



Report - MH2450 - 2020-12-23

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.

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.

Students were requested to fill in the LEQ online and to communicate any opinions to me by email. Only two students responded to the questionnaire, so no results are available (a minimum of 3 responses is required to generate results). Therefore, no description of gender is available. No students in the class were disabled, to my knowledge.

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 students wished to meet to discuss the course.

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 on communication in academia, science and engineering. There is also an introduction to the course.

In addition to lectures, students perform a short (120 hours) research project under the supervision of a researcher at the Department of Materials Science. In 2020, all students did individual projects. Many students continue their work as a master's degree project.

Students present a "problem formulation" after several weeks of work and then present their whole project after approximately 8 weeks in a seminar together with universities from other countries. In 2020, the seminar was held between KTH and NTNU (Trondheim, Norway). Students deliver an oral presentation, oppose another student's presentation, write a report and produce a poster.

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?

The intended workload of the project is 120 hours, including all reporting. There is a total of 24 hours of lectures/seminar, leading to a total world of 144 hours. Students are also expected to do some background reading or discussion on communication in academia, science and engineering, which should lead to a total course workload of 160 hours, or 40 hours per 1.5 credits.



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 failed to complete the course by not attending the final seminar or submitting and work for examination. This is an isolated case and has occurred for this student in many other courses.

The remaining seven results are quite spread: 2 A, 3B, 2C. This is very similar to the previous year (7A, 8B, 7C). It should be noted that all students worked individually for the first time in the experience of the course leader. In previous years, some students worked in pairs and received identical grades, which could allow weaker students to get higher grades than they should have. This was also one motivation to have individual projects. This seems to have had not large effect on the overall results and can be retained for next year.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

No answers available.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

No answers available.

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.

I was surprised that so few students responded, as I made a point of asking for feedback and students seemed enthusiastic to give it. Students seemed to enjoy the course, despite it begin 100% digital and even the seminar being on Zoom, instead of in person. Since the last course offering, more information has been made available as Canvas content pages and lectures are recorded and published online. Students seemed to make use of this, so I must conclude that it has been a success, although I cannot quantify that or provide any more evidence.

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?

Unfortunately, this cannot be done due to the lack of information.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The network of partner universities must be developed - Aalto University has been very reluctant to be involved in the past two years and Tallinn University of Technology considered joining but has not. This is probably due to budgetary reasons, but neither has confirmed that. More universities are needed to keep the seminar vibrant and exciting for everyone.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No.