

Course analysis, SF2739, Autumn 2023

Course evaluation process

There was a questionnaire at the end of the course. The outcome of this questionnaire was then discussed in a course meeting with student representatives (one man and one woman).

Course design

The course consisted of 14 two hour lectures and 14 one hour tutorials. In addition to this, there was one project which was handed in in writing and which was also presented orally. The examination consisted of two oral exams.

Teachers

The course was divided into two parts. In the first part, the lectures were given by Pavel Kurasov (SU) and the tutorials were given by Christian Emmel (SU). In the second part of the course, the lectures were given by Hans Ringström (KTH) and the tutorials were given by Rasmus Johansen Jouttijärvi (KTH)

Students

There were 24 students, of which 17 took both the oral exams and handed in projects. In the latter group, all students passed. The division of the grades was: 5 A's; 6 B's; 3 C's; 1 D; and 2 E's.

Summary of the course evaluation

Only seven out of 24 students answered the questionnaire. They seemed overall happy with the course. However, they did not seem to spend the expected 10 hours per week on the course. Among the suggestions of what to improve, the following appeared: More applications; not good when lectures go over time. Comments from the course meeting: Connect the two parts better; more applications; publish the projects earlier; good with oral exams.

Suggestion for changes

The lecturers were only informed a week or so before the beginning of the course that they were supposed to share the course. It would be good to be informed of this earlier so that the two lecturers could coordinate and plan the course together. This would then also mean coordinating the grading scheme, deciding on whether there should be homework problems or not, publishing the projects at the same time etc.