



Report - ID2221 - 2018-03-12

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):

Sarunas Girdzijauskas, sarunasg@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course had 4 lab sessions, 6 homework assignments (paper reviews) and the final exam. Due to large number of students in 2017 (137 students) the individual paper presentations were not conducted as in 2016 and instead were incorporated in paper review assignments.

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?

There is no significant deviation from the expected level of workload. We plan to keep similar workload for the future instances of the 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?

Only 10% of the students did not pass the course. More than three quarters of the students got grade C or higher. In 2016 there were no failures and 87 % of the students got grade C or higher. The slightly higher failure rate might be due to the fact that in 2017 there were almost twice the number of students than in 2016, which came from very different programmes with substantially different backgrounds in their previous education.

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.

Overall the students expressed positive evaluation of the course, with all of the LEQ statements scoring more than 4 (i.e., above neutral) with most of the statements scoring between 5-6.

There were no significant difference in evaluation from different groups of students, with a small exception of the students from "international exchange", which gave lower scores. This might have been due to the fact that they had not sufficient background to take the course.



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 lowest scores were on the questions 14 (4.4) "I received regular feedback that helped me to see my progress", 15 (4.6) "I could practice and receive feedback without being graded" and 20 (4.8) "I was able to learn in a way that suited me". These are mostly due to the fact that 2017 instance of the course had relatively large number of students expected for a master course (137 students) and the team had very limited resources for giving feedback to the students. We used "peer-assessment" methods to make sure the students get feedback from their peers whenever the teacher feedback is not available. In case the course resources remain the same and the number of students do not decrease we suggest to use the same "peer-assessment" teaching methods for the future instance of the course.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Separate lab session could be integrated into one big project.

Faster grading and feedback to the students should be addressed by attracting more resources (TAs) to the course if the number of students remain on similar level (100+ students).

Peer-assessment could be improved by giving even more detailed instructions to the students.
