

Report - MH2101 - 2023-03-10

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):

Christopher Hulme, chrihs@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.

Only two students participated in the course in HT22, so no formal LEQ-based analysis was possible. Informal discussions with the students was carried out during the course and the students were invited to contribute any comments after the course was finished.

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 face-to-face meetings were agreed with the students after the first lecture (other lectures took place digitally). Face-to-face meetings did also take place during and after the two laboratory sessions. The students did not request a meeting after the completion of the course.

COURSE DESIGN

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

12 lectures
2 laboratory sessions, which function as a teaching occasion but the students must also submit a report for examination purposes after the event. The laboratory sessions are together worth 1 HP. The content of these session shas been changed since 2022, as described in a later section of this evaluation.
1 exam, consisting of a multiple choice part (80 minutes, 40 points) and an essay-based part (150 minutes, 60 points). The exam was done on Canvas and is worth 3HP.
1 home assignment, worth 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?

There is no information about this, as no LEQ report was generated, but there were no complaints from the students.

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?

One student got a grade "A" and the other got a grade "B". No conclusions can be drawn from such a small sample size, but it is worth noting that both students also achieved high grades in other courses.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

No LEQ report was generated, so no information is available for analysis.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

No LEQ report was generated.

Students were satisfied with the course in general, especially the fact that all lectures were recorded and made available for students to watch again later. The subject itself is also interesting to many students, especially those who take the course.

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 laboratory sessions have been changed significantly for this course offering: new equipment has enabled one laboratory session to be altered to include a more complete set of cutting-edge characterisation techniques by adding dynamic image analysis; the second session has been written from scratch to take advantage of the new gas atomiser to which KTH has negotiated access. The new laboratory sessions were liked by the students, especially that about the gas atomiser.

The lectures and home assignments were not changed substantially from last year and no specific suggestions have been given for improvements moving ahead into 2023.

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 LEQ report was generated so no such breakdowns of groups is available and both students from KTH were Swedish from the KTH bachelor's programme and did not identify openly as disabled. One was femal and one was male, but there was no large difference in performance or feedback.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The laboratory sessions will be refined, based on the experiences of 2022. If resources permit, some parts of the lecture course shall be pre-recorded and made available as a video, with the lecture itself replaced by a workshop and/or question and answer session to deepen understanding. The exact parts of the lecture course that could be pre-recorded shall be identified closer to the summer.

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

The laboratory session on the new gas atomiser was comprised of a tour and lecture about the equipment and host institution. As KTH gains more experience in using the atomiser, the possibility of a more practical session shall be investigated, but this is more likely to be ready for 2024 than 2023, if it is practicable at all.

Due to time constraints, industrial lectures/presentations were not included in 2022. If enough time is made available by pre-recording some lecture material, these shall be reintroduced in 2023.
