

Report - LH238V - 2022-01-24

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):

Fredrik Enoksson, fen@kth.se; Stefan Stenbom, stkn@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 continuously evaluated during the course by participants giving feedback on the course content and format through course meetings and assignments. Also, a Community of Inquiry survey has been conducted within Module 4, which was used to collect feedback for the course's formative evaluation.

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.)

This course has not been evaluated in a separate formal meeting. Instead, during module 4, a formal mid-term evaluation of the course was conducted. Additionally, course meetings and assignments are designed so 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 include: Introduction to Digital learning, Digital assessment, Online and/or blended learning activities, Theoretical perspectives of digital learning, and 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 second offering of the course. While the first offering was a fully online course due to the pandemic, this second offering was a blended course with 3 on-campus and 7 online seminars.

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?

According to the LEQ survey responses, there is a wide range of responses, which is likely related to participants' previous experience with digital learning design. The average workload for participants 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?

As of one month after the completion of the course, nine of the 19 participants enrolled in the course have reported a passed result to Ladok. Out of the 10 participants who have not completed the course, five have completed all seminars and have some minor extra work to do. In addition, 3 participants need some more work, and 2 dropped out of the course during the autumn term.

The participants who dropped out of the course cite lack of time as their reason for leaving. This is common given the fact that the course is offered to teachers at KTH.

This is the second time that this course has been offered and the throughput is somewhat less than the previous course iteration while the dropout rate is lower. This is comparable to similar courses for faculty at KTH.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Based on the course evaluation's open questions, students describe the course design as generally satisfactory. Their comments emphasize the importance of interaction and discussion with other participants and teachers as an essential part of the class. In addition, the practical component of the course seems valuable, in that the theories and perspectives covered by the course can be applied directly to one's practice.

Regarding improvements, one participant suggests more theoretical perspectives to be prominent during seminars while another thought that the readings were somewhat on the heavy side. In addition to the peer feedback and instructor feedback that is provided in the assessments, the participants ask for even 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 Col survey (during the course), this course seems to be appreciated by participants. In the LEQ survey, general ratings are above 6 on a 7-point Likert scale.

Three items have average ratings below 6. The three items are the same as those that received lower ratings in the last iteration of the course. The three items are:

14. I received regular feedback that helped me to see my progress (m_2020 = 4.7, m_2021 = 5.8)
15. I could practice and receive feedback without being graded (m_2020 = 5.1, m_2021 = 5.8)
20. I had opportunities to influence the course activities (m_2020 = 4.5, m_2021 = 5.3)

There has been an improvement for all three items from the last iteration, which corresponds to the actions taken to address them. We put extra emphasis on providing feedback throughout the current iteration. Next time we need to better illustrate the ways in which participants can influence the course activities as they are present in terms of selecting topics for assignments and doing in-seminar tasks, but perhaps not as obvious to the participants.

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.

Participants have provided us with valuable feedback. An open, inclusive atmosphere and a high level of interaction are essential to 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.

Adding practical exercises to complement the discussions for this iteration seems to have worked out well, even if some participants ask for more theories on online and blended learning to be presented in the seminars. We will need to continue to balance the theoretical and practical portions of the course.

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?
-

It was not possible to find variations based on demographics.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

For the next iteration, the overall course design will remain the same. Thus, Fredrik Enokson will be the new course responsible, accompanied by a colleague, whereas Stefan Stenbom will only be an examiner and guest teacher for some modules. We will make some minor adjustments to reflect the personality differences in the new teacher teams. A special focus for the fall 2022 iteration will be on illustrating the opportunities to influence the course activities that participants have.
