Malmö universitet, Fakulteten för teknik och samhälle

Kursrapport
Course report

EvaluCourse name	**Materials Engineering**
Course code	MT640A
Semester	HT22
Number of students registered	8
Course responsible	Lindsay Richard Merte

	Course report is published on Canvas-site
X	Course report is published on course webpage

Course evaluation

Number of answers on obligatory course evaluation	3

Obligatory course evaluation has been done through:

X	Simplest standard template via SSR (Sunet Survey and Report)
	Standard template with added questions via SSR
	Own way of evaluation by course responsible
If own way, describe how:	

Any further evaluations during the course:

	Separate survey
	Oral in class
	Oral in smaller groups
	Other way
If other way, describe how:	

Comments to student course evaluations

Evaluations were positive in general, and based on this and on the teachers' experience, the overall approach is good. The course combines theoretical material covered in lectures and readings with seminars that cover more advanced topics. In this way we should offer something of value to students of a variety of backgrounds and begin to approach topics at the master's level. A change from the previous offering of the course was that more time was dedicated to student seminar presentations – one presentation + discussion in a 45min session, instead of two—and this seemed to improve the quality substantially. Discussions and presentations were high in quality

and most students were active and engaged in general. The students requested more and earlier feedback on their presentations, which is reasonable. The theoretical portion of the course was adequate, but there seemed to be some variability in the effectiveness of the lectures. More lecture sessions were suggested by one student; this is difficult to do without reduction of time spent on the seminars, but improvements could be made by providing more structured self-study assignments and making better use of written learning materials. Some students have not met deadlines for reports, and efforts should be made to ensure this work is completed within the teaching period.

Examination result

X	Examination result is like expected
	Examination result is not like expected

Exam performance varied widely but was good overall.

Recommendations and priorities for course evaluation

Provide more structured self-study assignments based on written course material, and coordinate this with lectures to ensure adequate coverage of all material. Adapt lab procedures and instructions to enable quicker processing and report writing.

Instructions and instructions

This part of the course report is only intended as support for the course coordinator to create the course report and the pages are removed before publication.

Course name is the complete course name that the course has in the syllabus. For example Computer Science: Research Methodology or Introduction to Programming and Embedded Systems

Course code is the code with which the course is identified, for example DA350A or MT158A.

The semester is the semester / course opportunity that the course report refers to, for example Spring 20 or Autumn 19.

Number of registered is the number of registered students on the course three weeks after the start of the course (ie number of registered after early interruptions).

Course coordinator is the name of the teacher who is the course coordinator and who is responsible for writing the course report. Other teachers may, however, have been involved in the course implementation and compilation of the course report. Other teachers' names are not given.

The fields above are filled in by the study administration if course evaluation is done via SSR under the auspices of the study administration.

It must be registered in the course report if it is published on the course website and the Canvas page of the current course opportunity. This is filled in by the person responsible for the publication.

Course evaluation
The number of responses to compulsory course evaluation is the number who submitted a course evaluation or otherwise actively participated if an alternative method was used in-house (to be filled in by the study administration if course evaluation is done via SSR under the auspices of the study administration).

Mandatory price valuation has taken place by reporting which approach has been used for the price valuation. Methods are indicated by checking the current option. There are three options of which only one should be ticked:
• Only standard template via SSR (Sunet Survey and Report): This is what the study administration organizes unless otherwise stated to the study administration for the course. Check this option if you used the standard template via the study administration without making any adjustments.
• Standard template extended with own questions via SSR: Check this option if you have extended the standard template that the study administration organizes with its own course-specific questions. Added questions do not need to be reported here. They are archived with the course evaluation itself.
• Under your own auspices by the course coordinator: Check this alternative if the course evaluation has not been carried out with one of the two alternatives above. The course evaluation has then been organized by the course coordinator outside the study administration. The course coordinator is then also responsible for compiling the course evaluation. If the course coordinator has organized a course evaluation in-house, the approach must be described briefly. Specific questions do not need to be reported here, but are reported via the summary the course coordinator then makes of the course evaluation. For example, course evaluation has been conducted anonymously on paper in connection with presentations at the end of the course or course evaluation has been conducted anonymously with Mentimeter in connection with lecture week 22.

If additional valuations have been made, these are described as follows. It is not necessary to carry out additional valuations. If this has not happened, the fields below are left blank.

Comments on course evaluations mean that the course coordinator must comment on the results of the course evaluations. The comments are aimed at current and future students on the course. It is therefore not necessary to explain in the comments what different course elements mean or the like. The reader can be expected to have knowledge of the course's structure and structure. Relevant things to address here are, for example, commenting on whether there is any result in the price evaluation that was not expected or whether there is any common criticism or results that may need to be explained or put in context.

Examination results
Examination results refer to results from all forms of examination that have taken place on the course (examination, laboratory work, assignments, etc.). Indicate whether the examination result overall was as expected or not. If there are separate examination parts that differed greatly in how they turned out in relation to the expected result (for example, the expected number of passers on a written exam but a very low number of passers on an assignment), then both alternatives can be checked.

If the alternative is that the examination result deviates from what was expected, this deviation is commented on and what any reasons for the deviation may consist of. Comment can be given even if the examination result looks as expected, but there is some aspect that needs to be highlighted.

Recommendations and priorities for course development
Briefly state which recommendations and priorities should be made for the upcoming course opportunity based on the results of course evaluations and in relation to examination results.