



Report - HN2005 - 2021-09-27

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):

Andrea Eriksson, andrea4@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.

Oral feedback on the course after each seminar. Student's more detailed oral comments on their perceptions of the course in connection to the final seminar at the course. Written course evaluation after the course was finished. Gender and disabilities are included in the LEQ-survey that is used for the written evaluation. 4/4 students attending the course answered the written course evaluation.

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 students were encouraged to give feedback on the content of the course during seminars. The preliminary course analysis was sent out to all students including an encouragement to give feedback on the content. A meeting with the students to discuss the preliminary course analysis was also arranged.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The following forms of examination are carried out within the course:

- RED2 - Literature Study, 5.0
- RED3 - Methodology Report, 5.0
- RED4 - Planning Report, 3.0 • SEM2 - Seminars, 2.0

No major changes have been done 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?

According to the course evaluation the workload correspond to the expected level.



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?

How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

3 of 4 students have finalized the course in time.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Please see below

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Overall the ratings of the course were positive including assessments that it was a helpful course. It was seen as positive that the course contained perspectives on project aspects that have not been in other courses and that it was not a strict project course. Especially aspects of work environment and how to develop and evaluate sustainable projects were seen as interesting parts of the course. The course was also seen as a good preparation for the future master thesis work. It was seen as positive with the opportunities to apply the knowledge and that the course gave a lot of learnings. The class discussion, exercises and assignments embedded learning, according to a comment to an open question in the course evaluation survey. The students thought it was a good idea to turn the course into a 7,5 HP course which is planned to be implemented 2023.

Students' improvement suggestions

- Clarifications on the process and how the report should be presented.
 - Provide examples of previous works and scientific publications that show what is expected.
 - More examples about what is a good literature review. Not just theoretically explained
 - Introduction to the different parts of the course with clear examples of formats of the literature search and review reports
 - More examples about what is a good literature review. Not just theoretically explained
 - Would be good with lectures on how to do literature reviews including what it means to make reflections.
 - Overwhelming with all the small assignments, hard to keep track on the different parts. Would prefer larger assignments.
 - Revise name of the course so that it includes "scientific project" as that is the main focus of the course.
-

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 students expressed being content with the course. Answer on LEQ-questions were in average between 5-6 (scale 1-7). Improvement suggestions included to clarify the assignments on doing literature reviews as well as reducing the number of assignments.

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?
-

No, too few students have answered for making this kind of analysis.



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 be given the last time in its current form 2022. Improvement suggestions for 2022 include giving students examples of previous project reports, as well as clarifying expectations and instructions on how to do the literature searches and literature reviews.

DEVELOPMENTS IN LONG TERM

The course will be developed to a 7,5 HP course in 2023 focusing on supporting students in preparing students in doing scientific projects including focus in doing a literature review and project planning.
