



Report - FDD3452 - 2021-06-21

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):

Dilian Gurov, dilian@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.

The students gave their feedback through a course questionnaire. Some students also sent direct e-mails with comments or suggestions.

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.)

I have not have had any meetings beyond the scheduled classes.

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 organized in three parts:

- (a) lectures,
- (b) tutorial sessions, and
- (c) laboratory sessions.

There are 6 homeworks, which are peer-reviewed during the tutorial sessions.

The laboratory assignments are mostly done at home, while the sessions are primarily for getting help and for reporting.

There was a written take-home exam in the end of the course.

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 probably somewhat lower than the 200 hours that would correspond to the 7.5 hp. We might include some additional tasks next time, such as a third lab.

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 students succeeded very well in the course. This may have been influenced by the high degree of participation by doctoral students this year.



STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

- Interesting topics.
 - A better coherence between the exercises and the labs can improve the course (especially the second lab).
 - More help sessions for the labs could be good.
-

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Overall the students find the course interesting and stimulating.
The only negative scores are about the relative lack of possibilities to collaborate and to get feedback without being graded.

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.

We are quite satisfied with how the course went and how it was perceived by the students.
We have tried to improve the lab assignments, but will obviously need to improve them even further, and to coordinate them even more with the tutorial sessions.

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?
-

We don't have enough data to judge this question. We didn't observe any such differences.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

We will work on further improving the tutorials and the labs. We might add one more lab.
