Report - SE2126 - 2020-01-28

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):

Peter Gudmundson, petergu@kth.se

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 composed of lectures, tutorials, two homeworks (each with three problems), four finite element exercises and one laboratory work. Credits are given for the final exam, the homeworks and the finite element/laboratory exercises. Basically the same as last year. Quizzes were used a new non-compulsory part. A minority of students used this tool for learning.

This year the student groups were the same for all laboratory exercises which was appreciated among the students. Last year new groups were formed for each laboratory exercise. Furthermore, a short introduction to the finite element exercises was given at the tutorials prior to the exercises.

THE STUDENT'S 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 number of respondents to the course questionaire was 4 out of 41 (10%). This makes if difficult to draw conclusions. The average workload reported by the students was about 8 hours per week which corresponds to about 4-5 full weeks. This is well in line with 9 ECTS points.

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 results of the exam was slightly lower in comparison to the previous year. Almost all students who followed the course finished the homeworks and the laboratory exercises.

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

The number of respondents to the course questionaire was 4 out of 41 (10%). This makes if difficult to make definitive conclusions.

Generally the judgements for the course were very positive. The minimum and maximum score were 5.3 and 6.8 respectively, which correspond to "My background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course" (5.3) and "I worked with interesting issues (6.8).

Due to the low number of respondants conclusions can not be drawn regarding differences between women and men as well as differences between international and Swedish students.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

Overall very positive response, see comments above. The comments from the students were as well positive.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

Many students point out the importance of continuous studies - go to the lectures and tutorials, follow the course step by step, take notes on lectures, study on a regular basis, solve own problems. They also recommend to to study the Solid Mechanics Handbook, in particular chappters 1-3 where a lot of useful information is found.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

In addition to the course analysis a meeting was held with three course representatives. Based on the course analysis and the course representative meeting, the following issues will be addressed for the course in fall 2020.

1. The instructions for the finite element exercises will be evaluated. The students are not used to the command based Ansys environment.

2. The scheduling of the presentations of finite element exercises will be overlooked. It seems that 30 minutes for each group is too short which caused delays.