Report - DM2350 - 2023-11-07

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.

The evaluation was based on a thorough analysis of the course survey. Beyond the survey, throughout the duration of the course the possibility to reach out with feedback was emphasized and encouraged, either by email, in the discussion on canvas, and in the zoom drop-in sessions that were organized weekly. Aspects regarding gender and disabled students were investigated based on the survey, and there is no difference recognizable related to either.

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.)

Weekly Q&A sessions on zoom were provided. Despite repeatedly pointing out this possibility, it was only used by very few students.

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

The course has 12 lectures, 3 web-based laboratories, 2 exercise assignments (reviews of scientific papers on the subjects of the lectures), and 1 project work that functions as final examination. Projects are conducted in groups of 3-4 students.

All lectures were conducted onsite, but in addition recordings were provided online.

In the labs, students were given the freedom to choose online exercises by the course book publisher.

No changes were implemented compared to the last course round by Andre Holzapfel (2020).

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 majority of the students spent between 100 and 160 hours of work on this course, which approximately corresponds to the expected workload.

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?

Out of 79 registered students, 78 students actively followed the course. Three students failed due to failed assignments INL1. Out of the remaining 75, 54 students managed to get an A. This is a very positive shift back from Covid times, when the lower project grades had created a shift to worse grades.

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

The best aspect of the course, as usual, is the project. But other course elements are not mentioned on the negative side by many. Some points that are criticized are to emphasize relevance of the topics to IT, and to improve connections between lectures and projects.

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

Course questionnaire responses are all above five, which is as excellent as in pre-covid times.

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.

One change regarded the addition of video recordings of lectures being available on Canvas, which was appreciated. Generally, it was great to be able to do the project presentations on-site again, which increased the learning effect and motivation a lot, as relflected to the differences in the grades.

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?

There are not differences between student groups that might be significant.

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

As the lectures are conducted by a diversity of teachers, it is hard or impossible to improve their relation to the projects. If time allows, the course responsible will add examples of relevance of lecture topics for IT to canvas.