HN2018 Course Analysis Spring 2024

Performed by: Catherine Trask, ctrask@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.

Mid-course evaluation was done in the middle of the course in form of an anonymous web-survey with open ended questions on what has been working well/have not been working well within the course. Similar reflections were done after the lab and 'physiology pub night'.
Course Reflections were discussed in class following presentations on the last day of class.
An LEQ-evaluation was performed in the end of the course including categories on gender and disabilities, but unfortunately the response rate was too low to display results.
The draft course analysis was provided to the Program Student Representatives for review and comment, so it could be revised if needed before publication.

COURSE DESIGN

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

OVERALL CONTENT OF THE COURSE

- Anthropometrics
- Work physiology
- Musculoskeletal disorders
- Biomechanics and biomechanical calculations
- Design of workplaces, products and aids

FORMS OF EXAMINATION
Group project
Individual assignments for seminars and labs
Written examination

No major changes since the last offering.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

The mid-point course evaluation students listed 8-12 hours per week. This is a bit lower than typically listed for course-end surveys, although course-end surveys may reflect the higher end-of-term project and exam workload.

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?

7/7 active students passed the course after the first exam. This is a little better than typical in the Masters program.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Good aspects of the course:

- Interactive and applied nature of labs and seminars was appreciated. Although some class days were long, the dynamic character of the sessions was appreciated
- The lab day was considered fun and valuable.

Suggestions for improvements

- More support for finding a workplace to conduct a study visit
- More hands-on time and instruction with the 3DSSPP, and more biomechanics lectures before having that session
- Double-check Canvas for date consistency.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Overall the feedback from in-class surveys and in-class discussions was positive. Most of the wishes and suggestions were incremental and constructive, especially requests to incorporate biomechanical software, and incorporating more practice exercises in the form of case studies.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

This course was successful, and overall the students demonstrated good mastery of the course content.

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 be? Are there significant differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female/male?

- international/national students?

- students with/without disabilities?

Unfortunately too few students responded to have a disaggregated analysis.

Summarize changes

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

Changes of the course before this course offering (max 2000 characters)

The big goal for this course will be to transform it into a 'flipped classroom' format more like CH2012 (where I am also examiner). As time allows (it may not all be possible in one year), I plan to add case study sessions for:

- Anatomy and physiology (in class first day)
- Anthropometry
- Biomechanics,
- Selecting the right risk assessment method,
- Ergo-VSM Developing controls.

The lab session will also get some updates to link it better to the biomechanics lecture session and to provide more hands-on time in the computer lab to use the 3DSSPP software. The idea is to incorporate kinesthetic learning with calculation by trying several simple work efforts and then comparing the exposure estimates generated by the software.