

Report - SF1861 - 2024-10-03

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):

Per Enqvist, penqvist@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 standard LEQ was sent out to all students.

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.)

I requested volunteers for a student evaluation board but got only one representative, from CFATE.

We had some issues with the setup of the first home assignment examination, and then I set up a meeting where 5-6 students showed up.

There was also email conversations and discussion forum exchange during the course.

Since the course is given in period 4, there is no good time to arrange a meeting after the results of the QED is returned.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course offers 15 lectures, 8 exercise classes, with traditional format.

There were two obligatory home assignments. Passing the home assignments means passing the HEM1 part of the examination.

For each HA there were a number of preparation problems the students could do in Matlab grader to practice how to formulate the problems mathematically, solving optimization problems with software, and check their solutions. This was done in pairs and they were allowed to discuss with other groups.

Then we had examination in computer class-rooms where the students got similar, slightly modified, problems to solve in matlab grader.

If they failed, or wanted to improve their score, they could redo the test at a backup time.

Their score also generated bonus points for the exams of this year.

The TEN1 part was examined using a classical written exam.

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?

Most report a reasonable workload

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?

137 out of 175 passed the ordinary exam (78%), and 35 out of 64 passed the re-exam (55%)

Similar to previous years, a bit lower than usual for the re-exam.

17 failed the HEM1, but I do not know how many of those did not finish the course.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Some thinks it too easy and not deep enough, and some thinks there are too much proofs.

Several thinks there are too much "power point presentations" in the lectures.

But they think the lectures were better live than on old videos (which were 100% slides)

Too much linear algebra.

Dislike of the new computer examination of the home assignments. Mostly based on the issues we had on the first test which had some form that worked well for the practice run, but did not transfer well to the test situation.

But several students state that they learned a lot from the problems and that it worked much better after we did some modifications to the format.

A few complained about not being able to finish the HEM1 part after the course. They had the back-up tests as a second chance, and setting up computer tests at more occasions would be too much work.

Since I am teaching 3 courses per year and supervising KEX and MEX it has become infeasible to allow students to hand in reports after the course finished as I have done before.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

See previous question

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 implementation of the new home assignment examination came with some issues, but with the modifications we applied after the first test it worked quite well. It would require some more tuning before it is working as I want.

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?

The EOQ setup did not differentiate the results according to student groups.

The office hours were not used by many students, but those who attended were very positive.

Some students said there was little connection between the problems in the HA and the questions on the exam. However, the point of having the HA was to test what is not suited for the on paper solutions at the written exam. I pointed this out at the lectures, but those who studied the videos from previous years would have missed this info.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

There is a wide range of the programming background of the students, and some have not used Matlab before. We should make an introduction to using the software to solve simple problems, in the format of an exercise or a video guide implementing a problem that could help nonexperienced users to get started.
