

Report - ID2218 - 2023-11-07

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

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.

In the beginning of the course, we selected course representatives. I also encouraged the students to contact me by email if they have any questions, concerns, on comments on lectures, exercises, etc. At the end of the course, the students were asked to fill a course survey form. I also had a meeting with the course representatives at which we discuss possible steps to improve the course.

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.)

In the beginning of the course, two student representatives were selected. I had discussions with them during the course and a meeting when the course ended.

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). In 2022 all lectures and exercises were given in the classroom. Videos of lectures and exercises from 2021 were provided to the students as a complementary material. The midterm and final exams were also carried out in the classroom. Examples of exams from previous years were provided to students.

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. Some students commented that "the regular homework makes it less time consuming when studying for the exams." Another comment says "It is a well adapted course with regards to workload for 7.5 HP".

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, which is similar to previous years.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students were happy with the course. Here are some comments:

- Elena is a great teacher and very inspiring
- The interesting topic, applicability to real life so one can actually know how to apply it in their career
- i would say that the teacher Elena Dubrova is the best teacher I've had in Campus Kista.
- The assignments were a good way to ensure that we worked with the material throughout the whole course
- Very refreshing and inspiring to have a female professor

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The overall impression is very positive. Practically all students found the course interesting, as demonstrated by the average score 6.7 on question 1 (I worked with interesting issues).

The students evaluated the course as challenging in a stimulating way (question 4) with the average score of 6.6. The students confirmed that they could practice and receive feedback without being graded (question 15) with the average score of 5.7. The students considered the assessment of the course to be fair and honest (question 16) with the average score of 7. The students answered that they were able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others (question 21) with the average score of 6. The students answered that they were able to get support if I needed it (question 22) with the average score of 6.7.

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.

I was very happy to see from the survey results that many students liked the course and highly evaluated my teaching skills. The examination results were in line with the results of the previous years.

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 differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?
 - international and national students?
 - students with or without disabilities?
-

There seems to be no significant differences between different groups of students, except that the female students gave a higher average score to the question 1 (I worked with interesting issues).

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 on interesting topics, as we did in the past years. In the long term, we will keep updating the course material with the new developments in the area of fault-tolerant design.