

Report - HN2020 - 2024-06-26

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@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.

This course analysis is based on i) informal discussions with, and feedback from, students, ii) a course evaluations discussion on the final seminar day, iii) discussions and feedback with the course responsible colleague who also was the main teacher, and iv) the KTH LEQs Course Evaluation Questionnaire among the course participants, which was available to students digitally with information sent out automatically through KTH systems and which the course management also kindly asked the students to fill in.

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 informal discussions (i) above) were taking place throughout the course with the students and the project groups. The course evaluation discussion (ii) above) was part of the final seminar day and its "wrapping up" session. The discussions between the course responsible teacher and the examiner were carried out during and after the course. The LEQ (iv) above) was carried out after the course.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course design includes lectures, workshops, seminars, webinars, supervision, peer-supervision, reflections and other assignments, an applied project and a final project seminar day with presentation of the project results using a poster, for different stakeholders. Lectures and seminars with theory and practical examples include topics, such as:

- Central terms and concepts related to business economics, work environment economics and personnel economics
- Work environment economics in practice and key performance indicators
- Work environment as a production factor, and the effects on operational productivity, efficiency and quality

The course includes a project work in which a workplace, task or work system is analysed to identify a work environment problem and suggest how it can be solved, based on relevant theory and good practice. Estimated effects of the suggested change on the work environment, personnel and operations should be described and motivated from a business and personnel economics approach.

The course activities are examined in a written exam (TEN1, 3.0 credits), project work (PRO1, 3.0 credits), and active participation in seminars and exercises (ÖVN1, 1.5 credits).

Changes: We replaced the previous main course book with other reading material. In addition, the examiner role was changed back to be taken by L Rose.

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?

Approximately, yes. Although less than 50 % of the students following the course filled in the LEQ. The results from the LEQ show that among the responding students 50 % stated that they worked between 18-23 hours/week with the course, varying between 12-14 hours/week (1 student) to 27-29 hours/week (1 student).

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?

Among the 25 students who followed the course, 22 passed all mandatory parts and received a final grade on the whole course, while the remaining three had not fulfilled the course requirements on all mandatory parts after the re-exam period in April 2024. 13 students received grade A, five students received grade B, one student received grade C and three students received grade D. The results do not differ significantly from the previous, course offerings.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

As course examiner I perceive the feedback from the different feedback activities in the course indicating that the students found the course interesting and that they perceived that they learned a lot, e.g. in the different learning activities and by practically working with a "real project". They appreciated the tailored learning activities including role playing, seminars and workshops where they could train "hands-on" for their projects and get rapid supervision and help in moving forward, as well as the final day poster presentation formed as a festive vernissage and mingle. They also expressed that they appreciated the open, safe and friendly atmosphere in the course. This is also reflected in the open questions in the LEQ.

In addition, in the LEQ several students mentioned that they would have appreciated a more rapid feedback on the assignments they handed in.

Advice to future course participants was mainly to start early with finding a project, and to be active in the course from the beginning.

Some LEQ student quotes:

"Good to have weekly assignments to keep up reading tempo"

"The course is very practical. Teaching the real-world Lingo to communicate in real business settings"

"I would appreciate feedback on assignment on an earlier stage..."

"The project work was very educational."

"Good assignments that helped with own reflections."

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The LEQ and the other feedback shows, as I interpret it, that the students regarded this as a good course, that they liked it and that they perceived that they learned valuable things.

Rather many of the students articulated that the feedback they received on the assignments they handed in was and too late in comparison to what one can expect. This is the first time we receive this type of comment in the course's history.

The scores for the 22 different topics/statements in the LEQ's 7-step scale (where 1 = "No, I strongly disagree", 4 = "I am neutral to the statement" and 7= "Yes, I strongly agree with the statement") were between 5.2 and 6.4 except for the statements: One (no. 14) regarding receiving regular feedback that helped the student to see their progress (score 4.1) and one (no. 13) regarding understanding what was expected from the student (score 4.8). As I see it, the answer on no. 13 can be a connected to not receiving feedback as expected.

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.

I have no noticeably different impressions from last year's and previous years' course offerings and student's results except on the issue with that the students articulated that they received feedback on assignments they handed in too late in comparison to what one can expect. Both the course responsible colleague and I agree that the students should have received feedback on the assignments they handed in faster.

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?
-

It is somewhat difficult to analyse the results since we don't know how many of the students identified as female, male, other, or did not want to state, etc in these domains depending on how they identify themselves. E.g. if there were only few students who identified as "woman" and several times more students who identified as "man", it is not optimal to compare these two groups due to group size differences.

However, there LEQ results show a tendency for higher scores among those who identify as "man", than for those who identify as "woman". I have never seen this in an LEQ before and the largest difference was visible regarding LEQ no. 14 (the one on receiving feedback). I will pay attention to this in the next course run and the next LEQ analysis. There may also be tendency that international students in some LEQ domains score somewhat higher than Swedish students. I will also pay attention to this in the next course-run. No differences between students with / without disabilities were identified.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Given the analysis of the course no main changes in the course structure and design need to be made. The action needed is to secure that the students get feedback on assignments that they hand in within a reasonable time. For the next course run, other resources have been allocated to secure this.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

We enjoy working with this course and are impressed to see the students' rather rapid development with acquiring skills in this work environment and economics area!
