

# Course analysis report – FAF3608 - 2023-03-09

## Project in Soil and Rock Mechanics, 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):**

Johan Spross, spross@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.

1 doctoral student has passed the course during 2022. The student 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 that is determined with input from 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.

**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 was very happy with the course, as it allowed them to deepen their knowledge in their degree subject. The student believed that the course helped them to reach the general goals of the PhD degree. The student felt the course became more relevant than many other courses, as it could be tailored to their interests and needs.

**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 only examined student, and they was 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?

As the student, as well as the involved teacher, were very happy with the course, 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.