

Course analysis FAK3137 period 1 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.

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.

Eleven lectures, four seminars and 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. 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?

Only three students from FAK3137 responded to the survey. The average workload reported by them was high in all cases, with 30-32 hours per week reported in two cases and 18-20 in one case (where the student took the course over two periods). Reasons included in comments were much time spent on the voluntary quizzes and on searching for additional literature on the internet. One student found it hard to grasp the general methodology and didactics of the course, which might also be a factor to the extra time spent.

Some ways to try to avoid cases like these in the future will be presented below in the section on course development.

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?

Four out of seven students taking the exam passed it. Two more students passed the re-exam for period 1. As noted in previous analyses, we would ideally like to see a better result, with

failing being a relatively rare event. We are continuously trying to improve the courses and prepare students for the exam in the right way.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What do students say in response to the open questions?

Some students were satisfied with the seminars, the lectures and the main course text. Some students were not satisfied with the scoring in the quizzes and some thought that they needed more introduction to the essay part.

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 around +2. The lowest mean scores were on "The course activities helped me to achieve the intended learning outcomes efficiently" (+1.3), and on "I was able to learn from concrete examples that I could relate to" (+1.6). On both of these, 4/10 students gave a negative score of 1 or 2.

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 main change for this period was that more of the senior staff than usual was involved in the teaching and grading. This seemed to work well. The seminars were conducted with all of the doctoral courses in one group and worked well. The essay meetings also worked well and all teachers involved reported a generally good attitude and willingness of the students to help one another during the meetings. No particular negative comments were raised by the teachers.

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 two lowest mean scores (see students' opinions above) might go hand in hand. In that case, students would need more concrete examples that they can relate to, in order to be able to achieve the learning outcome. One possible explanation is that the low score stems from students who haven't yet taken the essay part in period 1, since that is the part where they relate the course content to their own research. Another possible explanation is that the course is simply too broad to be able to include concrete examples that fit each individual student with their individual background and research projects. This should be monitored for the future.

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?

Trying to lower the students' workload. It is still not clear why many doctoral students report a high workload, since master's students taking equivalent courses generally report a low workload. In the future, the issue will be brought up to the students in an introductory meeting and/or in the online course room. In addition to pointing them to the already available information about managing the workload, students will be encouraged to email the course responsible or to ask their seminar teachers if they feel that the course is too time consuming. Hopefully, this will not only give the teachers the possibility to help the individual students managing their workload, but also provide more details about what tasks take up a disproportional amount of time in general.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No.