



Report - MH2450 - 2019-01-14

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-Smith chrihs@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 course consists of three lectures, an associated research project approximately two months long, a short seminar at KTH and an international seminar where students present their results. The lectures consists of one introductory lecture, one on written communication and one on oral communication. The short seminar takes place a few weeks after the research project begins and the students to present their research problem to each other. The international seminar takes place together with students of NTNU (Norway) and Aalto University (Finland) after the end of the research project. Since the last course offering, the person responsible for the course organisation and most of the teaching has changed. The international seminar has changed format to include more different types of communication skill and communication skills training, instead of including only oral presentations. This change was found to be positive and will be retained in future years.

THE STUDENT'S 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?

According to the feedback (3 students), students spent a total or around 80 h on the course, out of an intended 120 h. However, talking with supervisors indicates that many students spent longer than 8 h per week on research, so I expect the majority of students spent the correct amount of time on the course. In future years, students could be asked to report their time commitments as part of their assessed report.

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 results were in line with previous years:

A: 6 (4 groups)
B: 10 (7 groups)
C: 1 (1 group)

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

Only three students out of seventeen have replied, so only very limited analysis is possible. Based on this, the students found the course engaging and interesting. The overall response indicates that students found the course difficulty appropriate, but were less positive when answering this question (Q4) than others.



ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

The learning environment is mainly provided by the supervisor of each project group. No students complained to me about their supervisor, but two supervisors complained about their groups not working hard enough. Eventually, all groups produced acceptable work, but some supervisors had to provide significantly more support than others. For the students this course is a learning opportunity in project and time planning and management, so such experiences are to be expected.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

The students who responded were happy with the structured parts of the course, but found the projects more challenging. They recommended that projects should be given out earlier and be more "achievable". It is possible to give out projects slightly earlier, but it is not intended that the projects should be longer. Instead, simpler projects are ideal. However, there will always be some spread in the size and difficult of projects. One student also wanted the different universities to take a more similar approach to the projects so that they were more comparable at the seminar. This is not possible, since NTNU have a different programme structure and use the first stage of master's thesis projects for the seminar, unlike Aalto and KTH. Additionally, this year was an interim year while we adjust the course to include the new concept of communication/entrepreneurship skills training and only NTNU presented a slide-show. It is planned that everyone will provide both a slide-show and poster presentation in future years, so the output should be similar for all partners at the seminar, as wanted by the respondent.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Ensure students spend the intended time on the research project. Students could be asked to provide an estimate of their activity as part of their final report, as if they were working in industry and supervisors could be asked to provide more formal feedback on the
Increase the level of challenge offered by the course
