



---

## Report - HI2010 - 2020-08-05

---

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):**

Martin Jacobsson, martin.jacobsson@sth.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.**

We used the LEQ12 standard online survey for obtaining anonymous comments from students. The course evaluation survey was answered by 30%.

This report is based on that material together with subjective observations by the teachers and informal discussions with active students.

---

**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.)**

No meetings with students have been done.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

The course is 6 ECTS and had 32 active students this year. It was divided into:

- Lecture series with multiple lecturers, two external guest lecturers
- 2 labs
- Self-study project with poster presentation
- Written exam
- Seminar (on requirements analysis of a laboratory information system).

No major changes were made to the course.

---

**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?**

Several students report on a 'laid back' course requiring only small amount of effort. Some students report just right amount of effort required.

The self-reported amount of work varies between 2 h/week to 20 h/week with an average around 10h/week. This is less than what can be expected (16 h/week for 6 credits).

---



### **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?**

---

Almost everyone that actively participated in the course passed the course. The grades were distributed across all grades, with most obtaining a C. No significant difference from previous years.

---

### **STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

---

The students highlight different strengths and problems. The only consistent comments (reported by 2 or more students):

- Lab 2 (signal processing in Matlab) needs improvement.
- More technical depth, and less about regulations, standards, etc.

Many suggest there is no need to read the extra material, only follow the lectures. However, one remarks "Read from Day 1".

---

### **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

---

No LEQ statement scored significantly low.

---

### **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.**

---

Easy course. Seems to give a good introduction for most. Maybe should have more technical depth.

---

### **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 LEQ statement scored significantly low. All are consistently high.

The male/female participation in the course is almost fair.

No difference can be spotted between male/female. No one has indicated a problem either.

The international students are much better in filling out the survey. Perhaps this is because most of them take this course as the first course at KTH, while Swedish students take this course in year 4.

The survey result was inconclusive with respect to students with disabilities. No one has indicated a problem either.

---

### **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

Next course offering will be the last. Since the course will be replaced partly by a new course on medical signal processing, we will work on the signal processing parts.

---