



Report - DA2210 - 2018-05-24

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):

Johan Karlander karlan@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

10 lectures, 10 seminars (with 10 homework), one graded essay (E-A), one written exam for grades E-C, one oral exam for grades B-A

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 is 6 credits, so 160 hours in total (11 hours per week) would be expected.

Students say 5 hours per week, which is far less. We believe the students have probably not included the essay (since this was written later in the course). Also, time for reflection may not be included, as one student says in the evaluation:

"Some work did not happen on planned study time, as the most important aspects of the course was reflection, and that happens whenever you

let your mind wander; while taking a walk, in the shower, late at night, etc. So, the actual number of hours probably far exceeded the number of planned hours, and that is definitely how I think it should be on a course with this topic and focus"

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?

Out of 198 active students, 18 have not finished the course. In general these are missing one of the three course modules (5 need to write the exam, 6 need to do homework/seminars, and 7 need to write the essay). This is a good result.

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 sections "belonging", "understanding" and "manageability" in general have higher scores than "exploration" and "feedback". This is not surprising, since the course does not give much opportunity for exploration, and individual feedback from teachers was not given early in the course (the homework were peer reviewed and received only pass/fail from the instructor).

Women seem to be more positive, especially concerning the "constructive alignment" and "feedback" questions.



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?

The polar diagrams show that the students find the course comprehensible and reasonably meaningful, and that they were able to learn by collaboration and discussion with others. Lowest point was "I had opportunities to choose what to do", and rightly so - no such choices are available in this course.

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?

Some good advice to future participants:

Try to understand the homework, not simply do it.

It's a lot of deadlines each week. Get use to it and don't do it last minuit.

Go to the lectures.

Start writing the essay early.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Move exam to December (for exchange students and those who need to start the masters thesis in January).

Explain the pedagogical plan for the course in course PM. Detail deadlines in course PM.

Preface each Homework with excerpt from learning outcomes.

New coursebook, and lectures adapted to this book.

Kursdata 2018-09-28

DA2210 - Vetenskapsteori och vetenskaplig metodik för dataloger, HT 2017 vettig17

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2017 v.35
Kursen slutar:	2018 v.3
Antal högskolepoäng:	6,0
Examination:	HEM1 - Övningsuppgifter, 1,5, betygsskala: P, F HEM3 - Uppsats, 1,5, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F TEN1 - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Johan Karlander <karlan@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Johan Karlander <karlan@kth.se>
Lärare:	Johan Boye <jboye@kth.se> Dena Hussain <denah@kth.se> Linda Kann <lk@kth.se>

Assistenten:

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	210
Totalt registrerade:	231

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad ¹ [%]	85.70%
Prestationsgrad ² [%]	90.40%
Betygsfördelning ³ [%, antal]	A 7% (13) B 31% (56) C 46% (82) D 14% (26) E 2% (4)

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter