

Report - HM1025 - 2024-06-27

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):

Linda Rose, lrose@ktk.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.

The course evaluation process was continuous throughout the course, using:

- discussions with the students and in the project groups during the course and with the course's student representative
- an individual reflective assignment at the end of the course, focusing on discussing and reflecting on different themes related to the course
- KTH LEQs Course Evaluation Questionnaire at the end of the course, after the grades were given.

Adapted examination for students with documented special needs was provided, as prolonged exam writing time.

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.)

Mainly as discussions with the students and the project groups continuously during the course, e.g. in connection to the supervision meetings, shorter discussions with the student's representative, as well as with students when meeting them.

In addition, an optional feedback meeting after the course ended was offered to all project groups, which has been a part of the course design since the first year it was given.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course includes different types of learning activities. These are mainly:

- Lectures that give an overview of the subject with theories, facts and applied examples. These include: physical, system, and cognitive ergonomics, anthropometry, biomechanics, visual ergonomics, personal injury risks, methods in ergonomics studies, limit values and recommendations, ergonomics and economics and the product development process. Also how Ergonomics in product development links to the Design Thinking Framework and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals are included.

- Three laboratory work sessions where the focus is on learning how to apply a selection of ergonomics methods and gain experience based knowledge on their use.

A project where the objective is to form and carry out a project to improve ergonomics, develop a prototype and evaluate it with the help of real, professional users. The project includes collaboration as well as independent work and the students exchange peer feedback.

The examination is carried out in three different steps:

Written exam (TENA; 2 credits)

Passed project (PROA; 3 credits), oral and written presentation

Labs, work-shops, seminars, assignments (ÖVNA1; 1.5 credits)

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?

Only five out of 34 students filled out the LEQ and according to the results from the LEQ on this topic the students worked in average about 12 h/week with the course. My impression is that this is not representative for the students input in hours in this course run. Several of the weeks during the course only the teacher led activities were around that many hours per week. I base my impression also on the oral feedback from students during the course, that the work load was rather high in the course, mainly because they had another project course running in parallel to this course. Several students suggested to have the course running over two periods instead of one period.

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?

After the first re-exam period in April 2024, all students had managed to successfully pass the whole course. The grades varied between A (17), B (13) and C(4). This is somewhat higher than the previous course run when approximately 93 % of the students had passed the whole course successfully after the first re-exam period. Also, in this course run the students had slightly higher grades in average compared to last year. My perception is that this course run's students were very well organized and rather ambitious.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Please see the summary below as well.

Some quotes from the LEQ:

"Intressanta föreläsningar, laborationer som gav möjlighet att öva på olika metoder från kursen."

"Att den var väldigt verklighetstillämpad."

"Jag gillade nog kursens projekt mest (även om det var ont om tid) och tycker att det verkligen hjälpte mig att förstå hur metoderna (osv) används."

"Linda! Så himla kul med en så engagerad och kunnig föreläsare. Tack för en intressant och kul kurs!"

"Det enda jag skulle vilja påpeka är att det var ganska stressigt i och med att kursen gick under endast en period. Det var mycket att göra på en kortare tidsperiod vilket gjorde att det blev lite stressigt."

""Kursen var rolig och jag tycker att jag lärde mig mycket! Hade gärna fått chansen att arbeta vidare med projektet:)"

Advice for other students:

"Gå på föreläsningarna, kul att vara där och diskutera lite"

"Börja med projektet första dagen!"

"Vänta inte med att fråga yrkesverksamma om hjälp (vissa tar good tid på sig att svara)"

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The feedback from the students in general signals that they considered this to be a valuable course and that they appreciated the course design. Many also said that the course was fun. A large number of students especially mentioned the applied project as well as the labs where they could train on using methods they later used in the projects as supporting their learning. Also the teachers' engagement and teaching skills was mentioned as supporting learning and also appreciated by the students.

The 12 LEQ scores varied between 5.6 to 7.0, with an average of 6.7, which is rather high.

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.

Ambitious students who did a great job in the course! No major changes were implemented in this course run.

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 differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?

- international and national students?

- students with or without disabilities?

No.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

One re-occurring suggestion from a quite large amount of students over several years, also this year, is to prolong the course time, so that it runs during P1 and P2.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

It is fun to work with this course! And it is a delight to see how much they learn and accomplish in the course.
