

Report - II1302 - 2024-07-01

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):

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. The course survey was open to students for three weeks, starting the same day as the last lecture. 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 where 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.)

The course committee meetings were held twice: Tuesday, 30 April 2024 (mid-course) and Thursday, 13 June 2024 (after the course ended and grades were published).

We discussed what went well, what went not so well, and what could be improved. The meeting notes are also published in Canvas.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course design, in general, is the same as last year. The overarching structure is based on four phases of project management life-cycle: initiation, planning, execution, and closure.

Learning activities were a mixture of lectures, seminars, and project work. Lectures and seminars were teacher-led activities with scheduled classes. The project work was a student-led activity and focused on Agile principles based on the Scrum framework.

Ka-211 and the old forum library are used as the main project room, where students can sit and work in groups. Nevertheless, each group can work anywhere they prefer.

Canvas discussion forum is used as the main communication channel with teachers. Moreover, there are Q&A sessions on Wednesday and Thursday where teachers are available in Ka-211 to answer any questions students may have.

Examinations are a 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 there is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

Based on the survey, most students seemed to work 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 required more time to complete their task
- Students have to take on more tasks because other students in the group couldn't complete their tasks
- Students report a higher average workload than the actual workload (They may work a lot of hours for a few weeks and mistakenly perceive and report that they worked that many hours throughout the course that spanned over ten weeks)

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 better than anticipated. Compared to last year, more students got A and B grades, largely due to the new grading criteria based on scores introduced this year that are quite generous with giving many points to students for participating in seminars. Moreover, most groups did their project work and wrote their reports well (presumably because they also got many examples from last year). Thus, they got higher grades in general.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The course had various activities and different students enjoyed different aspects of the course.

Several students prefer to have fewer seminars and lectures and more time for project work.

Some students also prefer to have more guidance/support from the teachers.

Some students considered the grading criteria unclear and would prefer to have clearer instructions on what exactly must be done to get higher scores.

Moreover, some students wanted to have more concrete instructions on how to deal with free riders in the project groups.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The overall impression was good and students in general agreed that the course web was well-organized with clear activities and deadlines.

Although the questionnaire responses were mixed with both positive and negative, there were in general more positive responses.

Although the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) were unclear, the descriptions of how activities mapped to different ILOs helped with clarification.

Nevertheless, students felt there were still unclear parts (including criteria for advanced projects, deliverables, individual contributions, and feedback), which should be improved.

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 overall impression of the course this year is good, thanks to several improvements, including better explanations of how activities are mapped to ILOs, examples from last year, new score-based grading criteria, and revised course materials, templates, and activities.

Students appreciated that the course is well-organized with detailed information and examples provided from the start of the course.

In general, students seemed to work well with their assigned groups. However, some students who chose an advanced project did not have the corresponding skills for the task, which created friction within the group.

Although the course went well in general, some students still think the grading criteria are unclear.

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 primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

There are several issues that need future improvement, as follows:

- Seminars should focus more on practical skills and knowledge students require in their project execution.
 - Provide more details on grading criteria of different assignments/submissions
 - Improve instructions on what must be included in the daily time reports and group web documentation.
 - A method to prevent students who lack the required skills from choosing an advanced project
 - A method to deal with free-riders in the group
-

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

-
