



Report - AH2915 - 2021-10-22

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):

Milan Horemuz, horemuz@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.

On-line LEQ survey after the exam.

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 special evaluation meetings were arrange, but the course progression was discussed during labs and lectures.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The same activities as previous year:

Lectures,
Computer labs
Project work including practical measurements
Seminar - presentation of a chosen topic based on literature review
Study visit

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?

Most of the students spent ca 20 hours per week, which is expected for a 7,5 cr course.

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?

All students passed the oral exam with good grades. Most of the students got grade A or B. The worst grade was D. Most of the students submitted all reports on time.



STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

the best aspect of this course was that we had the chance to do measurements with instruments!

The best aspect of the course is it has a field work to scan a building at KTH, which is super interesting. It requires us to apply the knowledge we

learned from the class and make us understand them deeper.

The outdoor labs are interesting.

Lectures were good.

The workload of the course is challenging. Felt like home assignment could be implemented for labs instead in order to get better help and feedback

Some of the home assignments could be covered more during the lectures.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The students were generally satisfied with the course. The improvement can be made by adding more explanation of the home assignment tasks during lectures.

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 polar diagrams are quite even, which indicate a "normal" learning environment making no difference between different student groups.

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?

The student group was too little to see the differences.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Modify the lectures so they explain more the tasks in the home assignment.
