

# Report - LH216V - 2022-10-24

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 2022, 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. 5 of 16 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 spring of 2021):

\* 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.

For details, see the course memo <https://www.kth.se/kurs-pm/LH216V/LH216V20221-1>

---

**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 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.

Open comments: The assignments took some time, perhaps two-three whole days.

It was a good balance for the workload as long as you are doing it regularly.

The workload was OK. it was not more than 40 hours that complies with course description.

The course was well organized. This means that we had all the material we needed. Also the questions were nicely formulated. Therefore about 7 hours per week were ok to understand the literature and complete the assignments.

---

**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 16 course participants who attended the first meeting, 15 handed in the final assignment and 14 passed the course.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

---

Best aspect:

\* I learned the grading criteria which I haven't think about before! and indeed it helps with my plan of the course and teaching as well as examination.

\* I think that conveying the idea of the importance of the grading criteria, was the best part of the course. It makes life easier after all for students and the teacher. No longer animosity what this or this grade, what is expected from the student, and how student will be graded.

\* That the course was in hybrid format.

\* The practical design of grading criteria that can be applied in many courses.

\* Guided tour of grading criteria, ILOs, etc., so I don't have to figure the details out only after students use them against me.

Suggestions for improvement:

\* would be better to have more lectures!

\* A little bit more examples for project-based courses. Especially from the field of production engineering. It was a hard time for me to relate my very practical course with some math or IT courses.

\* Keep as it is. The course is well planned and achieves its goals at least for me.

\* More help from teacher for assignments.

\* Highlight connections to Swedish law and regulations in a more structured way.

Advice to future participants:

\* take the course better earlier than later.

\* Ask questions, participate actively in all discussions, work systematically, keep deadlines, and participate in all meetings (even if not mandatory).

\* Please be aware of FX requirement in the course.

\* Make the ILOs and the grading as realistic as possible. Results can be used directly to courses.

\* Learn this stuff so you won't be one-upped by students who are playing the system.

---

## **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 6.2 or higher, except "was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others" with an average of 5.6. But only 5 participants answered the LEQ.

Summary of suggestions from questionnaire and course meeting:

- \* More/longer meetings.
  - \* The student perspective should be presented earlier than at the final meeting.
  - \* Hybrid format is useful, but participating in the room is best.
  - \* More detailed criteria for assessment of the final assignment.
- 

## **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 participants who started the course offering did pass it, even if most participants received an Fx grade first. This is even better than the last course offering.

Almost all course participants seem to be happy with all aspects of the course. 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?
- 

Too few answers to analyze this.

---

## **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

Since the course is only 1,5 credits, we cannot add any more mandatory meeting. But we will extend meeting 1 and 2 15 minutes and add an optional feedback meeting before the deadline of the final assignment.

Final assignment: We will make the instructions and criteria a little more detailed.

---

## **OTHER INFORMATION**

### **Is there anything else you would like to add?**

---

Link to the LEQ questionnaire summary: <https://www.kth.se/social/files/635673b98ebeb33bec53cd5/kursenkatt-lh216v-utveckla-larandet-med-betygskriterier-vt-2022.pdf>

---