Report - FAK3127 - 2021-03-29

Respondents: 1
Answer Count: 1
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

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):
Per Wikman Svahn perw@kh.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.
The students were invited to respond to a survey through the LEQ-platform at KTH. 47 students, 21 responded (44,68 %)

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.)
-

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.
The course was adapted to use the Canvas platform for the first time in 2020. The students were able to submit their essay on the platform.

Due to the covid-19 pandemic the course was fully online, and the students did meet and did peer-review on their own.

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?
Of the respondents, 30% worked 6 or more hours per week, as the course is over 10 weeks this meant more than 60 hours, which is more than the expected 53 hours.
Some students complained over the high work-load for the course.
Some of the high work-load could be explained due to the fact that students write essays, which takes long time to write.

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 students that submitted got passed. This was similar to previous offerings.

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

One student was dissatisfied with the course being mandatory. Other students liked the content of the course, and thought that it as well designed. For example, one student wrote "very good design of course. Brainstorming and discussions enabled in the course are highly relevant and thought provoking." Several students like the assignments.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

The average response to the LEQ statements were in general positive, with nothing standing out really. Results were as follows

1. I worked with interesting issues = 6.4,
4. The course was challenging in a stimulating way: 5.3
15. I could practice and receive feedback without being graded: 6.3
16. The assessment on the course was fair and honest: 6.3
21. I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others: 5.4
22. I was able to get support if I needed it: 6.4

The comments were in general positive, even though the lectures of the first Module of the course was replaced by open Zoom-sessions with the teacher, due to the Covid19-pandemic just outbreaking at the time.

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 students were in general positive.

What was a bit surprising was the high quality of the Essays for the first Module (research ethics), in spite of the lectures being cancelled and the ongoing uncertainty and worry about about the pandemic. The essays were almost better than previously, which perhaps suggest that it was not bad that the students had to rely more on the literature for the course and did more self-study than otherwise?

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?

No significant difference between different groups identified in the survey.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

There has been a request to include also gender-issue in the course. The idea is to include this in the second module of the course.