

Course analysis FAK3012, FAK3014, FAK3137, FAK3138 period 3 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.

A course evaluation form was sent out to students in the course, following a copied version of the LEQ 12 format using Survey & Report. The evaluation combined opinions from several different course code to increase likelihood of a report being available.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

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

No meeting with PhD students has been arranged. A course analysis meeting was held with teachers in the course, but PhD student union representatives were not invited, due to unclear rules regarding who should be invited in the Rektorsbeslut.

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 these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

In general, the reported workload is around or slightly above the expected levels. There is substantial variation between course codes, though, with FAK3014 reporting an "as expected" workload, and FAK3138 reporting quite substantially more than expected. The written comments does not indicate a systemic issue, answers indicating that it was possible to adapt the workload as needed. Still, an ideal workload would be just below the expected hours, and here it might be that the quizzes are too demanding.

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: 6/6 counting from final submission, or 6/7 counting from first submission

FAK3014: 4/6
FAK3137: 4/5
FAK3138: 1/2

FAK3012 results are as expected, here students submit three assignments, and attend three meetings. 7 students attempted the part, 6 were passed.

The passing rate for the other three courses is about what was expected. Given that this is a mandatory course for PhD students, we would ideally see a better result, with failing being a relatively rare event. On the other hand, we should not lower standards just to achieve such a result. Our challenge is then how to better prepare students for the exam? Since the evaluation does not indicate that students are spending too little time on the course, the question is how to make them spend the time more efficiently.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students reported liking the discussions during the seminars and being able to choose how they liked studying. Students pointed out that some handouts for the seminars were too long. Some chapters in the course book were hard to understand. More guidance for the essay part could be given – specific chapters to read and how to structure it. The exam could also be improved – too high focus on examples and some stated that they did not believe it tested their knowledge accurately. Several students also reported being pleasantly surprised compared to their expectations.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The impression of the learning environment was generally favourable. Some weaker aspects were the reported lack of concrete examples to relate to and the assessment.

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, and the teachers at the course analysis meeting agreed.

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?

Stronger aspects of the learning environment are the seminars – the discussions are very appreciated. This should be expanded and developed, perhaps covering more course concepts, showing how they relate to the scientific process. This would also improve one of the weaker elements – the exam – since this might bring up important topics that are neglected because they are not a part of the seminars.

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?