



Report - FDH3004 - 2026-03-27

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):

Ulrik Franke, ulrif@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.

As in the previous offering, student expectations were collected in class at the first meeting and also discussed again at the last meeting. The LEQ - 6 questionnaire was used after the course to collect student impressions of the course.

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.)

At the first meeting, student expectations were collected. Since the course was mainly held as outdoors walking-seminars, the whiteboard exercise from the first offering was omitted. Nevertheless, expectations were briefly revisited again at the end of the course.

Since the course had fewer than 10 participants, no separate course meeting was held.

COURSE DESIGN

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

This was the second course offering. The course maintained its three interleaved course activities:

1. Literature seminars, in total 7 seminars.
2. Guest lectures (1-2) by external lecturers.
3. Opposition seminar, discussing research proposals.

In addition, three assignments need to be handed in; two minor tasks along the course and a small research proposal for transparency research in the student's own field. In the end, participants act as discussants of each other's proposals.

The course has five intended learning outcomes. Each intended learning outcome is covered by at least one of the four requirements for final grade (active seminar participation, assignments, research proposal and opposition). The constructive alignment was clarified in the updated course memo used in this course offering.

One main difference, not in design, but in execution was that this course offering was mainly held as outdoors walking-seminars, due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This adjustment was generally appreciated and preferred to Zoom meetings.

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?

Student reported workload is on the low side. Possibly, students have not spent as much time as desired on reading the literature thoroughly before each seminar. This aspect will be monitored in future course offerings.



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?

This was the second course offering. Just like the first time, a single student dropped out early, the rest all passed.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

As before, on the positive side, students appreciated the participation and efforts of each other, the broad range of topics covered, the relaxed atmosphere in class, and the walking seminars.

As before, suggestions for improvement included keeping the literature up to date.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

As before, the students are happy with the course. It is considered a good complement to more specialized technical courses, and the course design is appreciated.

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.

This was the second course offering. Overall, it went well, despite the pandemic. Students seemed to appreciate both the contents and the format. All participants did a good job in the course, both in the seminars, in their assignment, and in the opposition.

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?

Both the students and the teacher agree that the active participation of everyone in the seminars created a very good learning environment. No obvious weaknesses could be identified.

The number of participants is so small that no significant differences in experience can be identified.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

If the course is offered again, the literature will be reviewed and revised to reflect developments since the original literature list was put together.
