



---

## Report – MH2032- 2020-05-18

---

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):

Stefan Jonsson

---

### 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 students always have the possibility to give feed-back during lectures and exercises, through email or by their own initiatives. In addition, you always sense their immediate response to what you do. After the mid-term quiz, I specifically asked what the student thought about the course and they were very positive.

No gender aspects have been considered.

No disabled students have taken the course.

---

### DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion.

No additional meetings have been arranged.

---

### COURSE DESIGN

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

The course has 9 lectures, 4 exercises, a mid-course quiz, a seminar and a final exam. The students are given lectures and exercises in mechanical properties of metals.

No changes since last time.

---

### 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?

Yes.

### 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?

2019 was a good year, much above average. Marks: 12A, 1B, 3C, 3D, 1E.  
The students were of better quality. 4 students came from Grenoble (same as took my course in MH2281) and were very good. One from Kenya was also exceptionally good, as well as many others. The students were very focused this year. Perhaps the small lecture room in KTHB gave a very compact environment. The students were very interested and highly motivated.

### STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

What questions?

### SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Discussions with the students gave good feed-back. Practically all students came to every lecture and exercise. This is a good quality check of the course. They even changed a lecture from 13.00 to 08.00 because of some schedule conflict and all came to the morning lecture. This is quite different from the Swedish students.

### 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 students always come from abroad. The students selecting this course are generally of good standards. This year even better than the general level. The grades were very good for most of the students.  
The seminars were very well prepared and presented.  
The follow-up of the students was improved 2019, compared to previous years.

**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 be? Are there significant differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female/male?
- international/national students?
- students with/without disabilities?

No, the students are different because they come from different universities and different countries. Generally, the students are very good that registers for this course. Nobody comes from Sweden because they take the Swedish version of the course. There is absolutely no difference between men and women related to the course. No disabled student has ever taken the course.

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

The course will be turned into a digital course to the next time. Simulations and modelling will be extended.

**OTHER INFORMATION**

Is there anything else you would like to add?

I had 20 years to develop this course. I can see the results of that and I am happy about it.