

# Report - FAK3127 - 2023-02-10

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 perwi@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.

The course was evaluated using the LEQ form. Antal respondenter: 58 Antal svar: 24 Svarsfrekvens: 41,38 %

---

**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.

There was a new teacher giving the sustainable and equality part.

---

**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 workload seems to be in line with the expected level. Also the comments support this.

---

**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?

Yes, very good results.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

What does students say in response to the open questions?

They liked the IP part.  
They found the sustainability part too shallow.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

They would like to improve the sustainability equality part.  
They wanted more interactive lectures.  
They wanted better communication.

---

**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 time and effort was acceptable.  
The sustainability and equality part was criticised.  
The IP part was much appreciated.

---

**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 specific areas.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

The lectures are found boring by many, so we will completely redesign Part 1 and Part 2 of the course, to a "flipped learning" design. Instead of lectures, it will be "seminars", where the students have to prepare answers to questions before the seminar.