

Course analysis report – FAF3117 - 2023-03-22

Project in Concrete Structures, 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):

Anders Ansell, ansell@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.

4 doctoral students passed the course during 2022. One of these students has 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 may have the form of a theoretical or experimental study that is planned together with the examiner.

The project can also be performed as a literature review. The content shall be associated with a long-term sustainable societal development. The project is an individual task, on a topic determined by the teacher.

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 7.5 credit was reasonable for the workload. However, more time was probably invested in the project work.

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 student passed the course.

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

The student experienced the course as interesting and meaningful, since it widened the view of analysis of concrete structures also beyond the own doctoral project. To work with a tailored course project subject was appreciated and motivating. The course was very relevant with respect to the general goals for the PhD degree.

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.

The choice of project topic was successful and resulted in a very well written student report followed by inspired, interesting and rewarding discussions when the report was presented for the research group.

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 this year 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 course this year, as well as during 2019-21, gave a positive result with engaged and satisfied student, teacher and seminar participants, no further development is needed at this point. The course is judged to already be of sufficiently high quality and facilitates well the student's reaching of the general goals of the PhD program.

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

N/A.