Report - DM1135 - 2022-02-11

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):

Andre Holzapfel, holzap@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.

Course evaluation is based on the official course results, on the evaluation form sent out through the KTH platform, and an additional survey that inquired about the preferences related to on-site or online teaching and the formats of the course elements. Students were repeatedly encouraged to provide feedback in these channels, and gender aspects and disabled student related aspects are considered in the survey as far as possible, given the population size.

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 course had lectures, tutorials, and labs. Meetings were conducted online in the context of the former two, and online meetings were encouraged in the latter.

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

The course contains 10 lectures, 5 tutorials, and 5 labs. Both tutorials and lectures were online, whereas the labs were hybrid, with on-campus participation and discussion encouraged. The labs contribute the practical examination element (60% of the total course grade), and the final exam focuses on theory prepared in lectures and tutorials (40% of the overall grade). The exam was conducted as an individual oral online exam, in which previously conducted homeworks were examined individually.

There were only minor changes compared to the previous course round: python examples were provided in the lectures, to demonstrate practical value of theory more immediately.

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 seems similar to the last course round, with a slight increase, which is desirable (about 15 hrs per week in average).

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?

Final grade distribution is A: 22, B:18, C:5, D:6. Six students did not receive final grades due to a failed final exam, and one due to failed labs. Five students dropped out, and two did not take part in the exam.

It is noteworthy that the course results are slightly worse than last time. One reason for the shift in the distribution is the slightly more difficult final exam, which was too easy the last time. Another reason seems to be the high workload during the exam period: I took the opportunity to discuss reasons for bad performance with most students with low grades, and they all referred to having done exam preparations during nights.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students mention labs and tutorials positively. The majority of respondents seem to see the course elements well connected, but the content challenges them. The only consistent negative aspect are the lectures: students complain about the readability, which is odd since the videos are the same as last year. Nevertheless, it is clear that the recorded format is not appreciated.

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

All ratings are between 4 and 5 in average, so no clear bad aspects seen from that. The clearest negative aspect to see in the ratings, is that half of the respondents lack ability to collaborate and discuss with others, as for last year.

The additional questionnaire on canvas proved very valuable: The labs and tutorials are very positively regarded, but the recorded lectures not. This solidifies the course survey findings. Importantly, half of the students prefer on-site elements, and the other half online, whereas a majority appreciates the availability of online material and uses these for exam preparation.

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 was generally successful, and a well connected structure was again confirmed.

The exam was more difficult, but its format generally appreciated. This is very important, since the format is very work intense for the examiner, but it seems worth the effort.

Intenionally, no changes had been implemented to solidify course opinions over two rounds.

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?

No differences between groups can be determined.

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

After two rounds, and additional surveys for evaluation it seems clear that the recorded lectures should be accompanied by live lectures online. In these, care must be taken concerning readability of script. Lectures will be made more engaging by integrating python example, an initiative started already in some lectures in this year.

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?

It is extremely evident that the external teacher George Kafentzis does a job that is very much appreciated by the students. His tutorials have become the corner stone for the course.