Course Analysis MF2084

Managing Research and Development
HT2019

Date and author: 2020-02-06 by Johan Arekrans

1 Course information

Data from the Course Syllabus

Course responsible teacher:
Johan Arekrans

Other teachers in the course:

Mats Magnusson

Jens Hemphälä

Gunilla Ölundh Sandström

Examiner:

Mats Magnusson

Learning activities:
Lectures, workshops, seminars, individual essays, group project assignment and a written exam.

Additional Comments

2 Students' view of the course

Summary of students´ view of the course based on for example LEQ survey and/or interviews or other activities.

Response rate of LEQ course evaluation survey:

21% (9 out of 43)

Brief summary of students' responses from the LEQ survey and/or other types of course evaluation:

The survey responses are interpreted to be overall very satisfied with the course content and that it is well organized. The discussions and interactions that happen during the lectures are particularly highlighted and appreciated. Students value that relevant real-world examples and cases are used during the course, making it more comprehensible and entertaining. The supervision support during the project assignment is also appreciated.

In contrast, one student experiences that they would have liked to receive more support during the project. Another suggests that the project themes could be narrower when the assignment is given, for better results. Additional comments criticize the project's peer review (e.g. time for making an opposition report and logistics around the peer review) and highlight that this can be further improved.

In a more general context, one student suggests that the overall picture of the course content could be communicated better. Final negative comments concern the length of some lectures (4h) and also point out that access to more previous exams would have been helpful.

Additional Comments

3 Teacher analysis of the course

The analysis should present the development of the quality of the course as well as measures that have been taken after previous course analysis. The course's strengths and weaknesses based on the course evaluation and the teacher's reflection.

Changes of the course before this course offering:

No major changes as previous course analysis did not highlight any particular issues.

The course's strengths (based on the students' experiences and the teacher analysis):

The course content in this course can be challenging for students who primarily have studied technical subjects. By promoting active participation and using real-life examples during lecture discussions, the course seems to do a good job in sparking the interest of students who are previously unfamiliar with the subject. The project allows students to get a first contact with industry, as they are encouraged to interview R&D personnel.

Areas for improvement of the course (based on student experiences and teacher analysis)**:**

- The course grading and overall aim could be better communicated towards the students
- The logistics around the project assignment needs a clearer structure

Proposed changes to the next course round:

- A clearer overview of the course grading was already introduced during the re-exam for this period, based on the survey responses. This will also be included in the course syllabus starting 2020.
- The students seem to enjoy the active discussions, so more workshop-like components will be included in lectures.
- The project assignment will be managed more carefully to ensure that the scope fits the course:
    - The students will be asked to present literature related to their topic earlier in the process. This encourages them to explore topics on their own and gives them the tools for a better analysis in the final report.
    - The students will get more time to prepare a proper peer review before the final hand-in, giving them a better chance to both improve their own work and to get to know other projects more in-depth.

Additional Comments