

0. Author
Björn Kjellgren, bjoern@kth.se

1. Description of the course evaluation process

Given the low number of participants (4+2) it was not possible to use the LEQ and I relied for this analysis on feedback collected during the course, and on feedback solicited after the course, as well as on my own and my teaching assistant's observations.

2. Description of meetings with students

Four meetings took place, on Zoom, in accordance with the plan in the course memo, and was complemented by asynchronously through Canvas and e-mail.

3. Course design

The course was planned and given in accordance to the course memo, with no changes during the course. There were no Funka participants, or participants asking for similar adjustments. Since last time the literature had been updated and, based on previous feedback, the workload (assignments and readings) slightly reduced to better fit the size of the course. An addition was a KTH form for consent to use written assignments for research, so that the course would both be based on research and contribute to research.

4. Students' workload

The workload now seems to be in line with reasonable expectations, but individual workloads did vary depending on individual factors.

5. Students' results on the course

There was one student who never started the course, and another who dropped the course at start, but the success rate for the remaining six was 100%, which is an improvement compare to last time, likely helped by the adjusted workload and overall improved course design.

6. Students' answers to open questions

Positive feedback, with the course design working well for participating teachers.

7. Summary of students' opinions

Positive feedback, with the course design working well for participating teachers.

8. Overall impression

Overall, the course worked even better than before, with an updated and adjusted workload and a clearer course design, with improvements such as summaries in the course memo with detailed descriptions of schedule, activities, examinations, and grading criteria. This was the second time the course was delivered online, and both teachers and participants were more used to the format, which likely reduced problems with adjustments to the digital format.

9. Analysis

The limited number of students makes for a thin ground for an analysis, but it is line with experience and expectation that the course continues to draw primarily participants with international background, which more than educational background, field or gender seems to be an important factor for enrolling in the course. While this is in line with experience and expectations, it is a weakness if KTH wants to enhance the global competence of all its teachers. The low number of participants is, however, a bigger dilemma from this perspective, and the Division of learning in STEM may need to analyse the overlap between this and other advanced courses dealing with related topics.

10. Prioritized course development

Course literature will be kept up to date as needed and assignments reviewed for potential improvements, but the general design of the course now seems to have found a good form that could easily be kept.

11. Other information you want to share

This course was established as part of KTH's establishing of Certificate of Global Competence, and maintains a relation to the certificate courses for students to ensure constructive alignment between teacher and student training.