

Report - HL2040 - 2023-02-01

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.

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, 7 out of 11 students responded. (note: 13 students were registered, yet 11 of them attended the course eventually).

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.)

The course was given on-site. Attendance to the seminars was mandatory. During these meetings, the teachers were able to discuss, in a friendly way, with the students about different aspects of the course (e.g. to hear hear students' opinions on the content, the structure, and the overall quality of the course). 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 was based on nine lectures, and four laboratory demonstrations of: (i) a human-use centrifuge, (ii) hypobaric pressure chamber, (iii) hyperbaric pressure chamber and (iv) local thermal provocation. Students were also requested to participate in four ~2-h seminars (peer-teaching) on thermal physiology, high-altitude physiology, diving/hyperbaric physiology, and gravitational physiology. Attendance in the lectures and the laboratory demonstrations was optional, but highly recommended; whereas participation in the seminars was mandatory.

Students' formative assessment was performed via digital quizzes that were offered on the Canvas page of the course.

Students' summative assessment was based on the seminar work and the written examination. Thus: i) Seminar work; grading scale: Pass /Fail, ii) Written (final) examination; grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, F.

The course was primarily given on-site. The lectures were also broadcasted simultaneously via Zoom, and recorded and uploaded on Canvas afterwards.

No major changes have been implemented since the last course offering.

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 6 students, the estimated total workload ranged from 12 to 23 h/week. It appears that there was a high inter-individual variability on the amount of work; yet the majority of the students, who responded worked 15-20 h/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?

Eight (i.e., 72%) students passed the course. It should be mentioned that these 8 students participated in the written examination, whereas the remaining 3 did not show up. All eleven students passed the seminar work. Last year, 76% of students passed the course.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Overall, the students were satisfied with the content and the structure of the course, as well as of its overall quality. The students highlighted that the teaching topics were very interesting and challenging. Especially, they liked the laboratory demonstrations. All these points were also supported by the personal discussions that the teachers had with the students.

The students also pointed out that the HL2040 is a demanding course, and future students should study hard and throughout the course period.

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 content/topics, (ii) the structure, and (iii) the variety of learning activities employed. In particular, they highlighted the laboratory demonstrations, and the positive and inclusive 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.

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 content/topics, (ii) the structure, and (iii) the variety of learning activities employed.

No variation on the responses as regards gender, cultural and academic background were noted. Students have in fact highlighted the inclusive environment, and that the course is suitable for 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?

No major changes are scheduled to be employed.
