

Report - MH2032 - 2022-05-09

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, jonsson@kth.se

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. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

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 given on campus with the possibility to attend on Zoom. Lectures were recorded on Zoom.

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

2021 results: 2A, 4B, 6C, 1D

The result seems to have dropped a bit compared to previous years.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The comments from the students are very nice. I copy them directly:

What was the best aspect of the course? (I worked: 6-8 timmar/vecka)

Definitely the teacher, such a kind-hearted person!

The teacher was very helpful and kind, it was a pleasure to have such a person.

The teacher was excellent! always answering our questions and make sure we understand the course material

What would you suggest to improve? (I worked: 6-8 timmar/vecka)

The exercise sessions

Start the exercises a bit earlier in the period

What advice would you like to give to future participants? (I worked: 6-8 timmar/vecka)

Make questions to the professor anytime you don't fully understand a topic.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The students say they "really enjoyed it". The course was "very good and well managed". "Nothing needs to be changed". "The online seminar was really good". Two students wants campus teaching to better ask questions and to discuss, but online teaching is also OK.

A high interaction with students is emphasized and the "ability to have a good conversation with all the student without anyone talking over someone else".

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 generally good for most of the students. However, the result dropped a bit compared to previous years.

The seminars were very well prepared and presented.

The course was hybrid, given on Campus with Zoom sessions.

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?

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 hybrid and most students came to campus all the time. Lectures were recorded in Zoom. Simulations and modelling will be extended. Self-instructing and self-correcting exercises are planned. From 2022, the course is the same as MH2050. This means that all students, Swedish and international, will take the same course. In practice, the only difference between MH2032 and MH2050 has been the language. From 2022, there will only be an English version of the course. From 2023, the plan at the department is to increase the course to 7.5hp.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

I am very happy with this course and the students I teach. I am very happy with the response from the students.
