Course Report WASP Graduate School

Date: 2024-01-25
Authors[1]: Elin A. Topp, with support from further involved teachers (Ingrid Hotz, Gabriel Skantze, Morten Fjeld)

Interaction, Collaboration, and Visualisation, 6hp
Semester: Spring 2023

Number of registered students: 18 (2 no shows & 2 withdrawals)
Answering frequency (course evaluation): 5/18 = 27.8%

Examination results

Number of students examined: 14
Fail: 1 / 14 = 7 %
Pass: 13 / 14 = 93%

Brief summary of student viewpoints and suggestions

Altogether we got few answers with relatively wide spread ratings, that unfortunately cannot be seen as statistically really significant. There are however some indicators in the numbers that are worrying and the course definitely needs some revision, but at least better commitment in the execution.

Results of WASP base-line quantitative questions

- What is your overall rating of the course (1-5)
  The average rating is 2.4, with two answers at grade 4, 1 at grade 2, and two at grade 1.

- Did you enjoy the course? (1-5)
  Here, the average is again at 2.4, but based on a slightly different distribution, however with the same numer of answers above 2.

- Was it time well spent? (1-5)
  For this question the average rating is 2.6, but only based on fewer answers for grade 1.

Answers to free text-questions to be (shortly) summarized under "Strengths" and "Weaknesses"

- What was the best aspect of the course?
- What would you suggest improving?
- What advice would you like to give to future participants?

---

[1] *The report should be written by the examiner together with the teachers and possibly others, such as teaching assistants*

- Other comments. Is there anything else you would like to add?

"Strengths" according to students[2]

- Hand-on exercises
- Insight into "new" topics
- The course's concept, trying to bridge a gap between different topics relevant to the WASP areas and real-world problems
- The first session in Lund and the material for session two as such

"Weaknesses" according to students[1]

- Course modules were not well integrated
- Material, in particular for session two, was sent out too late to be useful
- More should be really "taught", not just introduced
- Handling / support of the projects was not really well organised

Comments from teachers on the implementation and outcome of the course[3]

Overall, the survey results reflect at least the examiner's thoughts on how the course occasion actually went in comparison to what had been aspired to do. The modules were not as well connected as they could have been, and communication around the organisation of module / session 2 in relation to session 1 was flawed. Many of the problems can be attributed to the situation for involved teachers changing quite extensively over the time period from initial idea to execution. We still think that the overall concept for the course is good, but no teacher really was available as genuinely responsible coordinator for the second session and the alignment of the content with the previous session, which resulted in lack of support for the students to identify project topics and form groups. The actually discussed plan for setting up support sessions with relevant teachers for the projects was probably good, but it turned out extremely difficult to identify suitable times for respective meetings during the term. This in turn made the third session less powerful than expected, as projects were not really in a presentable shape.

Proposed changes/comments/measures

General remarks about the coordination: If the course is to be given in the same or at least similar constellation, it must be assured that all involved teachers contribute to the planning and delivery on equal terms and are

---

[2] *Based on both quantitative results and key viewpoints from students' free-text answers*

[3] *Including changes effected during the course*

committed to this involvement. Persons, who cannot commit to the number of hours that being involved in this course requires, need to take measures early.

If different persons are responsible for different sessions, there must still be a clear agreement on what needs to be done once a session is approaching, i.e. a clear timeline must be communicated by one overall course responsible teacher, and everyone involved must commit to that. The overall course responsible teacher (examiner?) should be present in all sessions (was not in this case, that was a problem).

Content-related remarks: It might be good to look into the contents of the second module and introduce some "integrating it all together" exercise at the cost of maybe taking out some other parts of the content. This might make it more obvious to the participants how they could and should form project groups.

These changes have been discussed in a debriefing meeting between the involved teachers and one representative for the participants on February 6th, 2024.

Further discussion re the reshaping of the content and potentially format of delivery will be taken amongst the involved teachers, where the number of coordinating teachers will be reduced from four to three, corresponding to the reduction of core module-content.