Report - SD2231 - 2022-02-07

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):
Mikael Nybacka, mnybacka@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 evaluation of the course was done through the use of the learning outcome questionnaire LEQ12 that was sent out to all students in the course, where 6 students responded which is 15% of the students in the course. No information on gender or disabilities could be included in the data due to low participation. The course analysis due to the low participation will only be qualitative.

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.)
Meetings with the students this year due to COVID restrictions was purely through zoom where both recorded lectures and support sessions were used as well as lectures and group supervision through Zoom. For the group supervision the function of breakout room was used to enable more open discussions with each student group.

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.
The aim with the course is to give the students both theoretical and practical experience for different applications of vehicle dynamic control in both longitudinal, lateral and vertical direction. At the end of the course the students shall have theoretical and practical experience around three areas of vehicle dynamics control. These three areas are divided into three larger laboratory assignments where the students are writing a report on each and is graded by the teachers.
The changes for this year is new data for Laboratory 2 and a redesign of Laboratory no 1 on longitudinal control, this to give a better learning experience. As well as all content moved online.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?
The respondents given workload is varying quite a lot where some students have been spending much more time on the assignments and the course than others. Some students felt that some laboratory assignments took longer than other assignments. One explanation of the spread is that some students have more control theory experience which will make the course a bit easier to complete whereas other have less experience and hence it will take more time to complete the lab assignments. Another factor noted throughout the years is that some students have used Matlab and Simulink more and hence the labs will bea easier to get started with.

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?
There is a spread in the grades on this course that is similar to the year before. A=7%, B=69%, C=14%, D=10%, E=0%, F=0%.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?
Some students like the active experimentations and rather open laboratory assignments, others would like even more tasks and control aspects included where others want less. So the balance seems quite good but some adjustments will be done for next year.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.
Feedback was quite good even though it was few respondents but even though there was little time to prepare the course for full online teaching and issues with getting models and software up and running the feedback on the course was still very good.

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 course went well even though we had to run it online fully. There was some questions in the handouts of the assignments and balancing of the tasks that need to be worked on for next year.

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?

Too few responses to the survey to see anything in regards to gender, disabilities of different nationalities.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

We will continue to work on the lab designs to make them better for the students and minimise issues with software and clarify some questions.