

Report - SF1677 - 2022-06-21

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):

Hans Ringström, hansr@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.

At an early stage in the course, two student representatives volunteered to be members of the "kursnämnd". There were two meetings between the examiner and the kursnämnd: one in the exam period between periods 3 and 4, and one after the course finished. In addition, there was a kursenkät after the end of the course. Unfortunately, only 5 out of 43 students answered the kursenkät. For this reason there were not enough answers to obtain statistics pertinent to issues such as gender and disabilities.

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.)

See above.

COURSE DESIGN

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

There were four homework problems (corresponding to the first four problems on the exam) and a written exam (consisting of eight problems). This format is the same as last time the course was given.

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?

Since only 5 out of 43 students answered the kursenkät, it is hard to draw any strong conclusions.

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?

28 students wrote the exam. 22 students passed and 6 students received an F. More specifically, the division into grades was as follows: 5 A:s, 8 B:s, 6 C:s, 1 D, 2 E:s and 6 F:s. Of the students writing the exam, the number of F:s was larger than last year: 12,5% F:s last year compared with 21% F:s this year. On the other hand, if you consider the number of students that passed divided by the total number of students, it was 47% passing last year and 51% passing this year. For this reason, it is hard to draw any strong conclusions.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Unfortunately, there were not many answers.

1. What was the best aspect of the course? One answer: Våldigt rolig och spännande kurs! Innehållet känns genomtänkt och speglar boken väldigt bra.
2. What would you suggest to improve? One answer: Svårt att hinna göra hela tentan men det är lite av charmen! Det kanske hade varit trevligt med texade lösningsförslag till inlämningar/ övingar.
3. What advice would you like to give to future participants? One answer: Läs boken noga och fokusera på att förstå koncepten.

On the other hand, all the answers were from the same person. It is therefore not so clear how much can be deduced from the answers.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Since only 5 out of 43 students answered the kursenkät, it is hard to draw any strong conclusions.

Comments at the meetings: The students found that solving the homework problems was very time consuming. They appreciated the feedback on the homework. However, they would like to have suggested solutions. An additional comment was that it is important for the examiner to keep in mind that some of the students have not taken a course on differential equations.

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.

Unfortunately, there was not that much feedback from the students. However, the structure of the course seems to have worked well.

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?
-

Again, there were not enough answers to be able to draw strong conclusions on this point.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The structure of the course has been developed over several years. The current format seems to be appreciated by the students and works well from the point of view of the examiner. However, since the number of students is increasing, it is not reasonable to spend as much time correcting homework as was done this time. It will therefore be necessary to, for example, choose half of the homework problems randomly after the deadline and correct only those.
