

Report - DM2350 - 2025-10-27

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 the course survey, on feedback from student representatives, and on feedback gathered through other teaching and discussion occasions with students in the program. 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 online, as in previous years. Weekly Q&A sessions on zoom were provided. Again, despite repeatedly pointing out this possibility, it was basically not used by the 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). The project start was moved to the earliest possible point in response to student feedback. A major change was conducted in the exercise assignments: the reviews had to be submitted in the form of five minute video presentations, in order to improve student's presentation skill, and to avoid the increasing

tendency of generative AI use in producing text assignments. Furthermore, the structure of the project was further clarified by providing a time plan on Canvas.

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 majority of the students spent between 100 and 200 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 107 (compared to 91 the year before) registered students: 59 students managed to get an A, 41 B, and 1 C. This is a slight shift towards better grades compared to last year, towards similar grades as two years ago. Three registered students did not attend the course, and another three students failed to get a final grade due to low grades in the exercise assignments.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What do students say in response to the open questions?

Projects are strongly emphasized as positive, similarly to all previous years. Also the online labs are appreciated. No negative aspects popped up consistently. A few students dislike the unequal properties between some 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 around six, which is even better than before. However, the sample is small as usual (15 out of 107).

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, and with very positive evaluations by students. The advantages of the course's complexity, such as diversity and expertise, still outweigh the disadvantages of varying student experiences in projects. The overall number of students, which increased again in this year, presents a large challenge in managing this complexity in an appropriate way.

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 could be called significant.

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 have to further improve the new format of the exercise assignments: the instructions will be clarified, and the grading will be simplified to emphasize the central insights expected. In order to include a stronger individual contribution, the final project report should include a personal reflection and description of contribution by each student, or this reflection should be conducted as additional short assignment. We will consider focusing the final presentations on the posters instead, and leave out the short presentations, as these were not positively received by students.