



---

## Report – MH2032- 2021-03-02

---

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.

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.

The course was fully digital.

---

#### 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 results: 12A, 1B, 3C, 3D, 1E.

2020 results: 8A, 1B, 2C, 1D

The result is of the same high quality as previous year.

#### STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What do 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.

Too few students answered for the system to give any information.

#### 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 was no exception. The grades were very good for most of the students. The seminars were very well prepared and presented. The course was fully digital.

## 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?

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 was fully digital. Simulations and modelling will be extended. Self-instructing and self-correcting exercises are planned.

## 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. The course worked very well as fully digital.