



Report - HL2040 - 2021-01-22

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):

Michail Keramidas, mker@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.

Two days after the completion of the written examination, the KTH Learning Experience Questionnaire v.3.1.4 was sent to the students via email. The students were also notified and encouraged to complete it, via a message on Canvas that was sent by the course responsible. The questionnaire was delivered to all students, regardless of their gender, and their national and educational background. The participation in the survey was voluntary; and, after a two-week period, 8 out of 30 students responded.

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.)

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the course was transformed into a blended format: the lectures and seminars were performed via zoom, whereas the demos were performed on-site.

During the physical meetings in the four demo-sessions, the teachers were able to discuss, in a friendly way, with the students about different aspects of the course (e.g. the structure, the materials, the advantages/disadvantages of the digital lectures etc); and valuable insights were gained from these informal meetings.



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 based on nine lectures. It also includes four laboratory demonstrations of: (i) a human-use centrifuge, (ii) hypobaric pressure chamber, (iii) hyperbaric pressure chamber and (iv) local or whole-body thermal provocation. In addition, students are requested to participate in four 3-h seminars (peer-teaching) on thermal physiology, high-altitude physiology, diving/hyperbaric physiology, and gravitational physiology. The attendance in the lectures and the laboratory demonstrations is optional, but highly recommended; whereas the participation in the seminars is mandatory.

The final grade is based on the written examination. To complete the course, students should also pass the seminar work. Thus, i) Seminar work; grading scale: Pass/Fail, ii) Written (final) examination; grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, F.

This year, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the course was transformed into a blended format: the lectures and seminars were performed via zoom, whereas the demos were performed on-site.

Based on students' feedback from last year (autumn 2019), we aimed to improve the provision of the formative feedback. To address this, we included on Canvas:

- (i) short quizzes; a separate quiz for each teaching block. Each quiz consisted of 10 multiple choice questions. The quizzes were non time-limited, non-graded, and instant feedback, as well as the correct answer was provided after students' had submitted their responses.
- (ii) discussion forums, which were dedicated to each teaching block.

Also, all lectures were recorded, and were uploaded on Canvas.

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?

Based on the responses of 8 (out of 30) students, the estimated total workload ranged from ~6 to 24 h/week. It also appears that there was a high inter-individual variability on the amount of work. Students also claimed that the workload was heavier during the week that they had the seminar presentation.

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?

80% of students passed the course, whereas, last year, ~79% of students passed it. Therefore, we are overall satisfied, considering the new format (blended) of the course due to the pandemic.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Overall, the students were satisfied by the learning environment. The students perceived the teaching topics very interesting, and challenging. These points were also supported by the personal discussions that the teachers had with some of the students, as well as by the expression of interest by many students to conduct their master project in our group.

The students also pointed out that the HL2040 is a demanding course, in which one need to study throughout.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Students identified as the course's strongest points: (i) the interesting teaching topics, (ii) the structure of the course, as well as the variety of learning activities employed. In particular, they highlight the employment of the laboratory demonstrations, and (iii) the positive class atmosphere, and the teachers' responsiveness.

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.

Overall, the teachers were satisfied. They found challenging the required (due to COVID-19) transformation of the course into a digital format. Yet it worked well, and students performed adequately.



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?

Students identified as the course's strongest points: (i) the interesting teaching topics, (ii) the structure of the course, as well as the variety of learning activities employed. In particular, they highlight the employment of the laboratory demonstrations, and (iii) the positive class atmosphere, and the teachers' responsiveness.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The course will switch back to the traditional face-to-face format. However, elements related to the digital teaching will be developed: the in-site lectures will, in parallel, be live in zoom, and then will be recorded and uploaded on Canvas.
