

Report - EG2230 - 2023-10-12

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):

Mikael Amelin, amelin@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 students have been invited to submit answers to the standard KTH course survey (LEQ 6) and to participate in a course evaluation committee. Unfortunately, few students (20%) answered the course survey and no students volunteered for the course evaluation committee.

Some students have provided feedback directly to the examiner during the project assignment presentations.

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 only meetings with students have been in connection to lectures and project assignments presentations, as there has been no interest from the students to participate in other meetings.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course include the following learning activities:

- * Lectures (theory and examples)
- * Lecture assignments (small problems that are solved and discussed during the lectures)
- * Self-study (lecture notes, compendium, exercise book)

The examination includes the following parts:

- * Seminars: mandatory, pass/fail, mix of basic examples and discussions
- * Written exam: mandatory, pass/fail, basic theory
- * Project assignment I: voluntary, can give grades C or D, larger problems
- * Project assignment II: voluntary, can give grades A or B (and C or D in combination with project assignment I), larger problems

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?

Difficult to assess from the questionnaire, but students mostly seem to be fine with the workload. It can be noted that the student can decide themselves about the workload depending on if they do the larger project assignments or not.

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?

The results were generally good. As many as a third of the students managed to get the highest grade and the distribution of the other grades was fairly even.

However, it can be noted that almost 25% of the students did not pass the written exam. On the other hand, 44% of the students who did not pass the written exam did not participate in any mandatory examination in the course (i.e., they did not participate in any seminar and they did not attend any partial or final exam).

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

One student is saying that they did not get sufficient guidance for the projects. One student (could be the same) did not think that the theory and examples in the course was matching the problems in the written exam. Two students mentioned that the time for the exam (which is 3 hours) is too short.

Several students are saying that the course is well-structured.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

In general, the students seem to be happy 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.

This was the first time this course was given (although the course structure and much of the content are based on earlier courses that have been discontinued). The results of the students that were actively participating in the course are very good.

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 no obvious differences in experiences between different groups of students.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

The course is using a format that has been working very well in various courses for the past ten years and there is no immediate need for large changes in the course. The focus will be on making corrections and clarifications in the lecture slides. There is also a need for more exercises, but that will come naturally as all previous written exams (partial and final) are made available to the students on Canvas.

The most important task will be to write a new, updated course compendium.
