

Report - ID2012 - 2022-06-21

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):

Fredrik Kilander fki@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.

At the beginning of the course students were reminded of their opportunity to form a course council.
During the course, the course director was available at lectures and on email.
At the end of the course, an LEQ survey was issued.

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.)

No student course council announced itself.

COURSE DESIGN

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

There were nine lectures (2h) and one seminar (4h).
Students read articles and worked on an engineering project. They submitted an article review, a 5000 word essay, and performed an oral presentation of their project, with a demonstration and a project report. Project groups were 1-3 students.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

The workload response averaged to 7 hours per week. However, several students tend to procrastinate with the article review and essay until after the LEQ closes. The actual workload is therefore expected to be higher.

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?

At the time of this writing, 4 out of 20 students have completed the course round. 11 students passed their projects and are expected to complete their submissions and the course.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The project is appreciated. Two comments were made to the effect that students should not have to buy equipment. This is indeed the case, they are not expected to do so, and this is clearly stated in the course PM and said in lectures.
The flexible deadlines for the article review and essay were perceived as too loose, and did not really offer any help to complete them.

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.

It was a good course round. The student projects were again, amazingly innovative, personal, and well connected to the course.

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 of course not good if one or more students were under the misconception that they had to spend money in order to complete the course.
The issue of deadlines is tricky. If a deadline is presented, what is the meaning of it? Is that test failed, or is there some kind of retest strategy available similar to a re-exam?

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

A collaboration with the Kista mentor space should be explored, for the project part.