



Report - MH2252 - 2021-11-19

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):

Anders Eliasson, anderse@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 course have been evaluated by informal discussions with some of the students, by a meeting between the course responsible and the TA and by the statements in the LEQ evaluation. Aspects of gender and disabled students were not investigated, however the gender balance in the course was 8 male and two female students.

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 special meetings have been arranged, but since the lectures were given on campus, there was always an opportunity for the students to talk to the course coordinator before and after the lectures (which they did).

COURSE DESIGN

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

Lectures followed by exercises by the same course topics
Computer/simulation task done in in Magmasoft and presented as an individual report
Study visit to a foundry followed by a presentation of different tasks from the study visit
Written digital examination by the course topics (ILO)

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 average reported workload was 10-12h/week (4-20h/week). This is a little bit low but still in neighborhood of the expected workload (20h /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?

The students performed very well both on the written exam, the study visit/short presentation/seminar and the computer lab assignment. The results from the ordinary exam was 9/10 passed (1:FX/E, 2:D, 5:C, 1:B, 1:A)



STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

What was the best aspect of the course?

The lectures by Eliasson and the study visit at Scania. A very interesting course presented by a committed lecturer (Anders). Fun and informative to go on a study visit! The course is not too big, meaning it includes a good amount of topics that give you the time to look into each one. I think the study visit to Scania was very rewarding also the course is also very interesting.

Is there anything else you would like to add?

The exam was pretty good on a difficulty level but it was waaaaayyyy too big for 5 hours.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The students really liked the course and the topics included.

However they had problems with the used computer software "The MAGMAsoft lab was not well put together, the calculations was wrong, the software did not work at all for the first two lab sessions", did not like the format of the excersises "We did calculations at home and then we presented it to each other" and the preparations for the exam "Also, it is (very) difficult to study for the exam when all the old exams solutions are not presented, how is one supposed to know if one has made the correct assumptions and calculations?"

An advice to future participants from a student: Begin with the calculations early, it is the only hard part of the exam.

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.

Based on the result from the examination the course went very well, but the Covid 19 changes implemented from the previous course offering did not work out very well this time (the format of the excersises).

It was really nice students, they were genuinely interested and had a very high attendance at the campus lectures!

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 course content and the overall learning activities seem too be well developed but there must be a better focus on the excersises and the computer tasks in future. All students seem to like/place the study visit as the best part of the course which is really nice, perhaps it can be developed?! The examination seem to be rather ok but should likely be examined in a less time demanding manner.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Still a real casting excersise should be included in the course!

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Overall I'm very happy with this course and I'm glad that I choose it! A little more focus on the excersises and it will become perfect!
