

Course report

Semester: Spring 2019 Course: Materialtillverkning II, 1KB262 Registered students: 25 Answering frequency: 17/25 (68%) Date: 2019-05-26	Examination results Number of students examined: 25 Fail: 12 (%) Pass (3): 00 (%) Pass with credit (4): 32 (%) Pass with distinction (5): 56 (%)
---	--

Brief summary of student viewpoints and suggestions

(based on both quantitative results and key viewpoints from students' free-text answers)

"Strengths" according to students

- -Form of examination was challenging and rewarding-----
- -Course literature was interesting and highly relevant. Most felt that what they learned they would definitely use again-----
- -Course difficulty was just right-----

"Weaknesses" according to students

- -Material for seminars should be released sooner-----
- -Seminars did not cover all of the material-----
- -Questions for the lectures were often not found in the lectures themselves or the pace of the lecture was too fast-----

Comments from course director and teachers on the implementation and outcome of the course, including:

(i) any changes made to the course as a result of proposed changes/comments the last time the course was given (see for example previous course evaluations)

(ii) any changes made during the course as a result of formative course evaluations (if any)

- The biggest change requested in previous years was in regards to how the labs were organized and the equipment not working. This was addressed last year with all samples and equipment being replaced or repaired. Generally speaking, the labs have been very well received by the students.
- Otherwise, we have our hands tied in regards to lab organization as we are at the mercy of the timetabling unit. We try to be as flexible as possible but typically we cannot meet student requests from previous years (for example a specific lecture taking place prior to the labs) purely because once the timetable is set, by the timetabling unit, there is very little that can be done to change it and the timetable changes every year.
- There was also a comment from students about having the seminars more spread out in time so that the workload is more distributed. Again, this is something beyond my control.

Comments from lab teachers

Summarise here comments from lab teachers about the lab component of the course (strong points, room for improvement, requests etc). If the course does not include a lab component, write "No labs".

- The scheduling of the labs made running the particular experiment very difficult. The fact that there is no flexibility at all in choosing when the labs take place (eg, having two labs on two consecutive days was not possible) means that some aspects of the lab had to be omitted or extra work had to be performed by the lab teachers
- Suggestion of including two different synthesis methods and compare the resulting structure and properties. This would make lab scheduling a little more flexible.

Proposed changes/comments/measures

- In response to the students comments on the seminars, all the questions will be released at the very beginning of the course so that they can study at their own pace.
- Another change that I will make is to have a short exam at the end comprised of questions touched upon during the seminar and ones that were not covered, but listed as a possible question. This way, students are "trained" for the exam at the end through the seminars (which are also assessable). It also enables me to confirm, in an unbiased way, that the students have actually understood the content of the course and that everything covered in the course is fairly assessed. I would weight it such that the seminars are more important but the exam would still count for something.
- I will restructure the lectures a little more so that the material is covered in more detail, the content is relevant and at a pace that is suitable.

Names of those who wrote the course report, ie course director/another appointed person at the Department

William Brant