

# Report - AH2923 - 2024-02-13

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):**

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.**

LEQ survey published directly after the examination, 4 students out of 24 answered it.

---

**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.)**

There were no formal meetings, the students were given opportunity to discuss the course issues in connection with the lectures. I had a meeting with course representative after the course completion where we discussed the LEQ report,

---

**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 and practical measurements  
Seminar - presentation of a chosen topic based on literature review

---

**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?**

The workload is corresponding to a 7.5 credits 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?**

Most of the students passed the first exam: 4 students with grade A, 4 with B, 6 with C, 4 with D, 1 with E 2 with FX and one F. This is quite common grade distribution, similar to previous years.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

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

What was the best aspect of the course?  
- Two questions from the previous lecture  
- The lectures. The teacher felt interested and dedicated to the subject he talked about which made me enjoy going to the lectures.  
- Field Exercise plus later work on the data

What would you suggest to improve?  
- The lab could be a little more spread out through the week for one single assignment.  
- Since the labs are such a big, central part of the course, they unfortunately didn't work very well this year. The content and work procedure was fine and has probably worked for many years before, those I was fine with. However, the requirements in each lab was different to the requirements from the TA. One example was skyplots in Ass1. As a consequence, many of us students got comments and had to resubmit the reports with non-required stuff. It was in general a lot of comments and re-submission on the assignments after talking to other groups in the class. I usually don't mind this, the bar should be set high at a master's course on KTH, but it is a sign that stuff hasn't worked very well if all students gets it wrong on the first try.  
- If possible, I would have preferred to get our assignments graded closer to the due date. We now had comments on the last assignment the same week as the exam.  
- Maybe also include the topic of the architecture of GNSS receiver is a good idea  
- The Labs with the tutor

What advice would you like to give to future participants?

- Collaborate with other students.  
- Try to participate in every class and start the work as early as possible

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

The students were satisfied with the lectures and labs, but not satisfied with the teaching assistant.

---

**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?

This analysis is not possible, since only 4 of 24 students answered the survey.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

The suggested improvements:  
- instruct eventual TA that she/he should have more friendly approach to the students  
- earlier feedback on the submitted report

