



# Report - AH1025 - 2022-02-13

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):**

Erik Jenelius, jenelius@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 evaluation survey following the LEQ template was sent out to the students after the end of the course. The response rate was 6 out of 12 students (6/12 = 50%). The template distinguishes between gender and disabled students and displays results if the group is sufficiently large. In addition, a student representative gathered thoughts from the students which were presented and discussed with the course responsible and teaching assistant after the course end.

## **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 meeting was held with the student representative (Carl Vilhelm Boström) on January 21 2022 after the 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 two main parts: a set of lectures and a project assignment. The lectures are split into a basic block and an advanced block. A written exam on the basic block is given halfway into the course. An oral exam on the advanced block is given at the end of the course. The project assignment is reported in a written report and an oral presentation.

While the last two course offerings were offered remotely due to Covid-19, this course offering including the examination was held on campus. The course was designed similarly to before Covid-19, with the exception that a study journey was not conducted. This year, unlike last year, an extra teaching assistant was not used for the project.

## **THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD**

**Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?**

The students report a wide range of workloads, from 9-11 hours/week to 21-23 hours/week (median is 15-20). Overall the workload appears reasonable.

## **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 in general have good results on the course, in line with typical years.

## **STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

Positive comments: Lectures mostly good, study visit is appreciated. Project assignment best in the course.

Negative comments: Project assignment is difficult, takes time to get into, course material is sometimes outdated, could be more opportunities to discuss interesting topics. Negative scores on true/false questions on exam.

## **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

The course received overall high ratings in the survey. The scores on the different questions range from 4.2 to 6.7. The lowest ratings are given to the statements "I had opportunities to influence the course activities". The highest rating are given to "I felt togetherness with others on the course". This is a significant increase from last year (during Covid-19) where it was ranked the lowest.

The meeting with the students also revealed an overall positive evaluation 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.**

Both teachers and students appreciated and benefited from the on-campus teaching this offering. The offering was generally successful, although the students were fewer than previous year.



#### **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?

---

It is not possible to distinguish between female and male students from the survey results. There were no international students and according to the survey no students with disabilities in the course.

Some students remark that some of the teaching material is a bit dated. Some lectures could be a bit more interactive. There are still things in the project instructions and support that can be improved.

---

#### **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

The project support can be further developed and tuned. There is a need to update the course literature.

---