

Report - DM1135 - 2023-08-18

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.

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 the feedback obtained during the evaluation meeting. 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 on-site meetings were strongly 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 minor changes compared to the previous course round: the provided lecture videos were improved concerning the readability of hand-written notes. Lectures were also held live online, instead of playback of recorded lectures which was not appreciated previously.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If there is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

The workload seems similar to the last course round (about 12 hrs per week in average), but data are sparse.

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: 32, B:25, C:6, D:6, E:2. Nine students did not receive final grades due to failed final exam and/or due to failed labs.

The distribution is very similar to previous years.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Only seven students responded, so results are hardly representative. Good aspects mentioned are the tempo of the course, the labs, and the tutorials. Negative aspect is mainly - as in previous years - the lectures and in particular Andre's hand writing, despite the fact that many hours have been spent to improve that.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

With so few data impossible to say. Three students among the seven participants seemed quite unhappy with 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 course was generally successful, and a well connected structure was again confirmed. Intentionally, no big changes had been implemented to solidify course opinions over two rounds. For a large group the course seems to work, because I clearly see an improvement in how students explain results in the oral exam.

The improved hand writing does not have effect, which makes me wonder if there is a general problem with hand writing especially of maths notation.

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 be 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 primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

Lectures will be made more engaging by integrating python example, an initiative started already in some lectures last year but not sufficiently due to time constraints. In addition, lectures will be revised to include clarifications of relevance for practice. We will also publish labs in sync with lectures, and not again forget to ask for student representatives.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

In addition to regular course development, we obtained funding to develop question based learning elements. These will be developed during the course round in collaboration between George Kafetzis and a TA.
