



Report - LH216V - 2022-03-13

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 2021, 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.

15 of 24 active course participants answered the LEQ survey.

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 and the second is read, graded and feedbacked on by two teachers.

Changes since last course offering (in the autumn of 2020):

* The Canvas course room had a new structure, based on a student survey.

* In meeting 1, we pointed 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.

* In meeting 2, relevant parts of the new KTH guideline on course syllabus, grading system and examination were presented. The different deadlines for changing the ILOs and the grading criteria were emphasized.

For details, see the course room <https://canvas.kth.se/courses/23855/pages/course-memo-kurs-pm>

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?

The course was 9 weeks and 1.5 credits, which would mean 4-5 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 24 participants who submitted the first assignment, 22 participants submitted the final assignment.

Six passed directly. 16 received Fx, of which 15 submitted a new version of the final assignment before the deadline six weeks later. 13 of these passed, and two failed.

This is a large improvement from previous two course offerings, where only one course participant passed directly, probably since we this time pointed out more clearly that written exams graded using points and grade thresholds expressed by points are generally not compatible with outcome-based grading criteria.



STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Some of the stated best aspects of the course:

- * It was illuminating to see how easy it becomes to grade with respect to the learning outcomes and assessments
- * It really provides me a chance to re-examine the design of my course.
- * It is professional and has good examples.
- * Working in-depth with formulating grading criteria, hearing and seeing how others have done it, and feedback from teachers.

Some suggestions for improvement with my comments:

- * "Would have been good with some minor feedback from the teachers already after submission of the first draft (in addition to the peer student feedback)."

Comment: Individual feedback from teachers is a valuable resource. We have chosen to concentrate it to the final submission, since we think that it is important that the result will be usable in a real course. During the peer feedback session at meeting 2, the teachers visit each group and give some feedback, but this will not cover the whole first submission, only the part that the course participant chooses to present. I think that we have invested our time in the optimal way. Every submission will get peer-feedback from two peers, and this feedback is usually pretty good.

- * "I think the idea of having a full PM as final hand-in is interesting, but seems to me it could be clarified how it relates to the ILOs. Maybe an ILO can be updated or added to more clearly include something like "after the course, the students should be able to formulate a comprehensive course description/course-PM that links course structure, ILOs, and grading criteria". Alternatively, more focus can be put on discussing the grading criteria-ILO relation in the final hand-in."

Comment: The requirements on the course memo part of the final hand-in do not state that the hand-in should be a full course memo. It just recommend that the required content (relevant to the ILOs of LH216V) should be presented in a way suitable for reuse in a course memo. The assignment would be too large (and very hard if you do not work on an existing course) if we should require a full course memo as the first part of the hand-in. However, we would be happy to see more of discussion of the relation between ILOs and the grading criteria in some hand-ins.

- * "Something needs to be done about the Canvas page. Plain and simple it's confusing. The starting page contains very little information. I was not aware that the course syllabus, which is not the opening page, contained all relevant information until the second session, and that was only because I sent the teacher an email."

Comment: This shows that it is very hard to find a Canvas course structure that will suit every course participant. I have chosen to keep the first page simple, just containing links to the information and using the built-in structure of Canvas (where the syllabus page should be used for the chronological course overview and the assignments page for the assignments). In the first page, the first link is to a page called "Structure of the course room" describing where to find everything in the course room. The third link of the first page is to the course memo page, where there are links to the syllabus, the assignments and other information. In the first meeting I even show the participants where to find the information in the course room. I really do not see how to make this any clearer, but I will give it a try.

Some advice to future course participants:

- * Put aside more time than you think you need for the course. The more seriously you take the course, the better it gets.
- * Really think carefully before you choose what course to work with in this course. If you are engaged as a teacher in a course using grading A-F (rather than P/F), my advice would be to choose the A-F course in order to get most out of this grading course.
- * Try to challenge yourself. Similar to amount of time, you will learn more if you go outside of your comfort zone. Even though it may be more pragmatic to use a course that is mostly in need of some adjustments, using a course where you wish to try something new is very valuable.
- * Look at the many interesting examples of previous participants that are provided on the course website. This can definitely help when preparing the own final assignment.

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 5.4 or higher.

Question from the course meeting: "Would it be possible for the next round of students to also receive feedback on the matrices where they did not pass?"

Answer: This is a good idea, and we will try to do this next course offering.

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.

Almost all course participants seem to be happy with all aspects of the course. There seems to be one outlier who answered the lowest possible value in every LEQ question. The class size is so small that this outlier alone would explain the difference between the mean LEQ values this year and last year.

The results at the time of the end of the course were much better than 2020, which means that many more course participants grasped all ILOs of the course during the course and were able to apply them in their final hand-in.

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?

There were some small and not significant differences in the LEQ means between men and women. Women gave higher values (in mean) to "I worked with interesting issues" and "The course was challenging in a stimulating way", while men gave higher values (in mean) to "The assessment on the course was fair and honest" and "I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others".



PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

* Use a comment field in the criteria matrix in the final assignment to explain why the criterion was not met.

* Adapt the course to a hybrid format, so that it will be possible to participate both physically (which we prefer) and on-line.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Link to the notes from the course meeting 2021-06-08:

<https://www.kth.se/social/course/LH216V/page/course-meeting-2021-06-08/>

Link to the results from the course survey:

<https://www.kth.se/social/files/622e5949b56bb2225ea3dd3e/kursenkatt-lh216v-vt-2021.pdf>
