Report - MH2041 - 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.
The lectures in the course are given by mainly two teachers in different, but related areas.

1. Solution thermodynamics, ternary and multicomponent systems, liquid metal-slag reactions - four classroom lectures, each 90min
2. Chemical Metallurgy - application examples for metallurgical processes - seven classroom lectures, seven exercises, each 90min
3. Kinetics for materials processes, introduction to chemical kinetics - two classroom lectures, each 90min (only introduction, main lectures are given in course MH2049)

Examination:

6 hp - one written examination with different parts, related to the subject areas.(A,B,C,D,E,Fx,F)

Exercises have been added and structure, lectures and content has changed, since the last course offering.

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?
The workload of the students does 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 better 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 restructured course to the students is very positive. There are no significant differences 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?

Strong:
(1) The students worked with interesting issues.
(2) The course was challenging in a stimulating way to the students.
(3) The students have been able to practice and receive feedback without being graded.
(4) The assessment on the course was fair and honest.
(5) The students have been able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others.
(6) The students were able to get support when needed.

No weak areas could be identified. All areas in average were rated 6 out of 7.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

The course was majorly changed and the result seem to be satisfying. The students like the setup of the course. Maybe some more exercises or laboratories will be added to improve the learning outcomes of the students.

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?

In general it was the right way to restructure the course, change lecture and contents. The students like the new course setup, which can be seen in the learning outcomes of the students. There is still room for improvement, but no major changes are planned for the next course period.

The lecturer will update and renew some parts of the pp presentations.