



Report - MH2504 - 2020-05-18

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):

parj@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.

Students were offered to fill out an LEQ, but only 6 out of 37 students handed in their answers. In addition, the teachers have discussed details of the course with the students throughout 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.)

The teachers have discussed details of the course with the students throughout the course.

COURSE DESIGN

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

Objectives:

The objectives are that the students will learn how to apply their theoretical knowledge to solve industrial engineering problems. This includes that the students will obtain a new knowledge that has not been part of previous courses at KTH. They will also learn how to interact with industrial employees. More specifically, they will carry out two weeks of experimental and modeling work focusing on industrial problems, where they will learn practical aspects of production of metals. They will also visit the industrial companies to get acquainted with the industrial process and the particular problem of interest. In addition, they will make an oral presentation of their results. Furthermore, they will write a short technical report to describe their work, including an overall approach to solve the task, and the results of the study.

Examination

LAB1 - Project report and presentation, 6.0 credits, grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

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?

The few answered varied from 2 - 11 hours per week for 5 students and 30-32 hours per week for the sixth student. The workload is normal for the first 5 students but far too high for the sixth student. It is not clear why the person spent so much time, but a guess is that the person liked the Project so much so that he/she put in that many hours.



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 grades on the course were the following:

A: 5
B: 23
C: 8
d: 1

The result is overall very good. It is the examiners opinion that when the students are given relevant and interesting tasks they perform well.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

What was the best aspect of the course?

Teamwork and self initiation

That we are able to prepare for the master thesis and test our knowledge as engineers

I think that the best part of the course is the independence that the students have in the decisions and in the project work.

What would you suggest to improve?

More meetup with supervisors

My group did not get a company project. I think the learning outcome would increase combined with new company contacts if everyone had a company project. Also, the motivation would be even higher.

Another improvement could be to add a few lectures about writing a good thesis. It would be good timing to catch up some of the important writing techniques right before the master thesis begins.

Supervisor was too busy to manage the project. He should at least allocate some time to reply emails and review our progress.

Maybe more topic should be available for those students that do not have an idea for the project.

What advice would you like to give to future participants?

Please do initiate more meetings with supervisors

The supervisor is essential for a good outcome of the project, they should use her/his help in order to achieve great performance

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The few students that answered seemed satisfied, but also pointed out the need to have good supervisors.

When we have discussed with the supervisors they also said that some students were more motivated to work by themselves but others needed more follow up.

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.

It is all supervisors opinion that the students are very satisfied with the course since it teaches the students to work with realistic industrial problems that they can meet as future engineers.

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?
-

Too few answers to be able to evaluate.



PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

We will continue to identify relevant industrial problems well in advance with Contacts in industry. here, committees at Jernkontoret have and will be used to identify questions, since this is a Place were industrial partners meet.
