



Report - SD2225 - 2019-12-19

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):

Jenny Jerrelind, jennyj@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 overall goal of the course is to give the student a deeper knowledge about modelling, simulation, measurement and analysis of ground vehicles dynamic behavior.

The course has the following learning activities; lectures, exercises, guest lectures, one study visit, four compulsory assignments (LAB1, LAB2, LAB3, PA1) which includes field tests with a real test vehicle and a radio-controlled scaled down vehicle as well as modelling and simulation by using the software's Matlab and ADAMS.

The examination is a written exam and written reports and oral presentations of the completed assignments. The course runs over two study periods. In the first study period focus is on lectures and exercises and the three first assignments. At the end of the first study period the written exam is given. In the second period the focus is on study visits, guest lectures and the large final project.

Small changes in the formulation of the assignments has been done since last time to make it more clear.

THE STUDENT'S 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?

Calculating that one study period is 8 weeks the student in total have 16 weeks for 11 hp which results in an average of 18.3 hours per week.

Approximately half of the students responded that they had a higher workload than one could expect. Although 5 out of 12 responded that they had a workload of less than 14 hours a week.

The course ends with a project work where the amount of time invested in the project is varying from person to person. Some put in a large extra effort due to a very large interest in the subject and perform extra work just out of curiosity. But there are also a few that sometimes have difficulties in handling the simulation software and thereby the workload increases. Several students indicate in their comments that the workload is higher during the second period.

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?

I believe they succeeded very well. Maybe a little shift towards the higher grades (A and B) this year.



OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

From the polar diagram it is evident that the course receives scores between 5.2- 6.8 which I judge as the course is meaningful, comprehensive and manageable.

The lower score is in the manageability-part where the possibilities to influence the course activities received somewhat lower value than the rest (5.2), but it is still a high value.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

Strong areas: Stimulating, challenging and interesting course. Possibility to learn in different ways.

Weaker areas: Feedback

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

The students highlight the following parts as the best aspects of the course; structure of the course, experiments and labs, guest lectures, theory sessions, implementation of theoretical knowledge in practical aspects

Areas where they suggest improvements are; tutorial classes, feedback and support during last project.

Good advices from the course participants

* Great course

* Work with exercises early on, both in class and on your own

* Work on projects on time and discuss problems and ideas with other groups

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The main aspects to improve are the tutorial classes, feedback and support during last project.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

It seems from the responses to each statement that one student felt that he/she didn't have enough background knowledge which I believe makes it hard to appreciate the course fully.
