Report - AH2923 - 2024-12-18

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.

Standard LEQ questionnaire published 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 meetings were arranged. The students were given opportunity to discuss eventual problems during lectures. During the last lecture we summarized the course.

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

Lectures, Computer labs and practical measurements
Seminar - presentation of a chosen topic based on literature review
Written exam

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?

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, 2 with B, 4 with C, 2 with D, 3 with E, 1 with FX and 1 with 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?
-The lab exercises were very guided , easy to understand and to follow
- Well designed labs
- Easy to get help
- Good lectures and powerpoints
-The Labs were a good way of learning
- The teacher is a professionist of the field, his knowledge is broad and updated. The freedom in the "GNSS applications" presentation was also a plus, as it gives students the chance to go deeper in the field they prefer.
- I really enjoyed the field laboratory and the seminar, in which we saw the more practical aspects of the course.
- The subject matter was interesting. The lectures were good.

What would you suggest to improve?
- For the lab exercise where you had to extract the 3 RINEX file, please add a instructions file on how to extract their values easily as Matlab does not support those files.
- Parts of the labs could be specified better, like the part everyone got wrong on lab 2 and the various steps that had to be clarified in Canvas announcements.
- The deadlines for the lab reports deadline should be closer to the labs. Instead of having them grouped up at the end. It would motivate the students to complete them earlier and reduce stress at the end and even out the workload more
- I think it would be interesting to include more examples of interesting applications throughout the course. I am in the environmental engineering track and maybe its because I was a bit unfamiliar with the topics but sometimes I struggled to see how the theoretical aspects we were learning about were applied in practice.
- The labs took a lot of time, and sometimes felt a bit tedious in the sense that we just had to copy long algorithms from course material without necessarily understanding them. Perhaps look into whether it’s possible to reduce the scope of these a little bit, and make them more to the core.

What advice would you like to give to future participants?
- Ask for help when stuck.
- Good programming skills!
- Try to understand what you are doing in the labs and why, as it is easy to just do without understanding but will make studying to the exam much harder
- I think I would say to put work into understanding the labs, because it really helped me understand some of the more difficult concepts and alleviated the study workload for the exam
- Try to follow the lectures and start early with the labs.

Is there anything else you would like to add?
- It was a good and interesting course overall!
- Some deadlines were very close to each other. Maybe it would be possible to spread them out more evenly.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

The student's response is overall positive, no significant problems were pointed out. The students suggests to spread the submission deadlines more evenly throughout the course.

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 were significantly more positive about the labs this year compared the year before. The main reason is that the labs were supervised by the lecturer instead of a TA.

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 response frequency is too low to identify gender related differences.

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

- provide some Matlab functions that will ease tedious programming of simple operations, e.g. reading Rinex files
- improve the deadline distribution