



Report - HH1802 - 2018-10-31

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

COURSE DESIGN

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

Note, written comments in course analysis are from LEQ course evaluation, but low response, and from course - evaluation meeting in November with student class representatives GB, AV

weekly lectures on theory
weekly lecture focus on practical calculation
weekly weekly group work on obligatory course-assignment, PRO 3hp, leading to written report
weekly individual voluntary hand-in of assignments for bonus credit to written exam
course-end hand in of individual written report, PRO 3hp, from group work with three group-chosen learning outcomes to develop in report

Course grading
written individual course-end report, PRO 3hp, A-E
written course-end exam, TEN 4,5 hp, A-E

THE STUDENT'S 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?

corresponds

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?

students have performed well

students comments are that course design and weekly regular assignment structure supports learning and performance, and with reasonably challenging course content, considering the broad scope of the course



OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

the general impression of the learning environment, from the polar diagrams and from meeting on course evaluation with student representatives, is positive

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

weakness is in

-ability to try own ideas - the reason is likely that the course content is relatively fixed, to be able to cover the course's broad scope.

The intention is to allow weekly group work on obligatory course assignment for individual report, be on three group-selected learning outcomes, to allow group to focus on three topics for deeper study, and to allow group to select a company to study, related to the learning outcomes

- motivation and belonging - the reason may relate to rigid course content or to dynamics on work-group

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

start early and work regularly weekly on both obligatory assignment and voluntary assignments

follow lectures

be pro-active in developing good functional group dynamics, as working with the group is an important and supportive part of the learning environment

ask teacher for 'help' if group dynamics do not develop well enough for good learning

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

go back to regular semi-weekly verbal work-group presentations

this year mitted to allow groups more focus on own work, but that lost some aspect of class dynamics

go back to course-end larger group presentation, with related peer-review

Introduce clear structure for regular semi-weekly presentations and course-end presentation. That will demand one additional level of students, but likely positively adds to class dynamics, group dynamics and overall learning

Maybe move Course book 'Företagsekonomi 100' to 'reference literature or, alternatively, define what is required knowledge from previous courses HH1801 and HU1800

Or, alternatively, make courses HH1801 and HU1800 required competence to register for HH1802

Add guest lecturers, theory from teachers or experience from companies - to increase course variation, with the intention of increasing dynamics and motivation

Kursdata 2018-11-05

HH1802 - Finansiering och organisationsteori, VT 2018 HH1802

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2018 v.3
Kursen slutar:	2018 v.23
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	PRO1 - Projekt, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F TEN1 - Tentamen, 4,5, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Peter Sillén <petersil@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Peter Sillén <petersil@kth.se>
Lärare:	Peter Sillén <petersil@kth.se>
Assistenter:	

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	49
Totalt registrerade:	53

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad ¹ [%]	65.30%
Prestationsgrad ² [%]	72.70%
Betygsfördelning ³ [%, antal]	A 47% (15) B 25% (8) C 28% (9)

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter