

# Report - ID2214 - 2022-01-25

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):**

Henrik Boström, bostromh@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.**

The students have been invited to take part of the course evaluation through emails, and through announcements in Canvas, with a few reminders.

---

**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 special meetings were setup to discuss the course, but there were separate forums in Canvas for this purpose, as well as possibilities to discuss during online discussion sessions, and physical/online supervision meetings and seminars.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

The four mandatory assignments are mainly unchanged, except for that a novel dataset has been used in the final assignment. Compared to last year, the exam took place in class rooms instead of online, and no material/equipment was allowed during the exam (similar to how the exam was set up before last year). Rather than offering live online lectures, recordings of last year's lectures were provided together with live, online discussion sessions, at which typical exam questions were presented and discussed; the students were given time to reflect and submit their responses through the Mentimeter system.

---

**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 workload, as judged from the submitted course evaluations, were on average not far from what should be expected, with a few quite significant deviations.

---

**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 41 non-empty written exams, 27 (66%) received a grade E or higher, while 8 exams (20%) received the grade Fx, and 6 (15%) received the grade F. The proportion of the latter is about the same as last year, while the proportion receiving Fx has increased. One reason could be that the exam took place at the KTH campus, with no access to additional material (in contrast to last year's online exam, at which both computers and text books were allowed).

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

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

The students found the best aspects of the course to be the assignments, which were considered to be very well designed and helpful, the variety of theoretical and practical aspects, and the quizzes. Suggested improvements include giving more time for discussing the student's questions on the lectures, in addition or instead of discussing the quizzes, which possibly could be done separately.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

The students seem to be generally very happy/satisfied with the course; most aspects received an average score above or close to 6 (out of 7). The LEQ receiving the lowest average score (5.4) was LEQ 15., "I could practice and receive feedback without being graded", which however is a clear improvement from previous years' assessment of this quality (the average score was 4.7 last year for LEQ 15). This can mainly be explained by the introduction of quizzes, which gave the students a chance to practice without being graded on similar questions as would be given on the exam.

---

**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 overall impression is that the students to a large extent find the course interesting, rewarding and designed in a good way.

---

**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 number of respondents is too small to allow for a meaningful analysis of sub-populations.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

The students should be given more opportunities to freely ask questions during the online discussion sessions, which currently were primarily dedicated to discussing the presented quizzes. In the long term, the lecture recordings (often lasting more than two hours) should be replaced by shorter, more focused video lectures.

**OTHER INFORMATION****Is there anything else you would like to add?**

---

Serious concerns have been expressed by some students regarding having the exam in class rooms during a pandemic. Given how fast such a situation can change, the examiner should be given the freedom to replace a class room exam with an online exam with very short notice, i.e., without having to await decisions made centrally.

---