



Report - SG2219 - 2019-10-21

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):

Anders Dahlkild, aad@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

Part 1 Laminar compressible boundary layers
6 lectures
1 oral partial exam

Part 2 Thermodynamics for hypersonic applications
5 lectures
1 desk top lab-exercise
1 oral partial exam

Part 3 Propagation of shock waves
6 lectures
1 oral partial 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?

The evaluation is restricted to part 1 of the course because of the low frequency of answers.
The full course corresponds to about 14 hours a week.
4 students spent 6-8 hours or less a week.
2 students spent 12-14 hours a week.

The students do not seem to be overloaded.

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?

They performed very well. Grades are all quite good.



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 evaluation is restricted to part 1 of the course because of the low frequency of answers.

The number of students that answered are too low to make any statistical conclusions.

The general outcome from those who answered are good.

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 differences in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?

- international and national students?

- students with or without disabilities?

The evaluation is restricted to part 1 of the course because of the low frequency of answers.

"21. I was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others (n)"

was a little weaker, due to one student's answer.

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?

The evaluation is restricted to part 1 of the course because of the low frequency of answers.

The students were overall quite satisfied with the teacher.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Possibly activation of students between lectures (homework assignments).
