



Report - MH2000 - 2019-05-28

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):

Björn Glaser (bjoerng@kth.se)

COURSE DESIGN

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

1. Part:

- 6 lectures in frontline techniques in analysis and characterisation of materials
- 3 days' laboratory work (1 day - self-study and group work, 2 days - materials analysis and characterisation)
- Report for laboratory work is required

2. Part:

- 6 lectures in high temperature experimental methods
- 3 days' laboratory work (1 day - self-study and group work, 2 days - high temperature laboratory work)
- Report for the laboratory work is required

Final Exam - covering Part 1 and Part 2

Some lectures have been are given by guest lecturer.

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?

Including the laboratory sessions and the preparations for it, the workload for the students did well correspond to the expected level.

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?

The students did succeed similar to the previous course offerings.

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.

The overall impression of the course to the students is very positive. There are no signifikat difference between groups of students.



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?
-

Stronger areas:

- (1) Students worked with interesting issues.
- (2) The course was challenging.
- (3) The students were able to practice and receive feedback without being graded.
- (4) The assessment on the course was fair and honest.
- (5) The student was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others.
- (6) The students got support when needed.

No weaker areas, all areas have been in average rated 6 out of 7.

Some lecture notes and exam preparation will be improved.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Regarding course development, the following changes are planned.

- (1) Development of virtuell laboratory sessions, for basic understanding of the principles. (still on a long term development plan)
 - (2) Development of more hands on experiments for the students.(short term realization)
-