

Report - IH2653 - 2024-01-29

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):

Gunnar Malm, gunta@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 LEQ6 survey was given

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.)

N/A

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 centered around the tutorial/homework assignments/computer labs. These are reviewed and refreshed on a yearly basis. This round more emphasis was put on compact models and quantum effects. In general I try to use NanoHub and COMSOL as the main tools even though some coding parts in Matlab and Python remain.

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?

Relatively low values reported given that there are quite challenging assignments.

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?

Overall good efforts

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Very positive with regards to the teacher and the content. The course follows a progression IL2240/IH2657/IH2653 and this is crucial to build a comprehensive understanding for the students. It seems that this way of introducing the various aspects of the modern semiconductor device field e.g. CMOS-based is working

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Positive and better evaluation compared to previous rounds. Developing in the right direction.

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.

Some coding in Matlab or Python should be retained in the course. Initially I was making a transition away towards ready made tools but a mix probably is good for hands-on learning!

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?

N/A no statistics

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

See above regarding coding and maintaining the progression within the program (TNTEM).

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

This course is close to my research and could benefit from a more dedicated PhD round with more complex topics. Or organized as a separate PhD module besides the general content.