Report - SF2822 - 2019-08-23

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):

Anders Forsgren, andersf@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course covers nonlinear programming. The course is based on projects, where students get training in modeling and analysis of practical problems, in addition to lectures and tutorials, where students get understanding of theory and methods. The second project is optionally an implementation project. This is the same setup as last year.

The group sizes for the project groups were two or three persons and the groups were selected by me. The projects are presented at a particular lecture. This presentations lecture is devoted to discussion between students. First, students having worked on the same project sat together and discussed. As a second part of the lecture, students having worked on different projects sat together and discussed, three persons in each group. In addition, we have the "follow-up" discussions with the groups after the presentation lectures.

As earlier years I used laptop and project as support for the teaching. This gives a "skeleton" of the course material. The slides are written using LaTeX. By the laptop I could also illustrate some example problems by using GAMS and Matlab.

David Ek was teaching assistant for the first time in this course.

THE STUDENT'S 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?

Counting for ten weeks and 7.5 credits would give 20 hours per week. Several students report a workload which is less, 12-14 hours a week would be the median. I think that the students think about the projects even when they do not work actively with them, so the workload i slightly higher.

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?

The results on the exam was good. First exam, in May, had 29 pass and 8 failed, out of 37. The second exam, in August, had 5 pass and 3 failed out of 8. The trend of two groups, one that does very well, and one that almost fails or fails, that has been observed earlier years is present also this year.

The setup of the course is such that it suits students who want to take the course. I think this is valid for an advanced master course. It seems, however, that there is a group of students who are not that interested. The course being compulsory for some students is not something I prefer.

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

The overall impression of the learning environment is good. This is in line with previous years.

The number of students having handed in the course evaluation is, however, quite low.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

Collaboration and support get high marks. I think this is due to the setup of the projects and the way we give feedback. Some students are not happy with the way the project groups are set up, since they do not have freedom to choose their group mates. I understand their point of view, but think there is an overall benefit of doing it the way it is done.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

There was less comments written than usual. Not so specific advice.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should primarily be developed? How could these aspects be developed in the short or long term?

New projects are always useful.

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?

I enjoy giving this course. In general, I think it works well. David Ek is a good teaching assistant.

One student complains about schedule clash with SF2955. I will pass this on to the program responsible for applied and computational mathematics.