Report - LH216V - 2018-03-27

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):
Viggo Kann

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.
Three 3-hour meetings. The first two meetings contain both presentations of theory and examples as well as work in groups on grading criteria.
Before the second meeting the course participants should write a draft of new grading critieria for a course of their choice.
Before the third meeting the course participants should peer review two other drafts of grading critera and then produce complete grading criteria, including how they should be aligned to the assessments and how the separate grades should be combined to a final grade.
The examiner (course coordinator) grades the grading criteria and gives extensive individual feedback, in cooperation with the teaching assistant.
At the third meeting the course participants show their grading criteria to each other and discuss the issues that were brought up in the feedback from the course coordinator.
The main changes from last course offering was that the criteria for the final assignment were more explicitly described. The Swedish-English keyword list has been put into Canvas.

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 course participants are teachers and have usually lots of other engagements. Some of them start the course but have no time to do the assignments. Therefore 5 of 17 did not have time to go to the meetings and hand in the first assignments. For the course participants who hand in all assignments, the time spent on the course seems to be close to 40 hours, which corresponds to the size of the course 1,5 credits.

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?
Of the 12 course participants who handed in the final assignment, 10 did pass, and 2 have to hand in an updated version.
5 registered course participants did not attend any meeting and did not hand in the final assignment.
This is similar to previous course offerings. All course participants that get FX usually will pass the course in the second or third attempt.

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?

7 answers (out of 12 possible) were posted. We also had an evaluation session during the third meeting.
The learning environment gets very high numbers in almost all aspects. All aspects have at least 5.6 as mean (where 4 is neutral and 7 is max).

19 of 22 aspects have a larger mean than 6.

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?

In the previous course offering, aspects 5 and 21 only got weakly positive answers, but this course offering they were on par with the other aspects. This time, aspect 18 (I regularly spent time to reflect on what I learned), had the lowest mean, but the course give plenty of opportunities for reflection (for example in the evaluation of the first meeting, in the peer feedback, and in the final assignment), so I am not worried about this.

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?

A preparatory assignment before the first meeting and more time for the peer feedback assignment (1b) were proposed.
Two good pieces of advice:
"Do a thorough work regarding the ILO:s. Don't be afraid to do the changes that you think will be beneficial."
"Ta dig tid att reflektera över dina lärandemål. Se utformandet av betygskriterier som en anledning till att tänka igenom kursen. Börja med inlämningsuppgifterna i tid. De ser enkla ut, men tar mer tid än vad man tror."

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

The deadline for assignment 1a will be moved to one week before the second meeting, so that there will be time for looking at the peers' hand-ins before the meeting.
A preparatory assignment - to inspect and modify the ILOs - will be added before meeting 1.
As soon as the peergrade.io system is available, I would like to use it in the course, instead of the much too limited Canvas support for peer grading.

Kursdata 2018-03-27

LH216V - Utveckla lärandet med betygskriterier, HT 2017 Eng (per 2)

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2017 v.40
Kursen slutar:	2017 v.51
Antal högskolepoäng:	1,5
Examination:	INL1 - Inlämningsuppgift, 1,5, betygsskala: P, F
Betygsskala:	P, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Viggo Kann <viggo@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Viggo Kann <viggo@kth.se>
Lärare:	Viggo Kann <viggo@kth.se> Anna-Karin Högfeldt <akhog@kth.se>
Assistenter:	Veine Haglund <veineh@kth.se>

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	17
Totalt registrerade:	17

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad[1] [%]	58.80%
Prestationsgrad[2] [%]	58.80%
Betygsfördelning[3] [%, antal]	P 100% (10)

1 Andel godkända studenter
2 Andel avklarade poäng
3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter