

# Report - MH2281 - 2022-05-09

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, jonsson@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 students always have the possibility to give feed-back during lectures and exercises, through email or by their own initiatives. In addition, it is possible to sense their immediate response to what is happening.

No gender aspects have been considered.

No disabled students have taken the course.

---

**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 additional meetings have been arranged.

---

**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 6 lectures, 6 exercises, a mid-course quiz and a final exam. The students are given lectures and exercises in metal forming and mechanical properties, texture development etc, related to deformation of metals at high temperature.

The course was fully digital.

---

**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 resulted in 6A, 1B, 1C, 1E and 2 FX.

2020 resulted in 13A, 1B and 1FX

2021 resulted in 13A, 1B, 1C, 3D

The result is comparable to results in the past.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

They say that the best aspect of the course is the interesting topic. They want some better structure of the course and more Comsol simulations.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

It is sad that only 4 out of 18 students answer the questions. The comments are generally very nice, so the overall impression is that the students were happy with the course. Students say that the slides are clear and simple to read. The Zoom teaching has worked well. Some would have preferred campus teaching while others are happy not to go to campus for just 2h lecturing in a day. Recordings are very good for revising. Some say that it was a bit tricky to have discussions. Some wants the teacher to draw directly on the "white board" so the students become more active.

---

**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.**

Most students perform very well in the course. Most students usually come from abroad but this time there were 6 Swedish students in the course. The background of the students differ, but they manage to perform well. The impression from the teacher is that the students are motivated and study to understand the overall content of the course.

---

**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 students are very different because they come from different universities and different countries. Six came from Sweden this time. The course is given when the Swedish students have many mandatory big courses and most of them skip this course for this reason. There is absolutely no difference between men and women related to the course. No disabled student has ever taken 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?**

Simulations and modelling will be extended.

---

**OTHER INFORMATION**

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

This course appears to be attractive for exchange students.

---