

Kursanalys ME2016

0. Utförare

Anna Jerbrant, examinerator
Charlotta Linse, Course responsible teacher

1. *Beskrivning av kursvärderingsprocessen*

All of the students was asked to fill out the LEQ course evaluation after all the examination was executed and graded. 34 students out of a 100 did, so the response rate was 34%. During the course the examiner asked students that had any feed-back to contact her (by e-mail) if they had any ideas of things that needed to be changes, no one did. All students were also asked to submit an individual reflection with regards to how they perceived their group work (in the case-based assignment). In this reflection all students had the possibility to give feed-back on their group dynamics, difficulties based on gender (no one reported that) and work load. A majority of the students submitted a reflection.

2. *Redogörelse för möten som hållits med studenter*

The students were invited to a course evaluation meeting at the final lecture, but no one responded so no meeting was executed.

3. *Kursen upplägg*

For the academic year of 19/20 the entire course plan, especially the learning objectives was reworked and changed according to KTHs new guidelines of goal oriented grading criteria's. This also meant that the examination had major changes to become more continuous, from Ht19 it consists of two partial exams (that are executed during the course), an case-based assignment (to be submitted in the end of P3) and an voluntary open-book exam undertaken during the examination period (after P3). The main point with this increased amount of examination parts was to increase the student learning during the course, so that all students working with the case assignment has the same theoretical knowledge, as well as making it possible for the examiner to evaluate each student's knowledge in relation to the different learning objectives even though the course has a high amount of student (>100 each time) and a high number of LO (due to program needs).

4. *Studenternas arbetsinsats tid i relation till poäng*

According to the LEQ course evaluation only 2 students put more time into the course than expected (approx. 40 h per week), and 5 students estimated that they put only 3-5 hours/per week. In average the students that filled out the course evaluation put 12-14 hours per week which means that they in total put 90 hours into the course (which is less than from KTH expected 40 hours/1.5 hp). All though, several of the comments related to the LEQ question focused on how the work load shows a frustration that the course (and the fact that the examination consisted of several different parts). For example:

- "The course is too demanding for a 6 credit one period course" (from a students that had marked that s/he put 3-5 hours of work per week to the course"
- "I think this course is quite demanding"
- "In my case, I needed more hours to work on the project and to read the supplementary material such as the course book and the papers " (from students that marked 9-11 hours of work/week)
- "That was quite a high workload. In addition to the scheduled classes, we should include our own study for partial exams, group meetings in relation to the project and our own work on the project task. Therefore, I found

the course rather demanding, but at the same time really challenging and interesting.” (from students that marked 12-14 hours of work/week)

- “think it was just too much work in general, because it was not about learning it, but rather just getting it done. It's an intensive and fun course from this perspective.”
“A lot of hours were needed due to the amount of assignments in the course” (from students that marked 18-20 hours of work/week)
- “It was too much work in too short time for the partial exams, especially since my Masters (Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management) was 150% and is out of our control.” (from students that marked 20-24 hours of work/week)

So, based on the student feed-back focused on work load I will be more clear (at the introduction lecture) that this is an intense and time demanding course. But I will also review the case-based assignment since some students pinpointed that as the most time-consuming examination part and discuss with Indeks studierektor if the two partial exams (2 hours each) should be turned into one partial exam (for 4 hours). I will also extend the groups to include 5 students which will render the work-load to diminish a bit.

5. Studenternas resultat

The result of the examination is satisfactory. The grades were divided according to this table:

Grade A – 15 persons (16.4%)

Grade B – 15 persons (16.4%)

Grade C – 8 persons (8.8%)

Grade D – 5 persons (5.5%)

Grade E – 31 persons (34%)

Grade F – 17 students (18.7%)

Out of the 100 students taking the course approx. 55% of the students took the voluntary open-book exam (in order to strive for a grade higher than E).

6. Svar på öppna frågor

Selected answers from the course evaluation to the question: What was the best aspect of the course?

- The project (Case Assignment)
The collaborative environment within the case assignment group.
- The discussion seminars were great. A good way to test yourself and prepare for the partial exams. practical application of project management methods in the task
The structure and rules of the course were clear from the beginning.
- It's hard to pinpoint the best part because the high quality of this course consists of at least 3 factors. First of all, it is well thought-out material that was presented during classes - in an structured and clear form. Secondly, the accompanying activities in the form of seminars, where the information from the lectures was once again outlined. Finally, a very important point for me is the involvement of the lecturers who both show a passion for the subject.
- That you got a broad picture of project management
- Guest lecture because it's a real and applied example
That it was a very practical course and the skills acquired are going to be very helpful in my career plan
- The different ways of learning by testing students in different ways (case, partials, open-book exam etc.). I learned a lot
- very clear what is expected to get an A in the home exam and pass the partial exams; clear communication of objectives
- Great course materials and courses literature. Good learning methodologies, discussion, and group-oriented practices.
The best aspect of the course was the fact that concrete examples were brought in the module so that I could see

how the theory was applied. The case study was very practical and we learned a lot. I enjoyed the book a lot, too. It was just a lot for one period while studying 150%.

- Diverse assignments and abilities to practice the content.

Selected answers from the course evaluation to the question: What would you suggest to improve?

- More guest lectures with regard to project management in Industries
- No prepared reading instructions, motivated by "You're master students, you can find where to read", it's the job of the teacher to plan and facilitate learning and prevent wrongful learning
- I would suggest to have more clear instruction on the IND, I also received different perspectives from asking the teacher and ask TA
Please inform earlier about which chapters were good to read before each partial exam
The examiner should not be absent so many times! The other course teachers were not as much competent as the examiner of the course.
If I can get feedback on the partial exam, it would be great.
I would have liked one more seminar and some other instance of support for the realization of the project.
- The workload was intense in the amount of things to produce - the partial exams were too intense for 2 hours. The home exam was slightly unreasonable to be done on exam week with only Monday to Friday to work on. At this point I am not able to see any crucial parts to be improved.
I don't understand why it's necessary to buy a 60€ book to get a good grade. All students cannot afford it and a big part of the examination is based on this book. The lectures should give all the tools required for the exam and the book should be only a way to go further if wanted. Include individual parts of the group assignment so everyone must contribute during the whole course and not just in the very end
- To many assignments in one course
- Maybe one question less in the home exam. The tasks of the home exam are doable and well-defined. It is clear what is expected to get an A, but still this home exam was expected in short time during the exam period. I think that this was challenging, not because of the complexity of tasks, but because of the extent of workload while preparing and other exams as well.
- I felt the optional exam was not related to what we learned or discussed adequately in class. It was a lot of work to just "pass". The optional exam just be more relevant than covering abstract concepts barely discussed. The partial exams were also too many questions for 2 hours. As a native English speaker, I have no idea how my non-native English speaking classmates could adequately answer those questions in two hours. Instead I think it should only be 2-3 questions instead of the 4. They were long to sufficiently answer and too much. So I would change the partials and optional exam to be LESS and more on point to the learning objectives.
- project grouping. Since at the beginning of the career, one does not have the luxury to choose the project team while working I feel it will be better suited if the teacher were to divide students into random group

7. *Analys*

The case-based assignment is appreciated by some of the students and at the same time subject of frustration. So, I will keep it as an examination part but improve the clarity.

The hole (content) of the course is appreciated so I will not change the LO

The design of the partial exams must be developed, maybe less questions maybe only one partial exam. I will try less question during ME2015 in P3 (VT20) and based on that course evaluation maybe change to only one partial exam during ME2016 P1 Ht20.

I must align the content of the open-book exam better in the lectures and seminars

We did include reading instructions for the partial exams, so these will be kept

I will also change how we divide the groups

We will also change the accountability in the teacher team so that I as examiner lectures more, and together with the course responsible teacher develops the examination. The course responsible teacher will be responsible for updating canvas, make sure that the student receives all information, grading the partial exams, managing the case-based assignment and answering the students' question.

8. *Helhetsintryck*

As the course examiner I am satisfied with the outcome of the course, since the changes done based on the goal oriented grading criteria was extensive (especially regarding the

examination). The complaints from some students that the work-load was heavy and the literature extensive is not something I regard as only negative. The subject area of project management is important knowledge for an engineer and therefore the student's needs to learn a lot (a majority of Kath's students also work in projects after their graduation). But of course there are aspects that needs to be developed until next time course is given.

9. **Prioriterad kursutveckling**

The case-based assignment must be reviewed and maybe changed (to increase clarity)

The questions and design of the partial exam will be better/clearer aligned with the LO they are examining and to the time available for the exam

I increase the amount of flipped classroom - more lectures will be turned into videos which will make more room (in the schedule) for more seminars

Since the students appreciates the guest lecture I will invite more project managers, and then change the shape so that the guest lecture presents their knowledge during the first hour (off a two hour lecture) and I will lecture during the second hour. In this way practical vs theoretical knowledge can be compared in a better way.