

Report - MH2450 - 2023-01-25

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

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.

Feedback was collected continuously throughout the course by asking students for immediate feedback on lectures and as the course projects progressed. At the end of the course, students were invited to send comments about the entire course, or to arrange a meeting with the course leader. An LEQ was also created and sent out.

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 requested and pre-booked meetings. All feedback was gathered at the end of lectures and during the field trip.

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 six lectures, a 120 hours individual project with one-on-one supervision and a two-day field trip. Students are examined on their project, which consists of multiple parts: an oral presentation during the field trip (slides are also graded separately), a written report and a poster. No lectures are mandatory, although complete attendance during the field trip is mandatory.

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?

For a six credit course, the students' workload should be 160 h. The project is designed to last 120 h, including reporting. The field trip is two days, so approximately 16 hours, plus six two-hour lectures. This adds up to 150 h, so the total workload is reasonable. Of course, the amount of work students commit to the project is variable and difficult to track with any accuracy.

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?

In this course round, three students recieved gade "A" and five students recieved grade "B".

This is consistent wit the results in 2021: 5 "A", 5"B", 1"C", so the grades appear to be stable

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Only two students completed the LEQ, so no results were reported by the LEQ system.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Only two students completed the LEQ, so no results were reported by the LEQ system.

At meetings of the students, the course was well-received and no major changes were suggested, although one excellent suggestion was to pre-record some material to free up space for discussions in the lectures. This would make the lectures more of a flipped classroom arrangement. There is scope to do this within the course workload, as there are 10 hours available without exceeding the workload. This also solves the problem of the lecture schedule being too crowded following changes implemented when I took over the course in 2018 and which has only been improved slightly in this time. This change will be implemented in 2023 if time permits.

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 students seemed satisfied with the course, which was largely unchanged from the last course offering. The material was delivered more effectively this year, due to an increased experience with lecture timing and additional time required when interacting with the students. The results are consistent with previous years, in keeping with the stability of the course in its current form.

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?

Since no information was given by the LEQ system, such analysis cannot be performed and no significant difference between different groups was identified during informal conversations with the students.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Record some of the lecture material and make it available on Canvas for the students to watch in their own time.

Produce material to train students in opposition of a presentation and report, which most of them have not done before.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No.
