



Report - AF2609 - 2020-11-09

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):

Carl Wersäll, cwersall@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.

A course survey was sent out to all students of the course after the examination and was open for two weeks. A course evaluation meeting was conducted with two student representatives. Aspects regarding gender and disabled students were evaluated in the course survey and discussed in the course evaluation meeting.

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.)

A course evaluation meeting was conducted with two student representatives upon completion of 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 consists of lectures, workshops, three mandatory group assignments, one mandatory individual peer-review and one mandatory examination. Since the last course offering, the following changes have been implemented:

- Updated intended learning outcomes.
 - Implementation of grading criteria.
 - Introduction of theory questions in workshops and exam.
 - Updated course content.
 - Updated lecture notes.
 - Updated problem folder.
 - Removal of one workshop and addition of another workshop.
 - Changes in schedule and disposition.
 - New assignments.
-

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 workload corresponds to the expected level.



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 students have succeeded well. Updated course material has improved the results.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

This year, most responses were related to digital teaching methods. Some student complain of heavy workload, although it is not reflected in the stated amount of hours per week. Some parts of the course content is perceived as too difficult by some students.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The course was appreciated, although some parts of the content could be made more clear. The digital teaching method was concluded to work well under the circumstances. The only aspect that got a lower rating is the opportunity to affect the course content. However, this is not an objective of the course.

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.

The results and evaluation are positive and show that the course is appreciated and that the teaching methods are successful in relation to the intended learning outcomes. The implemented changes have improved the results.

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?

The only weaker are in the learning environment, based on the evaluation, is the opportunity to affect the course content. However, this is not an objective of the course. No differences related to gender, type of student or disability can be identified.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

More focus should be put on difficult content and key aspects. Some parts of the content should be clarified.
