



Report - SK2550 - 2021-04-07

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):

Ulrich Vogt, uvogt@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.

LEQ form send out to students after the course, individual discussions about the course during oral exams.
All 6 Master students attending the course were female, an interesting observation.

COURSE DESIGN

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

Lectures, student seminars, homework problems, oral exam.
Instead of lab a virtual workshop on beamtime application writing was organized.

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?

OK.

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?

All students passed like it is normal.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The course was diversified. Many different subjects and activities alone or in group. I learned a lot by practicing myself. I liked the fact that the evaluation was an oral and not just a written exam. It was far more concrete and challenging.
The homework really helped to understand the material. I also think the lectures were interesting and easy to follow.
The feedback session with Jonas was also really helpful in order to hold a good presentation.
I also believe that the beamline application assignment was reasonable and a good practice and it could definitely be part of the course in the future.



SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Course worked well and feedback was very positive, maybe even a bit better than for non-corona times.

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.

Very good presentations despite the fact that students worked alone on their topic. Something to consider for the future.

Another well-received aspect was the virtual beamtime application workshop. This could be added to the course and expand it to 7,5 hp in order to better fit to students schedule.

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?

Course activities are very well balanced. No differences can be seen for different student groups.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Develop beamtime application workshop.