Report - DD2411 - 2024-01-18

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):

Christian Smith, ccs@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.

This course round only had one participant, making all anonymized course feedback impossible. No statistics could be collected, for the same reason.

The reason was an error made by the admin staff, who rejected all applications to the course. The error was found and amended, but by time it was fixed, all students but one had started on other courses instead.

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.)

N/A

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course is an opportunity for motivated students to join a research group at RPL and carry out a real research project over the duration of a year, under the supervision of RPL staff (PhD students, Postdocs, and/or faculty)

The specific research topics vary, as do the contributions from the students. Typical student activities are literature studies, experimental design, experiement execution, and result analysis. Experiemtns range from numerical simulations to robot interaction and user studies.

Finally, the students write up their results in a conference paper, and perform peer reviews on each others' work. When the results are good, it is common for the papers to be submitted and (often) published at international scientific conferences.

In this particular course round, the peer review step was done by interacting with volunteers from outside the course, so that the single student taking it was still able to give and receive feedback on paper drafts.

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 has not been statistically measured, for reasons stated above.

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 single student taking the course performed well and finished on time.

STUDENTS'ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS What does students say in response to the open questions?
N/A
SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students. N/A
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 course round worked reasonably well, but it was very unfortunate that there were not more students taking the course.

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?

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?
The main change for the next course round is that instructions for admission have been clarified, to ensure that students can actually be admitted to the course in reasonable time.