

Report - AH2170 - 2024-02-19

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):

Fariya Sharmeen, Sharmeen@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.

Two course discussions during the course and evaluation form distributed after the course. No student representative was identified. Upon explaining what a student representative do, one student volunteered but did not show up in the course discussions.

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.)

Three meetings were organized (two during the course and one after). Dates and locations were announced ahead of time in Canvas. Students took actively part in it. When possible the suggestions were readily addressed during the course.

COURSE DESIGN

Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

- introductory sessions on Python (with 9 lab hours) were added in the beginning of the course to support students with coding in Python.
 - students were grouped as beginner and intermediary in Python based on pre-knowledge. Beginners were invited for extra hours with TAs and They were grouped together to enforce peer to peer learning.
 - extra examples and resources in the lecture sessions were added and it was recommended to practice problem (equation) solving after each lecture.
 - exam questions were revised and reconstructed to make them more interactive.
 - regular breaks during lectures were maintained.
 - most issues with IT support in digital exam were resolved.
-

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?

Varies as students come from different backgrounds with different skill analytical and programming skills and this is oner of their first master courses.

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?

88% students passed the course

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Students appreciate the course. Most of the comments are about the labs. This is something recurring as students have varying level of skills. It is difficult to maintain a steady pace that suits everone.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Opinions are about structure of the labs, link between labs and lectures, having to study at home considerably more, lowering expectation of passing criteria.

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 students have varying analytical and programming background. That is understandable and hasn't changed much over the years. However this year the English language background has been highly varying as well, which made it extremely difficult to maintain quality and pace. This also reflected in the assessment. For teachers and examiners it has been strenuous to maintain balance.

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?
-

Intenational students with limited English language skills found it very hard to follow the course.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- revise lab 2
 - revise lecture 8
 - have a small quiz after each module
 - address IT support problems during digital exam (image display, teacher's access)
-

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

We need to be more diligent about student's analytical and linguistic skills during admission process.
