Course analysis FAK3012 period 3 20222023

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail): Adam Lundström Ramirez, adamlr@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 (i.e. a sufficient number of answers).

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. No meeting was held before the time of this analysis.

COURSE DESIGN

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

Three essay meetings with accompanying submissions and peer review tasks. In addition, there was an introductory meeting to communicate the design of the course and point out common problems.

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?

The average workload reported was as expected.

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?

All eight students taking the course passed it.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What do students say in response to the open questions?

There were not many responses specific to the FAK3012 version. One respondee commented that the submission deadlines should be more flexible.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

On the scale from -3 to 3, most questions got a mean score between 0 and +2. The lowest mean score was on "The intended learning outcomes helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve" (-0.1), with five out of ten students giving a negative score. Most questions had at least one student giving a negative score. The highest mean score was on "I was able to get support if I needed it": +2.2, with all students grading it +1 or higher.

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 essay meetings worked well with no particular comments from teachers or students.

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 low score regarding the learning outcomes remains. The reason is still unclear. Otherwise, there was generally a lower mean score than in previous periods, with a relatively high answer frequency (10/24). This should definitely be monitored for the future to see if it is a trend.

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?

Apart from ongoing development projects, focus will be on improving the structure of the Canvas rooms and the course information. Another project will be to improve the scheduling of course activities to achieve a more even workload.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No.