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 30% 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, and laboratory 3 on vertical control this to give a better learning experience. As well as all content moved online similar to last year due to COVID.

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?
This year the few students that reported gave a workload of around 20 h per week which is what a 7,5 credit course should have, even so they felt the course was time heavy.

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=20%, B=30%, C=40%, D=10%, E=0%, F=0%.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?
Students liked that the course was a lab based course that is more realistic with no exam but three laboratory assignments instead.
Students would like to have more lectures on specific topics as well as more teachers present during help sessions since they felt they had to wait long time some times.
Some questions in the handout is unclear and could be improved.
Students also advise other students to start with the lab assignments directly and to write on the report in parallell to not be out of time at the end.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.
Good feedback on that the course is interesting and seem to give student centered learning through active experimentation and reflection.
Some issues were noted on clarity of some questions and to be more effective at help sessions or involve more teachers.

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.
Happy to see that the course still works to have online even though several students would have liked to sit in the lab and work on the assignments.

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.