



---

## Report – MH2050- 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.

No gender aspects have been considered.

Disabled students are following the FUNKA procedure.

---

### DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

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

A spontaneous meeting came in effect when some students entered my office. However, they were not interested in discussing the course. I think they just came in because they liked me from the course that had just finished.

---

### 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 11 lectures, 6 exercises, a mid-course quiz, a seminar and a final exam. The students are given lectures and exercises in mechanical properties. In addition, they are offered a study visit to Scania for ½ a day where they can see industrial activities in mechanical properties. 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 an average year. Marks: 6A, 4B, 4C, 6D, 3F.  
The Swedish students have the same chance to get good grades as the exchange students in MH2032 but they are much less prepared and less motivated for taking part in the teaching activities. As a result, they get much worse result.

### 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.

### 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.

All students come to the first lecture and to the seminar (mandatory)  
About 1/3 of the class (8-10) students come to all lectures.  
Lectures at 08.00 is not giving much. Even fewer students and they are sleepy.  
1/3 of the class joins the Scania study visit. The visit is very good. The engineers have prepared and give short and good presentations. So sad that the students don't come. Rumors tells that the students have many mandatory things in other courses. As a result, they skip this course because they can.  
Big changes since last time. The polymer part of the course was removed as well as the (small) ceramic part. The course is now focusing on mechanical properties of metals. The students could get much more teaching in the subject than before. But, as stated above. They don't come.

## **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?

There is absolutely no difference between men and women related to the course. Disabled students follow the FUNKA program. 2019 a (highly) disabled student managed to get a very good grade. No international students take this course. They take the English version of 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 give my lectures on the A-level. Perhaps this is not on the correct level for the Swedish students. Perhaps teaching should be given at a C-level. Then, the students will think it is easier and perhaps they will follow the lectures more. The good students must study by themselves to get the grade they want (A or B). However, when the course becomes digital, no lectures are needed. Then everything is found on the internet and the students can study just as they please, when they please.