

# Course analysis report – FAF3009 – March 22, 2023

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):

Johan Silfwerbrand, [jsilfwer@kth.se](mailto:jsilfwer@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.

All six participating students during the fall semester 2022 were interviewed at the last lecture on October 26, 2022.

**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.

After completed course, the student will be able to:

- Based on scientific literature, describe the terms social impact, co-operation and impact cases.
- Draw practical conclusions from and summarize a research project.
- Write a popular science paper about her or his own research project, discussing its relevance for society and highlighting any connections to sustainable development and gender equality.
- Present her or his research project orally for a general but technically interested audience.
- Know and describe potential stakeholders and target groups in the surrounding society, not least national and international committee and standardization activities, closest to her or his research project.

This is the first year the course was offered.

**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?

The students reported that 3 credits were 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?

The course contains three deliverables. Five students have received pass in the course. The sixth student has passed two of three deliverables.

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

All students were happy with the course. They appreciated the feedback given by the teacher. Some of the students expressed that it was a pity that such a course has not been organized previously. The visiting teacher (expert in communication) received praise.

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

Summary made in previous question. (The interview only had open questions).

**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.

Considering that this was the first time the course was given and that the students were all happy with the course content and execution, as well as relevance to their PhD studies, the teacher is also satisfied.

**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?**

A couple of the students proposed that the number of lectures ought to be increased. (The course consisted of five seminars, each 2 or 3 hours long.). Another suggestion was that social media could be added to the course.

These suggestions will be considered when planning the next course (time not specified yet).

**OTHER INFORMATIONIs there anything else you would like to add?**

After the course, the teacher received a letter from one of the students. It ends with the following words:

“Johan Silfwerbrand demonstrated to be a professor with exceptional creativity to engage students and facilitate their learning with numerous innovative materials and resources. His extensive experience in the course contents contributed to conveying knowledge and clarity to the course contents. His initiative to bring a professional communicator to the course provided a comprehensive, interactive and memorable experience to help reach with our research results other areas of society beyond academia. The subject of the course is of utmost relevance for any researcher and Johan Silfwerbrand’ methods to teach it are excellent.

I give my strongest recommendation to anyone in a position to help Johan Silfwerbrand continue teaching this course or interested in taking the course.”