Report - II1302 - 2023-10-30

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):
Voravit Tanyingyong, voravit@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.

Students were informed about the course evaluation at the start of the course. They were also invited to participate as course committee members to represent the course participants to discuss any issues they may have. Course survey was opened to students for two weeks, starting one week before the final report submission.

Gender and diversity were described and discussed as a part of a seminar series at the beginning of the course. The students were randomly assigned to groups, in which they had to consider gender and diversity aspects when working professionally as a team.

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.)

We held course committee meetings twice: Wednesday 26 April 2023 (mid-course) and Wednesday 16 June 2023 (after the course ended and grades published).
We discussed what went well, what was not so well, and what could be improved. The meeting notes can be found on the page below:
https://www.kth.se/social/course/II1302/page/kursnamnd-41/

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

The course has been re-designed from scratch. The overarching structure is based on four phases of project management life-cycle: initiation, planning, execution, and closure. The project method is now focusing on Agile principles based on the Scrum framework.
Learning activities were a mixture of lectures, seminars, and group work. Lectures and seminars were teacher-led activities with schedule classes. Group work were students-led activities. Each group was assigned a workspace on Kista campus but the group can work anywhere they prefer. Teachers regularly dropped by their workspace to answer any questions they may have.
Examinations are combination of seminar participation, Canvas quizzes, project work, project demonstrations, and reports.

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?

Based on the survey, most students seemed to work at the expected level.
However, some work many hours more than expected. There could be multiple reasons, as follows:
- Students tried to improve their work for a higher grade
- Students did not have sufficient skills and require more time to complete their task
- Students have to take on more tasks because other students in the group couldn't complete their tasks

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 general, the students perform relatively well. Compared to last year, more students got A and B grades. However, more students got D and E grades.
Last year, the grades mainly derived from group activities, and most students got a C. This year, the grade derived from many individual activities, which could contribute to a wider grade distribution.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

Students appreciate that they can choose their own project.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Students' opinions of the survey are quite mix with both positive and negative in all questions.
However, there are some clear issues that need to be improve in the next course round:
- The grading criteria that requires students to fulfill every row in the column seems to be a source of confusion and frustration. Students tend to put much more effort into particular rows and miss out on others, resulting in a lower grade than anticipated.
- Students would like to have tangible examples, which was lacking in this course round due to re-designing of the course.
- Students want to have information well in advance. In this course round, we published information a few day in advance before an activity start. However, it seems insufficient from the students' perspective.
- The learning outcomes in the course plan did not match with the course activities. One possible improvement is to provide clear goals for each activities and map them to the learning outcomes.

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.

Students seemed to work well with the groups they are assigned to.
The course organization need to be improved. Students want to have clear and concise information well in advance.
The grading criteria seems to be too complex and students tend to disregard the rules and make their own (wrong) assumption about how the grading will be.

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?

Unfortunately, there were too few responses to the course survey to consider the differences significant.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

All course information need to be published well in advance with clear objectives that map each course activity to the learning outcomes.
Examples from previous years should be given to students.
The grading criteria needs to be simplified. It should be also be clarified more elaborately so that students understand what exactly they must do and the consequences of not meeting a criterion.

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?

-