

AH2307

Fall semester 2021

Course responsible: Anders Karlström

Teachers: Fatemeh Naqavi, Iqbal Surahman

Examiner: Anders Karlström

## **1. 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.*

Mid term course meeting at Dec 1, where all students were invited.

Anonymous course evaluation 2022-01-11 - 2022-01-18

Gender and FUNKA is recorded by GRU administration, which is given as background information to course responsible.

## **2. 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.)*

Formative meeting at Dec 1<sup>st</sup>.

Anonymous course evaluation 2022-01-11 - 2022-01-18

## **3. Course design**

*Describe briefly the course design, the constructive alignment (intended learning objectives, learning activities, assessment, and how they interact), and the development that has been implemented since last course offering.*

The course has been given many years, with the same learning objectives, the same case studies, labs.

The examination is built on diversity, using

- Written report
- Labs
- Oral assessment of the written report
- Written examination

The labs are mandatory, where the first lab is essential to help the students with activities that are necessary as first steps in the project. The deadline and timing of the lab is set to facilitate learning activities at the right time.

The two other labs are more related to the exam.

The topics that are most relevant for the project is given as lectures in the first half of the course, where learning objectives that is not relevant for the project is tested in the written exam and the lectures is given in the latter part of the course.

#### **4.Students' workload**

*Are the students working to the expected extent in relation to the course credits? If there is a significant difference from the expected, what can be the reason?*

The response rate in the on-line course evaluation was low. However, there are indication that many students spend a lot of time on this course (and find it highly relevant).

#### **5.Students' results on the course**

*How have the students succeeded in the course? If there is a significant difference compared to previous course offerenings, what can be the reason?*

The turnout was similar or slightly better, compared with previous years.

There were 4/30 that received F, while half of the course received B or A.

#### **6.Students' answers to open questions**

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

1. One point was made that Appraisal was very short, and not clear why it is included. This should be clarified (there is a full course, the next course, on this topic, and therefore only the rudimentary presentation is made in this course).
2. The four step model should be even more central and visible.
3. The description of the literature should be more clear.

#### **7.Summary of students' opinions**

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

See above.

## **8.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.*

It seems that the students find the course interesting and relevant. A few students find the topic not difficult, while others find the course challenging.

## **9.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?*

A challenge is always students with different backgrounds, in particular programming and/or mathematics.

## **10.Prioritized course development**

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

Next year, it is suggested that the lab is re-designed from scratch.

The software should be aligned with the course AH2170.

A computer room written examination should be considered.

The multiple choice on transit assignment works well.

The IIA lab should be re-designed from scratch. It is not working well to facilitate students learning about relaxing the IID assumption.

Clarify final deadline also for labs in the course memo.

## **11.Other information you want to share**

New teachers will be giving this course from fall semester 2022.