Report - EL2320 - 2018-03-07

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):

John Folkesson, johnf@kth.se

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 now run for about 10 years and I have given it >8 times. It is arranged as lectures, 2 labs, 2 person project, and exam. The lectures are a complement to the required reading and try to give additional insights or points of view into the material rather than re-state what is explained well in the book. The labs are given in two parts, one a theory part that is gone over in class before starting the second part. The second part is a practical implementation in matlab starting from skeleton code.

The projects are individually chosen topics with some literature study, implementation and proper scientific report. The implementation can be skipped for a lower grade.

The exam covers the main topics of the course and gives a quality assurance to me that students that pass did really understand. The other moments all allow for group work so one can not be totally sure that the student has understood fully. There is however a strong correspondence between the evaluations of the different moments.

THE STUDENT'S 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 workload as reported by the students is fairly close to what the course should take (20 hours a week) and even if there are highs and lows I think they are not extreme. There is a comment about the project being over the break. The project can actually be completed before Christmas as it starts near the start of December and is about 40 hours of work. Many studnents chose to leave it to later and then get into this problem because I give a lot of time to the deadline in late January. So I think giving them flexible time on the project is better than a deadline before the Christmas break.

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 rather better than in the past. This is mostly due to a more straight forward exam where it was perhaps easier to pass and to get an A. It turned out that on the exam there were close to 11 students per grade from F to A so a near uniform distribution rather than a normal one. It is the first time that happened. In a way it is what I am trying to do when designing an exam as I want highest possible knowledge resolution across the student population. So uniform resolution is a good thing. I am a bit worried that passing may have been to easy but it was not very seriously too easy.

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

Overall the scores were good. It seems that there might be some feeling of not 'belonging'. I think that could be improved by greater student participation in class. I do have some interactive parts but could increase that. Working on the labs together also should help but that is informal now and up to the students themselves to arrange. there are lab help sessions with a TA.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

Pretty hard to draw any conclusions from the polar diagrams more than I have above.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

So some of the comments were very kind to my lectures this time. I have in the past been told that the lectures are confusing or too much information etc. So perhaps I did better job but I am not sure. The labs seem to have not been as well praised as in the past but not negative either. Just that some felt they could do the implementation without understanding. That is hard to adjust as if the implementation is too hard many will not manage it. I try to make sure with part I of the labs and the questions they must answer that they do understand what they are doing but it requires some effort of course.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

I think the grading criteria for both the course and the project could be looked over. In particular the students that do nto do an implementation on the project (only a few) do not really have clear grading criteria now. It might be better to have a two level criteria. One that studnets could reach C without an implementation and then the implementation could raise 2 levels from that. So more separate report writing and implementation. The bonus points on the lab counting to the exam is rather generous and sort of unjustifiable. I would like to have a better way to give lab-on-time incentives.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

I think the students were a very good batch this year! The program seems to be doing well at attracting good people.

Course data 2018-03-26

EL2320 - Applied Estimation, HT 2017

Course facts

Course start:	2017 w.44
Course end:	2018 w.3
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	PRO1 - Project, 2.0, Grading scale: P, F PRO2 - Project, 2.0, Grading scale: P, F TEN1 - Examination, 3.5, Grading scale: P, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	John Folkesson <johnf@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	John Folkesson <johnf@kth.se>
Teachers:	John Folkesson <johnf@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	69
Total number of registered:	79

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate[1] [%]	59.40%
Performance rate[2] [%]	80.20%
Grade distribution[3] [%, number]	A 22% (9) B 29% (12) C 27% (11) D 22% (9) E 2% (1)

1 Percentage approved students
2 Percentage achieved credits
3 Distribution of grades among the approved students