



Report - HE1031 - 2021-01-04

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):

Peter Sillén, petersil@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.

weekly part of lecture for questions, suggestions, comments
end-of-course obligatory hand in of short not on own learning during course
end-of course LEQ course evaluation

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.)

weekly part of lecture time for questions, suggestions, comments

COURSE DESIGN

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

* changes / additions from previous years

weekly lectures

ÖVN 2,0 credits, grade P/F

weekly hand in of own / group work with assignments

*end of course obligatory hand in reflection of own learning

TEN 5,0 credits, grade F, FX, E-A

* TEN DEL A

* four part-exams of course basics

* TEN DEL A may also be examined at final written exam

* TEN Del B

* six possible hand-ins of project group 'lab' excercises

* TEN Del A passed through all four part-exams

+ TEN Del B three passed 'lab' excercises can give TEN grade E during course

+ four passed 'lab' excercises can give TEN grade D during course

+ six passed 'lab' excercises give option to be examined final written exam TEN DEL C

*TEN DEL C final written exam with verbal follow-up

* TEN DEL C more advanced assignment to demonstrate own competence in writing and calculation



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?

15-20 hours per week, in line with previous years

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?

99 registered students

18 grade E

46 grade D

2 grade C

7 grade B

5 grade B

overall pass rate in line with previous years

seems a slightly lower share of students aiming for higher grades C-A, as a result of possibility to 'pass' during course, w.o. need for taking final written exam, which is also intended to open up study time for parallell technology course

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

low reply rate ca 18%

demanding work load during course

limit number of hand-in assignments during course or, alternatively, fewer more demanding assignments

four written part-exams during course are short on time

more feedback on hand-ins

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

low reply rate ca 18%

demanding work load during course

limit number of hand-in assignments during course or, alternatively, fewer more demanding assignments

four written part-exams during course are short on time

more feedback on hand-ins

of expressed value to students are

possibility to complete and pass course during course weeks - for students who need to prioritise other course(s) during 'exam week', and in general

balanced middle-to-high work load, with due dates throughout course vs (higher end-of course work load)

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.

positive replies give impression course design, content delivery and and examination is sufficiently efficient and functional
may be a need for clearer or fewer assignments



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?
-

weakness

the online format for lecture dynamics and dialogue
teacher time and resource for feedback

strength

reality-related course content and assignments
functional examination during course needs tuning, though a strength
variable structure where student can decide own ambition for grade during course may be a strength, still under development

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

written part-exam content and time
number and content in weekly hand-ins

look at

- * recording possibilities
 - * development into hybrid digital-online-classroom lectures
-