



Report - HU1801 - 2020-12-30

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):

Peter Sillén, petersil@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.

weekly time for question, discussion, suggestions, as part of a lecture
end of course LEQ

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.)

weekly time for question, discussion, suggestions, as part of a lecture

COURSE DESIGN

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

weekly lectures
examination
* changes 2020
PRO 4,0 credits
* fem group project assignments
* three passed gives grade E
* five passed gives grade D-A
TEN 3,0 credits, written exam has a known structure w ten questions in three parts
part A - four unknown shorter questions
part B - four mid-length questions drawn from 10 beforehand known questions
part C - three lengthier questions known beforehand
the format is used, functions well since a couple of years, minor changes in wording
* online examination has added complexity and necessitated to demand somewhat higher complexity in hand-ins, in effort to individualise replies, one way is through own-selected practical examples
ÖVN 0,5 credits
* verbal own-filmed presentation of own-selected topic and example combining course content and sustainability



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?

< replies on LEQ, so no report

impression is workload is 15-20 + hours per week

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?

in line with previous years

57 registered on course

6 grade D

4 grade C

17 grade B

21 grade A

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

LEQ < 3 responders, so no report

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

LEQ < 3 responders, so no report

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.

the learning activities function dynamically to motivate learning

the examination is functional and seems well understood

many students take the opportunity to take steps for added learning and examination for a higher grade

many, but not all, project groups function well and likely add to learning dynamics, though less so for the students who are in less well

functioning project groups - this is a continuous challenge and question, how to set up working group in 'best way'

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?

strength - well functioning examination design

possible weakness - method to design project working groups, the method is dependent on students' own initiative, interest and drive to make groups function well

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

how to stimulate working groups to work as dynamically as possible, while still relying on students' own initiative