



---

## Report - HN2021 - 2021-04-22

---

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 and 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 a survey with open ended questions on what has been working well/have not been working well within the course. Invitations to give feedback on course content was made in the end of seminars. A LEQ-evaluation was performed in the end of the course including categories on gender and disabilities.

---

**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 results from the mid-course evaluation were presented with the opportunity for the students to comment on the results. Invitations to give feedback in the end of mandatory seminars were given. 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.**

**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?**

The students' workload corresponded more or less the expected level according to the results from the mid-course evaluation and the LEQ-survey.

---



### 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 out of 10 active students passed the course so far. This is comparable with previous course offerings.

---

### STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

---

#### WHAT HAS BEEN WORKING WELL

High level of engagement of teachers.  
Well-structured course  
Well performed lectures  
Mini-polls during lectures  
Good with recordings of lectures  
Session with librarians very helpful  
Good practice by assignments  
Well formulated and constructive feedback after handing in assignments  
Good individual development of knowledge, skills and overall understanding of different methods

#### WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED

Some of the lectures that are mandatory maybe shouldn't be. Students have different background knowledge and want to choose themselves if it is necessary to attend or not.  
Space out lectures to a greater extent  
Not use too much lecture time for longer discussions based on students questions - have specific time for questions.  
Planned breaks and keep lectures in time  
Assignments to prepare more before SPPS sessions  
Better overview of key concepts

---

### SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

---

Overall the assessments of the course were very positive and all LEQ-questions, except one, had mean scores in between 6,5-7 (maximum score 7). The questions that had lower mean score (3,8) was "My background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course". To note that ratings on this questions was considerable lower compared to the two previous course offerings.

Improvement suggestions were mainly related to dealing with students having different backgrounds/pre-knowledge as well as improving minor structural aspects of the course that would enhance the students' online learning environment.

To note is that the student's opinions on the work load varied which can be illustrated by the following quotes from two different students:

"I think there are many seminar assignments with close deadlines, I would like them more spaced out"  
"I also like that there are several smaller assignments to keep the active studying going during the weeks"

---



### **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. Smaller refinements of the course were suggested and it seemed that several of them were related to either smaller improvements of how to structuring of online teaching or how to deal with a master course including students with different backgrounds and pre-knowledge. To note that this was the first year the course has been given more or less completely online - the last course offering was finishing just before the restrictions related to the pandemic were implemented. What stood out this year, compared to previous years was that students this year rated lower on having the sufficient pre-knowledge for the course. It is hard to speculate on the reasons for this as well as what impact it had on the students' results as there are overall few students taking the course. Furthermore only one third of the students answered the final LEQ-course evaluation. To note is that online teaching might offer decreased chances for students to get support and ask questions on issues they need more support on.

Adjustments of the work load was made since last year's course offering including revisions of time between deadlines and scope of assignments and mandatory course literature. Overall it is a balancing act to design a course content that is stimulating for those with more background knowledge on methods and that at the same time is giving the basic knowledge to those students with limited pre-knowledge in the field.

There were varying opinions on some issues (for example work load, structuring and content of lectures) which makes us believe that we reached a middle way. Students overall being content with the course also points at this. The evaluations point at implementing smaller refinements of the course content including structuring of assignments and lectures.

---

### **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?**

---

#### **DEVELOPMENTS IN SHORT TERM**

Fitting literature review into the study design hierarchy

Glossary on Canvas on key concepts

Distinguishing between literature review as a research methodology (systematic, scoping, etc) and a literature search to inform the background section of a thesis

Add in the instructions that they should have a conclusion section in the report that examines scientific writing.

Reducing the questions in the SPSS sessions.

Support students to make preparation before the SPSS sessions.

Next year's course offering will probably be every third week on campus and online teaching in between. Suggestion is to space out online teaching in time with fewer lecture hours per day.

Change so that the lectures on the following content not are mandatory: Study design hierarchy and weight of evidence, Triangulation, Mixed methods, Case studies, Structure and content of master thesis, Scientific writing.

---

#### **DEVELOPMENTS IN LONG TERM**

Shorten the module on scientific writing. Narrow the scope of the module on scientific writing to include training in writing shorter reports that include to formulate aims for qualitative/quantitative methods, present results and draw conclusions that correspond to the aim. Aspects of doing literature reviews to be included in a mandatory project course.

---