Report - EL2820 - 2023-12-08

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 R. Rojas, crro@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 assessments had finished, and while the grades of all assessments were posted, the students had access to a course survey, opened between 2023-11-14 and 2023-11-27.

In addition, we had a course committee conformed by one student, who provided feedback in the middle of the course and after the final exam had been given. Also, the teacher had a meeting with a small sample of the students of the course during a seminar of the EL2220 course "The sustainable systems and control engineer".

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.)

Two course committee meetings were arranged: one after half of the lectures had been given, and a second one after the final exam.

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 lectures, exercise sessions and computer exercises. In addition, regarding assessments, it has 3 labs and 1 final written exam. The first lab consists of 2 homework assignments; the 2nd lab is performed in computer labs, and for the last lab the students are given data from a real process and they should build a model of such a system.

The main change that has been performed since the last course round is the use of a new process plant for Lab 3, which is a now a physical process (an rotational inverted pendulum) instead of simply providing data to the students.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

According to the students who answered the survey, the average workload was slightly less than 25 hours per week, i.e., about 200 hours in total, which is expected from a 7.5 hp course.

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 pass rate of the exam (including bonus points from the quizzes) was 69%, which is within the normal variation (65%-80%) for this course.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

Many students found the course topics very interesting and relevant, but considered the material to be challenging to learn, especially due to its diversity, required background, and due to the high pace of the course.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

In general the course is considered interesting, but students would like more feedback, for example through complete solutions of problems /exam questions, or regular office hours.

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 course round went well, and there was good interaction with the students. However, due to a reduction in the number of TAs, the workload for the teachers was sometimes difficult to handle. To address this, a suggestion is to only address questions through Canvas (so all students can benefit from the teachers' and other students' replies), and to allow anonymous posting there (so the students can feel less inhibited to ask questions). The new lab process was quite successful.

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?

As mentioned in the previous point, it would be beneficial to improve the interaction with the students, by providing office hours, and encouraging posting in the discussion section of Canvas (which this year, unlike previous course rounds, was fairly silent), so the students can enhance their understanding of the course topics.

It is difficult from the survey results to draw conclusions on differences between genders and students with/without disabilities, because it is unknown how many students of each class answered the survey (in fact, no students who declared having a disability answered it). There is no discernible difference in experience between national and international students.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

The main effort should be put on the development of more lecture notes, to complement the classroom slides.