Report - DM2350 - 2024-10-24

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.

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.)

Meetings with student representatives were conducted several times. 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 4-5 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.

Few consistent aspects from the course evaluation that could be improved, given the structure of the course with a very large number of involved actors. (with all advantages and problems) Project groups had to be increased in size due to the increased number of students. Course held in period 2 for the first time, resulting in the project over Christmas, which is a difficulty.

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 91 (compared to 79 the year before) registered students: Three students failed due to failed assignments INL1. Out of the remaining 88, 31 students managed to get an A, and 48 B. This is a slight shift towards lower grades compared to last year.

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. Several students also positively emphasize the course book. The only negative aspects mentioned several times regard the project timing and supervision, where more time and support is desired by several. The former will be addressed in the next course round, but the latter seems also be an outcome of increasing student numbers and consequential less supervision time per student.

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

Course questionnaire responses are all around 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.

The course seems stable over the years, with problems mainly emerging from its complex structure and many involved people. The advantages of this complexity, such as diversity and expertise, seem to outweigh the disadvantages of various glitches in supervision, for instance. The increase of group sizes is clearly a disadvantage, but in the light of pressure by KTH to increase efficiency, it is hard to see a way around that.

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?

Project selections will be conducted as early as possible in the course. Project timing will be suggested on Canvas. Paper reviews will be restructured to accommodate for the impact of generative AI, as many review texts suggest that such tools may have been used. THe change to accommodate for that will be a short oral presentation as a review, to be uploaded by the students.