

Report - EL2810 - 2022-04-22

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):

Cristian Rojas (cro@kth.se) and Alexandre Proutiere (alepro@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.

After the course finished, the students were sent a link to a LEQ course survey. Since only 5 out of 19 students replied to it, we cannot investigate gender and disability aspects.

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 2 labs, 2 home-works and 1 final exam. This is the first time the course has been given.

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 student's workload, according to the survey, was as expected.

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 14 students who took the final exam, only 3 failed, which is a good outcome.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students suggested to state more clear recommended prerequisites for the course.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The students suggested to state more clear recommended prerequisites for 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.

The outcome of the course was very good, even though some students might have felt that the course was difficult due to some lacks of prerequisites and the amount of material being covered.

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?

The survey sample size was too small (5 students) to draw any conclusions about this.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- State clear recommended pre-requisites (the English version of the course description unfortunately did not include those, unlike the Swedish version).
- Consider reducing amount of material being covered, and add more background material.