



---

## Report - ID2218 - 2018-08-14

---

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):**

Elena Dubrova, dubrova@kth.se

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

This course is given annually at KTH since 2000. The course has 12 2-hour lectures and 6 1-hour exercises. The examination is based on the 5 homework assignments (1.5 points, grade scale A, B, C, D, E, FX, F), the midterm exam (1.5 points, grade scale A, B, C, D, E, FX, F), and the final exam (4.0 points, grade scale A, B, C, D, E, FX, F). A change from the last years was that we offered students to do a non-obligatory group project (groups of max 2 people), intended to help them understanding a specific topic in more depth. 4 groups of students has submitted their projects and 2 of these groups got bonus points for successful projects.

---

**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 estimated workload seems to match the expected level.

---

**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 are close to a normal distribution with the mean being around the grade B. This is not surprising, given that this course is selective and only students motivated to study this subject are attending it.

---

**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 very positive. Practically all students found the course interesting, as demonstrated by the average score 6.4 for the question 1 (I worked with interesting issues).

The students' experience of meaningfulness (questions 1-6) is very positive, with the minimum score of 5.4 and maximum 6.7.

The students' experience of comprehensibility (questions 7-16) is even more positive, with the minimum score of 5.6 and maximum 7.

The students' experience of manageability (questions 17-22) is positive, too, with the minimum score of 5.1 and maximum 6.6.

There seems to be no significant differences between different groups of students, except that the Swedish students gave a lower average grade 5 for the question 7 (The intended learning outcomes helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve). International students gave a higher grade for the same questions, 6.8 for master students and 6.0 for exchange students.

---



#### **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 highest average score 7 for the question 16 (The assessment on the course was fair and honest) and the next highest is 6.9 for the question 8 (I understood how the course was organized and what I was expected to do). This shows that the course is well-organised and run.

The lowest average score is 5.4 for the question 20 (I had opportunities to choose what to do). It might be correlated to the fact that question 8 got a high score - teacher's expectations are very well defined and that limits the choices student's need to do.

---

#### **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

In the short term, we will continue offering non-compulsory group projects, as we did this year.

In the long term, we will keep updating the course material with the new developments in the area of fault-tolerant design.

---