



Report - HN2021 - 2019-06-26

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):

Andrea Eriksson, andrea4@kth.se

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

- ¶ Concepts of theory of science and research ethics
- ¶ Overview of common methods applied within the field of ergonomics and work environment engineering
- ¶ Epidemiology and statistical methods
- ¶ Qualitative methods
- ¶ Interactive research approaches
- ¶ Scientific writing and reporting
- ¶ Workshops, laboratories and seminars for training and reflections on applications different methods

This is the first time the course has been held. The course has been developed for the new master's program in technology, work and health

THE STUDENT'S 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?

After half of the course a "mid-evaluation" of the course was performed. It was asked for how many hours the students spent on the course. The answers varied from 15-80 hours/1,5 p. The variety of answers could be due to the different background and knowledge of the students. For some students the content was repetition from their Bachelor exam while for some student all of the content of the course was known. The list of course literature was also very extensive. To the next year the mandatory course literature will be more limited.

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?

10 out of 11 students that took the final exam has passed the course.

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

The students are in general rating a positive Learning Environment, the ratings go from 4,4 (opportunities to influence course activities) to 6,9 (I was able to get support if I needed). Students also rated high on that the examination was fair and just (6,6). To few students were responding for making any conclusions on differences between student Groups,



ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

Strengths were that the students thought that the course was well structured, that the course included time for reflection and the possibilities to get support when needed. Weaknesses were mainly related to specific parts of the course where students pointed at potential for improvements, see below on prioritized course development

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

The students' advice to future students included to try to take part in all course activities and try to do the best with all assignments during the whole course. By doing these things will clarify during the course and it will be easier to understand the course literature.

A mid-term evaluation with open-ended answers showed the following opinions:

Planning and instructions: Well-organized course. Pedagogical and informative instructions. Good structure with preparatory assignments helping to read the literature and divide the course in pieces

Facilitating factors for learning: Positive that there was time for reflection over the course content. Positive feedback and interactions during the course. Positive with time to read. It was good with possibilities to choose your own topic.

The content of the course was perceived as helpful for future thesis course: Some expressed that they struggled with the research principles presented during the course that were new to them. Some perceived that the literature was helpful for understanding the new principles, while others struggled with parts of the literature.

Course management: Responsive and helpful course leader and good communication with students.

Lectures and seminars: Knowledge redundancy was provided by the lectures. Good summary of the content of the literature in the lectures. Good mixtures of lectures. Would however have been good with more examples of how qualitative methods, for example case studies, can be used in different kinds of scenarios. Comments that it would have been good to spread out lectures over time as it was perceived to be too many lectures in too short time. One opinion that too much time was spent on lectures on quantitative methods but that the mixture of quantitative methods and workshops were good.

Overall good seminars. Good with seminars where methods can be trained, for example interviewing. There were mixed opinions on the time spent on the literature search seminars. 2 students expressed that too much time was spent on literature seminars and that these sessions could be condensed. 4 students expressed specific positive opinions on the literature seminars as they had developed their skills in doing proper literature searches.

Literature: Most negative evaluations of the course were connected to the literature. The literature list was perceived as too extensive and that it was hard to know how to prioritize among the literature. Parts of the literature was perceived as too theoretical. A suggestion - for motivating the students to read the literature - was to have questions for the students to answer after reading the literature (compare with MOOC).

Patton chapter 1 was not perceived as good. Williams was perceived as good. More practice-oriented literature was after sought.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The course literature will be revised until next year. More effort will be put in clarifying different research principles that can be new to students in the beginning of the course. This will be done by adding more examples and reflections on how the different research principles can be applied in the field of work environment engineering and ergonomics.
