



Report - SE2126 - 2022-02-04

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

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 is based on results from the web based course survey and meetings with course representatives. Three students were selected as course representatives by the students that followed the course. There were two meetings, one in the middle of the course and one after the final examination. The course representatives were asked to capture opinions from other students following the course. The aspects regarding gender and disabled students were covered by the course survey.

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.)

Three students were selected as course representatives by the students that followed the course. There were two meetings, one in the middle of the course and one after the final examination. The course representatives were asked to capture opinions from other students following the course.

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.

Due to the Corona restrictions the course was initially given in hybrid form. When restrictions were removed, we changed to physical teaching without recordings. Recorded lectures and tutorials from last year's course were published on Canvas.

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 number of respondents to the course questionnaire was 6 out of 45 (13%). This makes it difficult to draw definite conclusions. The average workload reported by the students was about 15 hours per week which corresponds to about 8 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 were very good. Only 4 out of 36 failed the examination and 10 got the grade A. The difficulty of the exam was judged to be the same as previous years. Almost all students who followed the course finished the homeworks and the laboratory exercises.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What do students say in response to the open questions?

Good lectures and tutorials. Well structured course. The homeworks were very good for learning. The recorded lectures and tutorials were very much appreciated. The finite element and laboratory exercises were useful for learning.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The students are overall very satisfied with the course. The course was well structured, the lectures and tutorials were very good, the homeworks were very good for learning, the exam was fair and relevant. The online course survey gave high marks in all aspects. The average grade was 6.2

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.

Generally the judgements for the course were very positive.



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?

Almost all aspects of the course were favorably judged by the students. Due to the low number of respondents in the survey, conclusions can not be drawn regarding differences between women and men, students with/without disabilities as well as differences between international and Swedish students.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The instructions for the finite element exercises will be reviewed. In particular, more information and background to the problems will be considered.
