



Report - LH216V - 2017-06-18

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):

Viggo Kann

COURSE DESIGN

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

Three 3-hour meetings. The first two meetings contain both presentations of theory and examples as well as work in groups on grading criteria.

Before the second meeting the course participants should write a draft of new grading criteria for a course of their choice.

Before the third meeting the course participants should peer review two other drafts of grading criteria and then produce complete grading criteria, including how they should be aligned to the assessments and how the separate grades should be combined to a final grade.

The examiner (course coordinator) grades the grading criteria and gives extensive individual feedback.

At the third meeting the course participants show their grading criteria to each other and discuss the issues that were brought up in the feedback from the course coordinator.

The main change from last course offering was the introduction of the third meeting.

THE STUDENT'S 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 course participants are teachers and have usually lots of other engagements. Some of them start the course but have no time to do the assignments. Therefore 2 of 15 did not have time to hand in the first assignment and 2 more did not have time to hand in the second assignment). For the course participants who hand in all assignments, the time spent on the course seems to be close to 40 hours, which corresponds to the size of the course 1,5 credits.

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?

Of the 11 course participants who handed in the final assignment, 6 did pass, and 5 got FX and had to improve the grading criteria and hand in an updated version.

This is similar to previous course offerings. All course participants that get FX usually will pass the course in the second or third attempt.

Several of the students that don't finish the course offering will return and finish a later course offering.



OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

Only 5 answers (out of 12 possible - the rest of the course participants were registered on an old course offering and did not receive the questionnaire) were posted. But we also had an evaluation session during the third meeting.

The learning environment gets very high numbers in almost all aspects. Only two aspects have slightly lower numbers:

5. I felt togetherness with others on the course (mean value 4.5 where 4 is neutral and 7 is max)

21. I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others (mean value 5.0)

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

The reason that aspects 5 and 21 only got weakly positive answers might be that the course participants come from different parts of KTH and do not know each other, and they meet the others only during the three meetings of the course. But during each meeting there are activities where the course participants discuss each other's grading criteria and they also write two peer reviews, so there are opportunities for collaborating and discussing with others. I do not think that we need to improve these aspects.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

The, very few, open answers in the questionnaire together with the evaluation at the third meeting show that the course is considered very good and important.

For example: "This course was very useful. It clearly helps improving my own courses. Thanks Viggo."

An advice for future participants was "Read grading criteria on final assignment closely".

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The peer review system in Canvas is hard for the course participants to understand and use. I would prefer to switch to the system peergrade.io next time, if possible.

Most of the final hand-ins that are graded FX are missing one or more of the following things:

1. Description of how the assessment of the course will guarantee that each student who gets pass will fulfill all ILOs to the E level criteria.
2. An alignment between the grading criteria and the assessment.
3. A reflection.

I will try to state these requirements even more clearly in the next course offering.

The Swedish-English keyword list in the course web should be copied to Canvas.

At the third meeting only 4 of the course participants were present. The meeting was not mandatory. I would like to keep the third meeting the next course offering as well, because for the course participants who are present, the meeting is valuable and appreciated.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

This course offering, Viggo Kann was both examiner and course coordinator. One guest lecturer, Emma Lundkvist, from Uppsala university were responsible for the second meeting. Two student TAs participated in all three meetings: Svea Ekelin and Veine Haglund.

Kursdata 2017-06-18

LH216V - Utveckla lärandet med betygskriterier, VT 2017 Eng (per 4)

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2017 v.12
Kursen slutar:	2017 v.22
Antal högskolepoäng:	1,5
Examination:	INL1 - Inlämningsuppgift, 1,5, betygsskala: P, F
Betygsskala:	P, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Viggo Kann <viggo@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Anna-Karin Högfeldt <akhog@kth.se>
Lärare:	Viggo Kann <viggo@kth.se> Anna-Karin Högfeldt <akhog@kth.se>
Assistent:	Veine Haglund <veineh@kth.se> Svea Ekelin <sveae@kth.se>

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	11
Totalt registrerade:	14

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad ¹ [%]	45.50%
Prestationsgrad ² [%]	45.50%
Betygsfördelning ³ [%, antal]	P 100% (5)

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter

LH216V - Utveckla lärandet med betygskriterier, VT 2017

Eng (per 4)

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2017 v.12
Kursen slutar:	2017 v.22
Antal högskolepoäng:	1,5
Examination:	INL1 - Inlämningsuppgift, 1,5, betygsskala: P, F
Betygsskala:	P, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Viggo Kann <viggo@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Anna-Karin Högfeldt <akhog@kth.se>
Lärare:	Viggo Kann <viggo@kth.se> Anna-Karin Högfeldt <akhog@kth.se>
Assistenter:	

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	1
Totalt registrerade:	4

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad ¹ [%]	Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade
Prestationsgrad ² [%]	Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade
Betygsfördelning ³ [%, antal]	Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter