

Report - IH2657 - 2024-06-07

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):

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 offered with a response rate of 4 (23). For this reason, low response rate, analysis in different categories should not be attempted.

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.)

Student have commented on lab-instruction during the course and also in the survey. More clarity could be achieved here with relatively low effort.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course was given in the same format. Experimental labs were planned but had to be omitted due to lack of suitable assistants. No active PhD student at the division could be assigned due to other teaching duties this academic year.

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 course run in parallel with EK2350 Microsystem Technology 7.5 credits. The format of that course is very presence oriented and causes both workload and scheduling issues for IH2657. This problem is known and has persisted several years and needs to be addressed at program 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?

Almost all students appeared for the final exam and performed well at C-level or higher. The examination preparations had been significantly clarified compared to previous years.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

See above about workload in parallel course work. This is a concerning issue.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

High scores on all LEQ6 items nothing to comment on.

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 exam format changes worked out well. Student had better chances to prepare, clearer instructions.

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 too few responses 4 (23).

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

To find assistants, PhD students, for an experimental lab.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No