



Report - HN2021 - 2020-05-26

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

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 evaluation was performed after each seminar. A "half-term" evaluation was performed in the middle of the course where the students handed in written evaluation of what was working well in the course and what could be improved. A written evaluation was also performed of the seminar on usability as this seminar was for the year a "new" seminar. In the end of the course a written course evaluation (LEQ) was performed. In the LEQ survey analysis of the answers separated on gender and disabilities are made - no issues of concern were visible in the answers of the students.

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.)

Possibilities for reflections and discussions on the course content have been given in connection to all seminars and some lectures.

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

FORMS OF EXAMINATION

Individual assignments and seminars/workshops
Written examination

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?

In average 30/40 hours/1,5 ranging from 15 hours to 60 hours. The variation depends probably on the different pre-knowledge of the students.



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?

All students who wrote the written exam passed. This year the grades were more "normally distributed" between A-E. Last year the grades were more divided in two Groups (A/B and E) The design and content of the written exams were similar between the years so there is no obvious reason for the differences in gradings.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

LEARNINGS FROM THE COURSE

Insights on concepts and theories that are important for master students/doing research
How to write your thesis
How to do better literature searches - Lecture and workshop on literature studies was useful
How to perform a qualitative study. Good learnings from the workshop on qualitative interviews
Good information of how to write report
Good lectures on different study designs
Learnings on how to apply/evaluate aspects related to usability
Important things for future career

WHAT HAS BEEN WORKING WELL

Well-organized and structured course: Pedagogical course structure. Good and informative course-plan. Clear plan and requirements of the course and assignments. Good deadlines and explanations of what to do step by step. The assignments are building on each other - natural progress during the course.
Good with introduction of literature before each course section - gives in-depth knowledge.
Lot of practice and small assignments. Good to "mini practice" on writing assignments
Lectures give practical support to the assignments. Good supervision and good and clear lectures. Good with involvement of experts like the librarians.
Canvas is used well. Instructions and information is put out on CANVAS one month before course start - good chance to prepare for the course.

Good resources
Course leadership: Good support and great feedback. Easy communication.
Clear aim of each seminar. Good to focus on seminars instead of lectures.
Good that there was only individual assignment and no group work - you can study when it suits yourself.
Good to interview each other instead of trying to find a company representative to interview.
The usability workshop was interactive in a very positive way.

WHAT WAS WORKING LESS WELL/WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED

Fewer hours in lectures. Too long days with lectures. Spread out lectures more.
Too extensive course information. Clearer overview of the assignments in the beginning is after sought. The names SEM1, SEM2 and SEM3 could be removed as they are confusing. A bit hard to keep assignments and deadlines apart if doing the project course and method course at the same time - but this resolves over time/not a major problem.
More time is needed to understand new terminologies. Would have been good with more practical examples of the theories, methods and concepts so that it would be easier to comprehend the context and situations where they are applied. More examples in lectures as the content is abstract.
Hard to find a good topic for the qualitative interviews
Too extensive amount of literature
Some mandatory seminars/lectures could have been elective as some already have knowledge on for example literature searches.
The seminar on theory of science was too long time spent on discussion different views/schools of research.
Too limited time for the group assignment in the course on usability - more preparations could have been done before the seminar. Maybe some more lectures on quantitative methods before the seminar. Preparatory assignment could have also included to get an overview of different usability/evaluations methods to be able to reflect more on the methods during the seminar.
More time for quantitative lectures and SPSS



SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Overall the students express that they to a great extent are content with the course. The mean of all answers, except one, in the LEQ questions range from 6,3-7 (7=maximum). One question (=the course was challenging in a stimulating way) got 5,3. Some refinements of the content based on the course evaluation is recommended. This includes giving more examples of theories/concepts in the lectures and shorter days with lectures. The issue of not making all seminars mandatory/the length of different seminars need to be carefully considered as the needs and pre-knowledge differ between the students and we want to make sure that everyone reaches a certain level of knowledge.

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 the course offering in relation to the students' results are satisfactory. The student felt that the course content and course structure support their learning and achievements. Last year some students rated a to high work load - this has been adjusted by removing some of the mandatory literature. The issue of an uneven work load during the course remains and this needs to be considered for the next course offering.

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, to few students 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?

A more even work load - can be developed by changes in the schedule/deadlines of assignment to the next course offering. After adjustments in the next course offer a new evaluation of the work load should be made to see if future adjustments are necessary.

More emphasis on the understanding and application of specific concepts and theories during lectures should be made - this can be developed both in short and long term by continuous development of the content of lectures.

The scope of the course literature should be re-considered, some literature could be removed for focusing on in-depth understanding of the key literature.

Some adjustments in the overview of the course for making it less complex

Some smaller adjustments in the the length and scope of the seminars.