



Report - HI2010 - 2020-11-16

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):

Martin Jacobsson, martin.jacobsson@sth.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.

We used the LEQ12 standard online survey for obtaining anonymous comments from students. The course evaluation survey was answered by 30%.

This report is based on that material together with subjective observations by the teachers and informal discussions with active students.

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.)

No meetings with students have been done.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course is 6 ECTS and had 10 active students this year. It was divided into:

- Lecture series with multiple lecturers, two external guest lecturers
- 2 labs
- Self-study project with poster presentation
- Written exam
- Seminar (on requirements analysis of a laboratory information system).

No major changes were made to the course.

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?

The self-reported amount of work was 6-8h / week.



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?

The average grade was higher than previous years. Probably due to the grading of the re-designed exam (it was made into a remote exam due to the Corona pandemic).

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

There are too few answers to see any patterns.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

"I could practice and receive feedback without being graded" scored low. Reasons seems to be a perceived lack of possibilities for communications with the teachers.

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.

It is an easy course. Seems to give a good introduction for most.

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?

There are no indications that there should be any issues wrt gender, (inter)national students, disabilities. The course had a fair mix between male/female as well as Swedish/international students.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

This was the last time this course was given.
