# Report - DD2419 - 2022-09-06

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):

Patric Jenmsfelt, patric@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.

We met every group (and thus every student) for a final session that consisted of both examination and ended in a discussion about the course. The students were also given an opportunity to complete a course evaluation.

#### 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.)

The meeting after the completion of the course was the final examination and debriefing session that was held with the course responsible, TA and the group.

#### COURSE DESIGN

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

The course runs in two main phases. In the first phase the students complete individual assignments that end in an examination session. The purpose of this is to ensure that every individual has the skills and knowledge to contribute to the work in the group. We call this the "flight camp". At the end of flight camp the students have to pass an oral examination where they present their solution to a final flight camp assignment and that they have general knowledge needed to move on to the project. Passing this part is needed before entering the second phase, which is the group project.

The group work is where most of the time in the course is spent. All teams are given the same task to solve. To support these learning activities there are initially lectures on specific topics important for the project and four project meetings between project group and teaching team. The project work is done in two steps to ensure that everyone gets close to the hardware. In the first phase students are allowed to pick a parter to work with. This was a result of covid19 as we require that these two people share the same hardware. There are certain requirements to be fulfilled for the initial phase. When completed the 2-person-groups are merged into groups of four by the teachers. Students are given a total of three milestones with specified functionality in three topics (localization, perception and planning) and overall integration. We meet the groups after each milestone. Students are able to build their own test setup at home but to encourage more collaboration we also opened up a seminar room with a test setup for two periods of three days during the course. We also arranged two seminars where the focus was to discuss progress and planning.

#### 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?

Very few people answered the course evaluation so it is hard to say much at all really for the data. From the few that answered we can say

the reported between 12-20 hours/week. This is roughly the expected, maybe a bit on the low side. 9hp over two period means 300h over two periods or 150h per period.

I ask students to keep a log of the time spent to follow up. It is meant to give some experience with the hard task of assessing how long something will actually take to do.

## 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?

Compared to last year I think that the result was a bit better. Only one person was asked to provide additional work after the course.

## STUDENTS ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

I think this comment described what most students feel "It was hard but ultimately fulfilling to work in an environment with less handholding, this made the collaborative effort of the whole group more important to the larger picture."

Better alignment between lectures and project is also asked for but this is hard to do in practice since we want to provide the students with the information before it is needed by the first team rather than deliver it N times, whenever a particular student wants it.

## SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Not so easy to say with so few comments I think. No one is really angry about anything but then no one is super happy either. More interaction between groups would do it better I think.

#### **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.

So sad with so few comments from the students in this written form. Based on the comments in the last meeting I think that the course went quite well.

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?
<u>students with or without disabilities?</u>
Pointless to do with 6 answers

## PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term? Finding a way for students to meet more natuarally while working on the project. The answer is to have a project course room.