

Course analysis FAK3137 period 2 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?

The average workload reported was a bit higher than expected, even when factoring in that some students take the whole course in one period. It is an ongoing project to try to find out what tasks are more time-consuming than expected and why.

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 five students taking the exam passed it. Given the small number of students, it is hard to say that this is a significant difference. All four students taking the project part in this period passed it.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What do students say in response to the open questions?

There were various positive and negative responses, but no trend regarding some particular part or feature of the course.

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 +1 and +2. The lowest mean score was on "The intended learning outcomes helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve" (+1.8), with two out of four students giving a negative score of -2. There were three more questions where more than one student gave a negative score: "...learn in different ways", "...concrete examples" and "...get support if needed". One student was particularly dissatisfied during the course and often contacted the course responsible as well as the examiner with questions and concerns.

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.

Similarly to period 1, the senior staff was involved in the teaching and grading. This worked well. The seminars were conducted with all of the doctoral courses in one group and worked well. The essay meetings also 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 sample was very small this time, so one should be careful drawing too strong conclusions. Still, problems with communicating the learning outcomes should be evaluated to see if anything can be improved, since this might affect all parts of the learning environment.

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. Some measures were taken for this means during period 2, but the students still seem to work too many hours (although the sample is small).

This will be monitored in the upcoming periods and teachers will be encouraged to ask the doctoral students in particular about this.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No.