

# Report - SD2805 - 2022-04-05

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):**

Ulf Ringertz rzu@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.

Standard KTH survey was used.

---

**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.)

Due to the pandemic, a class room session with half the class each week, group support, 45 minutes per group given each week on zoom.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

One lecture per week, team work sessions, group level support each week to monitor progress.

---

**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?

Varies a lot depending on student background and ambitions.

---

**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?

Again, varies a lot. End results ok even compared to previous years.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Too much work, and issues with Matlab programming taking a lot of time.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Matlab programming needs to improve in earlier years, many student that enter the masters level from other schools have little or no programming experience.

---

**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.

Programming skills must improve. Team support on zoom works well, but some sessions must be in the class room.

---

**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?

I set up groups with a mix of gender when possible, avoiding a single woman with an all men crowd which appears to be appreciated.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

To include also the use of flight test data and system identification techniques.