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, viggo@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.

This is the course analysis of the course offering in period 4, spring 2020, of LH216V.

As described in the course memo:
By the end of meeting 1, a mini-evaluation will be carried out. At the end of the third meeting, we will evaluate the course together, which will constitute the course meeting of the course (as required by the KTH regulations for course evaluation and course analysis). After the third meeting, there will be an ordinary Learning Experience Questionnaire (LEQ).

After the course, the course coordinator will write a course analysis, that will be published on the official course web page in the course catalog.

Aspects regarding gender and disabled students have not been investigated, except for the LEQ.
https://canvas.kth.se/courses/18842/pages/course-memo-kurs-pm

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.)

See above.

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

There are three meetings, with reading assignments before each meeting and two assignments (draft and final version of your own grading criteria) to submit during the course, where the first is peer-assessed using the Peergrade system and the second is read, graded and feedbacked on by two teachers.

Changes since last course offering (in the autumn of 2019):
* The course is given at distance using online tools (Zoom, Canvas, Peergrade).
* The presentation of the students' perspective has been moved from meeting 2 to meeting 3, since some former course participants thought that meeting 2 was a bit rushed.
* Chapter 11 and 12 from the famous book by Biggs&Tang have been included in the course reading.

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 course was 8 weeks and 1.5 credits, which would mean 5 hours per week if distributed evenly. There were no significant deviations from this value reported by the participants.

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 14 participants who submitted the first assignment, 12 participants submitted the final assignment. Only one passed directly. 11 received Fx, of which 10 submitted a new version of the final assignment before the deadline six weeks later. 6 of these passed, and 4 will have to resubmit an improved version.

The result is OK, but too few participants passed directly, in spite of strict criteria based assessment with clearly stated assessment criteria published both at the beginning of the course and in the Canvas page of the assignment.

Most of the participants who received Fx, used a final exam with point thresholds for grading, with outcome-based grading criteria only for E. In the future, we could try to point out in advance that this is not a useful way to assess and grade students.

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

Some of the stated best aspects of the course:
* "That this potentially boring subject was made interesting through your engagement and reflections. It inspired many thoughts about how we teach and how we might improve (also in other areas than learning outcomes/assessment)."
* "Me realizing the difficulty of setting grading criteria; and how much my colleagues don't really do it."
* "The chance to develop my own course with guidance from experts with lots of experience for how to design ILOs and grading criteria."
* "Reasoning about grading criteria and connecting them to the intended learning outcome is an intellectually rewarding exercise about our teaching practices."

Some suggestions for improvement with my comments:
* "Relax a bit deadlines, they were very serious."
There is plenty of time before each deadline. It is important for LH216V that hand-ins and comments are submitted in time. This is important for the other students in need of feedback (assignment 1) and the teachers being able to grade and give feedback to the final submission in an efficient way.
* "It would be good to have a specific discussion for qualitative and quantitative courses. Also, it would be nice to add grading of group assignments in the course."
Most courses have both qualitative and quantitative aspects. In LH216V, we give examples from both different types of courses, forms of assessment and grading criteria, covering both qualitative and quantitative assessments/assignments. Thus this should be covered well enough. Grading of group assignments should be discussed in some other teaching and learning course. There are examples of grading critera for such assignments in the list of KTH examples on the web page
https://intra.kth.se/utbildning/utveckling-och-hogskolepedagogik/stodmaterial/malrelaterade-betygskriterier-1.370030
* "A refresher part of the course i.e for review of designs that have been in place a while"
This is an idea that will be suggested to the Learning in STEM division.
* "It would have been great to know early on how much one is allowed to change ILOs and grading criteria, and *when* the updated course memos need to be submitted to be effective for the spring and fall semesters. Probably half of the students in this course worked on improving a course that is in the fall semester, and then the resulting improvements can't be used right away. Because of this, it would be great if the course instead ran in p1 or p3?"
This is a misunderstanding. The grading critera should be published in the course memo at the beginning of the course. It is the ILOs that have to be published earlier because they are a part of the official course syllabus. But the deadlines for changing the course syllabus is April 15 and October 15, and the internal school deadlines are at least a month earlier, so moving the course to period 1 or 3 won't help.

Some advice to future course participants:
* "See to that you reserve the time needed to really reflect on the course content. There is a lot to learn here."
* "Prepare your ILOs in advance of this course."
* "It is important to take this course. It is quite short and important."

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.
All LEQ statements have an average of 6.0 or higher.
The highest score, 6.7, was given to the statement "I could practice and receive feedback without being graded".

One participant came with a good suggestion, which would be easy to implement:
"Maybe have a discussions tab on canvas and encourage people to ask questions there."

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 course participants seem to be happy with all aspects of the course, eventhough it was given at a distance for the first time. As a teacher it was harder to see if the participants understood what we taught. This might be the reason that more participants than usual received Fx.

The course is designed to make the best use of the involved teachers' time in order to maximize the quality of the grading criteria and assessment presented by the course participants in the final assignment, and let the participants help each other and learn at the same time.

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?
The group is too small for LEQ to present data for women and participants with disabilities.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?
* The different deadlines for changing the ILOs and the grading criteria will be emphasized.
* A discussions tab will be added on canvas and the participants will be encourage people to ask questions there.
* Point out more clearly that written exams graded using points and grade thresholds expressed by points should not be used, and explain why this is not in agreement with the KTH regulations.

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?
A comment from one student:
"Great course. I learned that working in a structured way with the ILOs and grading criteria helped to shape my thinking about the course contents, and make both the design of the examination and the grading easier. I'm also convinced this will benefit the students who will get a clearer picture of what's required and what they're expected to learn."