

# Report - MJ2386 - 2023-03-06

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):**

Justin Chiu, justin.chiu@energy.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 was offered for the first time in VT22. The students were informed about it and were encouraged to share inputs to the course throughout the semester. All students were given the course evaluation **LEQ survey** that they could fill in on Canvas Learning Management platform, the survey was activated for **one month** 10 days after the exam. The equality and fairness including gender aspect and students with disabilities are addressed in the survey questions "The assessment on the course was fair and honest", "Please comment on the course from this (gender) perspective", "Please comment on the course from this (disability) perspective" and an open ended question "Is there anything else you would like to add?" allows the students to freely express themselves.

In total 8 answers have been received representing around **24%** of the whole class. This ratio is consistent with the average number of survey replies for LEQ in the examiner's other courses.

---

**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.)**

This is the **first survey analysis** of the course and will be conveyed to the students at the kickoff session in the upcoming semester in VT23. All students were encouraged to share their opinion and suggestions throughout the course year in VT22 and a number of suggestions have come in during this period.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

The course is designed with **1 lab** work with group report (students can choose between two topics), **1 project** with report and oral presentation and a **final home exam** (essay and calculation) to train their analytics, critical thinking and creativity for problem solving. This is the first course offering, so all the activities are newly implemented in the course.

---

**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?**

This 6 ECTS course was given over a period of two periods, the expected work level would be 6ECTS/1,5ECTS\*40 hr= 160 hr. From the students' response of average 9 -11 hr work/week, a total of 9\*9=81 hr to 11\*9=99 hr were spent by the students. The students have thus spent less time than required. The students mentioned "**Amount of work reflected the credits of the course.**" and that "**It was a good tempo.**"

---

**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?**

Around **¼** of the students received **A**, **¼** received **B**, **¼** received **C** and **¼** failed the course due to non- submission to the final take home exam. The distribution of the results is more towards higher end of the full grades with **¾** of the students attaining C and above. The reason for non-submission of the final take home exam is worth investigating, **two students have had family emergency** and **three already dropped out from the course due to high mandatory course workload**. Four students have now already expressed their wish for taking the re-exam.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

The teaching team has been praised by the students: "**The teachers was very helping and engaged !**" The content has been good: "**Interesting lectures, diverse course with lectures, lab, project**", "Very interesting course with good content."

The essay and calculation exercise in the exam required **high amount of study effort**: "the essay exam could be delivered later so that all the attention before the exam is for studying the lectures." And more exercises are requested by the students "Exercises to help practice".

Overall, LEQ number "14. I received regular feedback that helped me to see my progress" and "15. I could practice and receive feedback without being graded" have shown the lowest score. **More interactive activities shall be setup.**

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

The students **liked the lectures** "Attend the lectures, they are very interesting!" There was an affirmation on the course responsible and teaching assistant's quality, "I think both Justin and Felipe are amazing as persons. They are very knowledgeable and experts in their field, (and) from the human perspective they are **really approachable and helpful**. In other words, they are great professors and excellent persons, which is very valuable in a classroom."

---

**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.**

There were many **clashes** between elective courses, hence **many students missed out on multiple sessions**, the misconception of lack of exercises and not finding the exam exercises in lecture hours is mainly due to this.

---

## 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?

---

The **male** students tend to give up to 1.5 pts higher score from LEQ number 8 to number 17 and 19. The male students may be more accustomed to the diversified contents assembled in a package as is delivered in this course. The **female** students seem to prefer **fewer topics** to be covered in a course, but deeper in terms of depth of activities.

The **international** students have 2 pts lower mark on "18. I regularly spent time to reflect on what I learned" and "20. I had opportunities to influence the course activities" as compared to **Swedish students**. This may be due to the customary difference that the local and the international have in self-learning and their capacity in influencing courses.

---

## PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

---

Exam format and **instructions** will be given at an early stage of the course as several comments addressed this: "Post the exam instructions more early. I did not have enough time to prepare because of this" "Exam information was received quite late".

**In-class exercises** will be tagged on canvas so as to facilitate students' access who missed out on the class, as one student was unable to locate the exercises done in class: "I still don't know where I'm supposed to gain knowledge on some of the topics in the exam, as there was no similar case in the lectures."

On the long term. A **collection of in-class exercises will be compiled**. This will serve as the database **for future exams**.

---