



Report - EH2745 - 2020-02-11

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):

Lars Nordström, larsno@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.

1

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course consists of three blocks: Software development in Java, power system data modelling and machine learning. The software development block runs throughout the course and forms the basis for the two other blocks. The course consists of a total of an introductory lecture, 17 combined lecture and exercise sessions and one final voluntary test. Since the course is applied, there is a need to mix theory and practice (programming) to facilitate learning and provide the hands-on experiences needed to learn software development. Most of the scheduled 2 hours sessions are therefore split between lecture time and exercise time in the classroom. In addition to the combined lecture and exercise sessions, there are voluntary project hours arranged. These are not scheduled, but during these hours the course lab is open for use and course assistants are present to assist in the work.

No changes since last year.

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?

Yes, the answers in the survey vary - but appear to reflect differences in classroom time versus individual work.

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?

No major differences since earlier years. Good success rate.

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.

Low response rate in the LEQ, but positive in all aspects, very little differences across the various fields.



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?

No

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

None - addition of Python programming for next year.