Report - LH238V - 2021-01-21

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):
Stefan Stenbom, stkn@kth.se; Fredrik Enoksson, fen@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.

The course has been evaluated continuously during the course by the participants giving feedback on the course content and format during course meetings and via assignments. A Community of Inquiry survey has also been conducted within module 4, which was used as a formative evaluation during the course.

After completing the course, the LEQ survey was conducted in which questions such as gender and disabilities are included.

The evaluation results have then been analyzed at a formal course evaluation meeting between the course's teachers.

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.)

No separate formal course evaluation meeting has been conducted in this course. Instead, a formal mid-term evaluation of the course was conducted during module 4. Also, course meetings and assignments are formulated in such a way that feedback on the course design is encouraged.

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

The course contains workshops, seminars/webinars, self-study material and assignments on various aspects of digital education.

Topics of the course includes: Introduction to Digital learning, Digital assessment, Online and/or blended learning activities, Theoretical perspectives of digital learning, Digital learning in the light of industry 4.0.

The course aims to contribute to your development of skills and abilities to analyze, plan, create, implement, and evaluate learning and teaching in a digital education environment.

This was the first offering of the course.

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?

According to the LEQ survey responses, the workload for students matches the intended workload.

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?

One month after the course has formally ended, 21 of the 28 (75%) participants registered for the course have reported an approved result in Ladok. Of the 7 participants that have not passed the course, 3 participants have some work left in the course, while 4 participants have dropped out of the course during the autumn term.

The participants who have left the course state that the reason for dropping out is lack of time. This is common given the fact that the course is offered to teachers at KTH.

This is the first time that this course is given, but the throughput and reasons for dropout are similar to those that previously similar courses usually have.

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

In the course evaluation's open questions, the participants state that they are generally satisfied with the course design. In particular, they indicate the high degree of interaction and discussion with other participants and teachers as an essential part of the course. Furthermore, the practice-oriented focus seems valuable, where the theories and perspectives that the course covers can be applied directly in one's practice right away.

Regarding improvements, participants suggest more practical exercises to complement the discussions of the course. They also ask for more hands-on examples of well-conducted online learning and examination activities within STEM. Most of the course assignments include some form of peer-review so that participants get feedback on their work. In addition to the peer feedback, the participants ask for more teacher feedback on their submissions.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

According to the LEQ survey (end of the course) and the CoI survey (during the course), this course seems to be appreciated by particpants.

LEQ statements with lower feedback (indicating rooms for improvements are):
14. I received regular feedback that helped me to see my progress (m = 4.7)
15. I could practice and receive feedback without being graded (m = 5.1)
20. I had opportunities to influence the course activities (m = 4.5)

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.

We agree with the feedback the participants have provided. The open, inclusive tone of the course with a high level of interaction is essential for this course. Since this is a course about online and blended learning given in an online format, it also naturally serves as a joint reflection base for discussions.

We agree with feedback regarding a need for more practical exercises to complement the discussions. Some of the planned practical exercises had to be removed as the offering had to transfer from a blended to a fully online course. For these practical exercises, we also intended to have more eligibility that addresses that feedback from the survey,

We also agree that we, as teachers, should have spent more time providing individual feedback to participants. As this was the first offering, and it was offered during the pandemic, we simply did not have enough time to do this.

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?

No variations based on demographic data could be found.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

We intend to keep the overall course design untouched for the next iteration. That said, we intend to review the course meetings and assignments in order to address the feedback of more hand-on examples of online and blended learning activities. We also intend to pre-plan the upcoming course iteration so that we can spend more time during the course to interact with the participants. We are planning for a blended delivery for the upcoming iteration, where some of the most workshop-oriented activities will be on campus.