



Report - MH2040 - 2021-03-03

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):

Malin Selleby malin@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.

A LEQ questionnaire has been sent out after the course. During the course the teachers and assistants have answered questions in person during lectures and as covid got worse, mainly by email and during zoom (lectures and labs). Equal treatment of all students regardless of gender or other differences have been the goal. Disabilities have been taken care of during the exams by FUNKA.

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.)

The course usually gives plenty of contact between students and teachers/assistants. This corona-year the first part of the lectures (thermodynamics) was given in the classroom but after a few lectures I started to use zoom and be in the classroom. About half of the students attended and half used zoom. The second part of the lectures (kinetics) were given only through zoom as the covid situation had become worse. All the exercises and computer labs were given digitally.

The students answer that they were able to get help when they needed, so even during covid this seems to have been ok.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course is divided in two parts, thermodynamics and kinetics. The thermodynamics part is given by Malin Selleby and the kinetics part by Joakim Odqvist. Based on the new goals for the course we have added two Partial exams, one for each part of the course. If a student pass both partial exams s/he gets an E on the exam. The final exam was divided in two parts, one to obtain grade E and one for higher grades. This setup of the course and exam was better than just one exam.

In addition to the exam assignments based on computer and pen/paper exercises had to be handed in to fulfill the goals.

The exam gives 2 hp and each of the assignments gave 2 hp.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

Of the students that answered 3 studied 18-20 h/week, 2 12-14, 2 9-11 while one student studied 6-8 hours/week. The intended workload is about 25 hours per week.



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?

As last year they succeeded much better than during previous course offerings, probably mainly due to the new setup with partial exams.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

They seem to like the course, "all good" "good as it is". They like especially the computer labs but also the lectures get positive feedback. One student says that it would have been better without the present situation. It was difficult to work with other students for some masters students that were new in the class.

They have some suggestions on improving the instructions for the computer labs.

One issue that was raised by the students is that the driving force to take the final exam while having already passed the course through the partial exams, was low.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Overall the course gets good "grade".

The LEQ pattern was almost the same as last year, maybe a bit surprising considering the situation.

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.

We were both happy with the outcome and the result.

The changes in the labs made the time needed more even (implemented since last year).

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?

No, not really. The number of students that answered is too low.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Rewrite and update the exercise material.