

Report - LH238V - 2023-03-28

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

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 participants of the course have been given opportunities to continuously provide feedback on the course content and format during the course meetings and via assignments, thereby facilitating an ongoing evaluation of the course. A Community of Inquiry survey was also conducted during module 4, which served as yet another way to carry out formative evaluation throughout the course.

Upon completion of the course, an LEQ survey was administered and included questions pertaining to gender and disabilities.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

No formal course meetings have been arranged in this course. A formal mid-term evaluation was conducted during module 4, which was also discussed with the course participants. The course meetings and assignments have also been structured to encourage feedback on the course.

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, and Digital learning in the light of industry 4.0.

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

This was the third offering of the course, and few changes in course design has been made since the last offering. Some changes in course material (readings) has been made as this is a course in a rapid changing subject.

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?

From the data of the responses in the LEQ survey, the workload for students matches with the intended workload.

The teachers of the course carried out an analysis of predicted workload for the first course offering, which is followed up when making changes to the course activities and readings.

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 week after the course has formally ended, 11 of the 20 (55%) participants registered for the course have a result in Ladok that they have passed the whole course in Ladok. Out of the 9 participants that have not passed the course, 1 participants have some work left in the course, while 8 participants have dropped out of the course during the autumn term (2 of them did not even started the course). The participants who have left the course state that the reason for dropping out is lack of time they can spend on the course. This is common given due to the fact that the course is offered to teachers at KTH, where they might get a research grant where they have reprioritise their time.

This is the second time that this course is given, the throughput is lower than at the same period last year (75%), but those that have still not passed the course are nearer a passing grade this year so likely the throughput will be similar in about two months.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The participants expressed that were in overall satisfied with the course design. They particularly appreciated the high level of interaction and discussion with other participants and teachers, which they deemed an integral aspect of the course. Additionally, the course's practice-oriented approach was valued as it enabled the immediate application of the covered theories and perspectives in their professional work. No recurring feedback regarding improvements was received; however, one participant suggested reducing the emphasis on reviewing topics from the basic course, while another recommended setting aside one-hour time slots for group interaction without teacher involvement in each module.

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. The rating according to LEQ varies between, 5.9 and 6.9 (7.0 being the max).

LEQ statements with lower feedback (indicating rooms for improvements are):

14. I received regular feedback that helped me to see my progress (m = 6.1)

20. I had opportunities to influence the course activities (m = 5.9)

These are the two same statements that received the lowest ratings in the previous course iteration, but then with an average of 5,8 for statement 14 and 5,3 for statement 20. So, hopefully this course round improved on those aspects.

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 and how it is designed. 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.

Keeping the practical exercises to complement the discussions from last course iteration seems to be a good decision. The plan is to still 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?

One of the things discussed is to deepen the module on learning activities. Right now the participants can choose to focus on digital meetings or educational video. The focus on those tracks is on how to record an educational video or carry out a digital meeting in an educational setting. In the coming course round we will also include readings and discussion on how educational video and digital meetings can be used and combined with other (digital) learning activities.

The module Learning 2.0 for industry 4.0 will include a larger part on AI at its implications. In the previous course rounds the focus has been on immersive technologies such as VR/AR/XR.
