

Course analysis report – FAF3005 - 2023-01-20

Project in Structural Engineering, 7.5 credits

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):

Raid Karoumi, raid.karoumi@byv.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.

This course is taken by all the phd students in Structural Engineering and bridges, which means that about 2 phd students passed the course every year. The students who took the courses the last two years have been interviewed after the course.

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.)

See above.

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

The project is an individual task that is determined with the examiner. It can be a theoretical or experimental study in the field of structural engineering or it can be a literature review.

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?

The students reported that 7.5 credit was reasonable for the workload.

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 the student passed the course.

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

The students were very happy with the course, as it allowed them to deepen their knowledge in a subject which is relevant for their studies. One positive aspect is that they could decide the content of the project together with the examiner and their supervisor.

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

See above.

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 examiner thinks that the course works very well.

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?

Too few students and too small course to make this detailed analysis.

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

As the students as well as the involved teacher, think that the course works very well, no further development is needed at this point.

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

N/A.