

Course analysis FAK3012, FAK3014, FAK3137, period 2 2021-2022

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail): Johan Berg, jgberg@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.

Due to a technical error, no course evaluation was sent out. When this was discovered it was much too late to send one out. This evaluation is therefore based on evaluations from master students of the similar courses AK2030 and AK2036, and personal communication.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion.

No meeting with students has been arranged.

COURSE DESIGN

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

Eleven lectures, four seminars and three essay meetings. In addition, I held an introductory meeting to communicate the design of the course and point out common problems. FAK3014 (3 credits): Only nine lectures, three seminars and no essay meetings. FAK3012 (3 credits): Only the three essay meetings. Accompanying the lectures there were voluntary quizzes, giving bonus points for the exam, and there were mandatory quizzes for the seminars. The lectures have been transcribed and edited into a course compendium.

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?

Master students spend as much time as expected or less. It is therefore not likely that there is a systemic issue regarding workload for PhD-students. Personal communication with students during the period, however, indicated that certain individual students spent much more time than expected on certain non-mandatory tasks, such as video lecture quizzes. They also did not request help from me, the teacher, in relation to their apparent struggles, despite being instructed to do so in the quiz and in the introduction meeting.

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?

FAK3012: 3/5 counting from final submission, or 3/8 counting from first submission

FAK3014: 6/7

FAK3137: 5/5

FAK3012 results are as expected, here students submit three assignments, and attend three meetings. 8 students attempted the part, 3 were passed, 2 were asked to resubmit the final essay. Typical reason for not completing the part is a scheduling conflict with one of the mandatory meetings.

The passing rate for the other two courses is higher than expected. I attribute this to statistical variation, rather to any specific improvement done previously.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

No particular opinions from master student evaluations would apply to these courses. In general, there is a dissatisfaction with the quizzes, where some options and formulations are frustrating to students, and the exam. In particular, they dislike the multiple-choice part of the exam. This is presumably true for PhD students as well.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Master students have a generally favourable opinion of the learning environment. There are some lower scores for the exam being fair and honest and being able to learn in different ways, for some course codes.

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.

No particular changes were implemented for this period. My opinion is that the period went rather 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 be?

The exam is something that was discussed in the master level evaluation. It might be possible to supplement the MCQ with text based questions or replace them entirely. It is also possible to imagine an entirely different type of exam for PhD students, however at the moment this not being developed. It would also be significantly more time consuming to correct.

Are there significant differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female/male?

No breakdown.

- international/national students?

No breakdown.

- students with/without disabilities?

No breakdown.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- Exam will be further discussed and developed by the teachers.
- The quizzes will be continually improved.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?