

# Report - AH2173 - 2023-06-26

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 questionnaire based on the LEQ format was carried out after the end of the course. The respondents could indicate their gender and disabilities, allowing for studying differences in responses. 10 out of 26 registered students (38%) answered the survey.

---

**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.)**

No meetings were arranged during or after 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 forms of examination, a written exam and a project examined through oral presentation and written report. Learning activities consist of lectures, exercises intended to give hands-on training with the theory, a workshop discussing current topics, a study trip through the Stockholm public transport network, and a study visit. This year, the project assignment, particularly the teaching assistance, was redesigned somewhat to put more emphasis on creative applications of automatically collected public transport data.

---

**THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD**

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

Students report widely different workloads, from 3-5 hours/week to >41 hours. It may reflect the level of ambition and pre-existing knowledge of each student. The median workload is about expected, 18-20 hours/week.

---

**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 student grades are similar to previous years. There is a tendency of higher grades for the project assignment. On the other hand, a few more students (4) failed the written exam compared to most recent years (1-2). It could be due to random variations between years or because of unsuitable prioritization of study effort between the project assignment and the material covered by the written exam.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

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

Compliments to interesting course, good guest lecturers and good project assignment assistance (Wilco). Some comments that lectures could be made more interactive and stimulating.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Scores are similar to previous years but on most questions the scores are slightly higher this year. Overall the students' opinions are positive (score >= 4.4 for all questions). Compared to last year, the question (4) "The course was challenging in a stimulating way" received a significantly higher score (5.2 compared to 3.8). Also the score for question (19) "The course activities enabled me to learn in different ways" increased from 4.8 to 5.8. Meanwhile the scores on question (5) "I felt togetherness with others on the course" and (6) "The atmosphere on the course was open and inclusive" fell somewhat. On the other hand, the very high scores last year were probably an effect of the return after the pandemic, and this year's scores represents a return to normal expectations.

Female students tend to give slightly higher scores than male students on average. Also, international master students give slightly higher average scores than international exchange students.

---

**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 are in general very satisfied with the course. The project assignment and exercises including the teaching assistants are highly appreciated. Some aspects of lectures and exercises may be possible to improve in future offerings.

---

**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?

Strong aspects of the learning environment include the project and exercises. Female students and international master students tend to give slightly higher scores. The development of the project assignment has had positive effects on student results and feedback.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

Some exercises may be reevaluated. A seminar on APIs for public transport data will be moved earlier in the course.