



Report - MJ2383 - 2020-06-29

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):

Hauke Henke, haukeh@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 course evaluation was carried out over two stages. The first stage covered the lecturing period. After each lecture the students were asked to fill a quiz containing two items. Firstly rating the lecture on a scale 1 to 5 and secondly to provide comments and feedback. The quizzes were anonymous.

The second stage of the evaluation consisted out of a course survey with 22 questions set-up in the course web.

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 course consisted out of four lectures, four labs, a seminar and an exam.

One of the labs is a question and answer session on the course project.

In previous course editions on request separate meetings with project groups had been arranged. In this edition this request didn't come up.

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 out of four lectures and four labs that build up on the lectures and aim to apply the theoretical knowledge from the lectures. The course grading is based on the final exam and the course project with a ratio 40:60.

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 estimated workload indicated in the course survey is rather low and doesn't equal the hours that should be spend for achieving 6 ECTS. Comparing this with the grades given in the course one might draw the conclusion that the expectations regarding self-study time in particular in context of the course project which contributes half of the course credits was not understood by all students. Even though the importance to start early with the project had been highlighted in multiple occasions through out the course, one might need to consider how to ensure that the expectations regarding independent project work is understood.

Lastly it also needs to be noted that the participation to the course survey was rather low (26%).

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?

Most students have achieved a good or better grade. The frequency of grade given has changed only to a minor extend.



STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

LECTURE QUIZZES

Lecture 1

- the speed of delivery can be reduced.
- The structure and information was pretty nice. Although I wanted more visualizations and real life examples from UNSTATS or IEA or something. Also, as a student with no background in economic courses, I struggled with various economic terms and formulas. Maybe a lecture where we could do just the exercises of economic formulas and concepts would be really really beneficial.
- Structure was good, although many of the economic concepts were quite basic. Explanation and teaching by the teacher was also good. As a recommendation, I would advise allowing the students to review the material before the class starts by unlocking the documents on Canvas before class.
- I liked everything, it was pretty clear and easy to follow, I also liked the clarity in the teaching style
- The lecture is very well structured and the explanation is excellent and it is easy to follow up with the lecturer. I was able to keep focused through 80% of the lecture which is excellent % for me.
- The teacher is very good and the topics are clearly explained. Many of the concepts treated during the class may be repetitive for students attending their 5th year.
- The explanation was good. I have experience with some of these concepts, but I thought the way they were explained was adequate for students that aren't familiar with them. I also liked that there was interaction with the students.
- Add some color or funny video to explain. Example with bull was very cool! Thank you!

Lecture 2

No quiz results since problem with publication on Canvas

Lecture 3

No comments

Lecture 4

- Pretty good. However, a clear connection between Paris Agreement and SDGs should have been shown.
- Very clear lecture and explanation. Some points were already provided in the course MJ2413.
- It was very structured and did a good job of going in depth into some aspects, which made it more interesting and enriching.
- Averagely I was good and well structured. I enjoyed learning new things.

SURVEY QUESTIONS

What was the best aspect of the course?

- The course responsible and everyone who gave a lecture or led a lab was very willing to help, answer questions, etc.
- Having the feedback forms after each lecture is a very good idea.

- The practical case we worked on

What would you suggest to improve?

- More course content and material. Improved guidance with computer tools. Tools to be up to date (units etc.)
- We didn't have any feedback on the project, for instance on the MCA we had to do: was it right? Was it the good way to do it? We find methods by ourselves so we don't know if they were good. The project instructions were not very clear.

It would have been good also to get feedback/correction on the exam.

The ILOs were not so clear as well: we've never used the concept of 3E?? (or at least not directly with this name)

To improve: reactivity to emails.

But the lectures were clear. Maybe it could be interesting to do more exercises/examples related to the tough concepts (otherwise it looks very theoretical without any application).

- The course was already very short and it began with explaining very basic concepts like net present value, so we didn't get very far in the course. Given that it's a masters level course, the financial basics should be given as a pre-lecture (not one of the only 4 lectures). Also, some of the lectures and labs could have been much more interesting and interactive. I believe the topics in this class are well-suited for more discussion during class (not just lecture).

Also, the labs were very superficial. The one with the online "tool" was hardly a lab. I think most of the labs should be used to actually work on the project, and the project should begin much earlier. Random groups could work well so that they're assigned from the beginning.

- More supervision of the project work

What advice would you like to give for future participants?

- MCA is long to do, so be careful with time management. Maybe read some articles/books about the concepts to deepen them.

It's a short course and covers a lot of basics, so don't expect to go into much detail. Ask a lot of questions if you want to go more in depth.

Don't

expect to really build a model. They give you a model to build upon. Start the project as early as possible and ask the TAs for help.

- Contact the teacher more often with your work, it is a challenging course as it's difficult to know what the teacher expects out of you

Is there anything else you would like to add?

- It is very odd that we did not have a professor for this course.

- the evaluation should be fair next time

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The quizzes after the lectures were mostly positive. The clarity of the lectures and the approachability of the lecturing staff was appreciated.

After the first lecture some students noted that concepts that were introduced might have been too basic.

The final course survey produced a overall positive feedback but highlighting some critical aspects. 4 out of 5 students indicated that they worked with interesting issues. And a majority of students indicated that the course was challenging in a stimulating way.

However, some students remarked that the instructions for the course project were not clear enough. Others commented the labs were superficial. One could conclude that the students perceived a lack of depth.

One needs to note that in the final course survey only 5 out of 19 students participate while the participation in the quizzes was often higher. This could explain the difference in the general tone.



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.

Looking at the given grades and the outcome of the course survey and lecture quizzes one gets the impression that the high relevance of the course project (3 ECTS) didn't become clear to all students in time to deliver a good project.

Some lectures and labs were perceived as lacking depth, which might be related to the fact that the course is open for student with very different backgrounds and therefore doesn't request knowledge from previous courses.

It was noted that the course was held while the organizing division was in a transition between managers.

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?

When contemplating the average responses to the LEQ statements it is eye catching that in particular statement 16 on the fair and honest assessment of the course and statement 12 on the support that course activities provided to achieve the ILOs achieved a low average. With only five participants in the survey one of course needs to consider that already one very differing opinion can change the average significantly. However, when looking on the the additional comments to statement 16 it seems that in particular the grading of the exam was perceived as not fair and transparent. This perception might be related to the fact that in this course edition the main source of points was shifted from MCQs to open questions. The grading of the open questions is due to the diverse possible answers challenging. For the next course edition one might need to sharpen the questions better in the sense that it becomes easier to define the expected answers. The relation of ILOs and course activities is important. This was also highlighted by last years move by KTH towards ILOs that are testable, after which the ILOs of MJ2383 have been updated. The students feedback gave us confirmation that there is still space for improvement in linking course content to the ILOs. Therefore the creation of this link plays an important role for the planning of the next course edition.

The respondents group to the course survey was very homogeneous and consisted out of 5 male international students.

Therefore no differences between female/male, international/national or with/without disabilities can be derived.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Short term:

- Clear kick-off of the course project, perhaps as part of a lecture, to ensure that students notice the project's importance and start working on the projects in time.

- Creating an overview how the ILOs are related to the different activities of the course and where their achievement is tested, perhaps in a matrix/table.

Long-term:

- Deepen the course, this needs to be done by linking the course with other courses that should be taken before. These courses could be either recommended on the course web or be mandatory to take before. Regarding this the recommendation is probably the better solution since many course participants are commonly international students which might not have the possibility to take other KTH course beforehand.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

This edition of the course had significantly less students than previous versions. After talking to course coordinators from other courses it seems that this might be related to a decrease in enrolled international students. In any case also in future editions one will need to pay attention if this trend continues and if so conduct some analysis how to react to it.