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 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?

Make the grading more structured, like introduce yellow highlighting for changes after the first formative feedback for each submission. Make or extend checklists for TA's for grading so as to improve the grading to be more consistent.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No.
