

# Report - SI2400 - 2023-08-16

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):**

Sandhya Choubey, choubey@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 LEQ questionnaire was created for the students after the completion of the course using the standard KTH template. Aspects of gender, disabled students etc were included as per the KTH template and full opportunity was provided to the students to obtain their feedback.

The students were informed about the LEQ via the KTH portal and thereafter it was taken over by the web portal.

---

**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.)**

---

The course included 14 lectures, each 45+45 mins long. Students were encouraged to ask questions during the lectures as well as before and after the lecture. There were 7 seminars, also with 45+45 mins contact time with the students. The purpose of the seminars was to discuss with students and answer student questions.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

---

There were regular lectures and seminars during the course. There were 15 scheduled lectures that were given. There were 7 scheduled seminars that were given. Student queries were also regularly addressed by emails and all efforts were made to clear their doubts. Especially, all queries regarding the homework problems and other grading related matters were attended to. The slides of the lectures were uploaded on canvas.

The evaluation/assessment was done via the following format. Three sets of homework assignment were handed out as part of INL1. The home works were graded according to grades A,B,C,D,E,F,Fx. In order to get passing grade (E or higher), students had to obtain at least 40% on each of the problem sets. There was an oral exam at the end of the course as a part of TEN1. The possible grades for the oral exam was pass or fail. The final grade for students who passed both INL1 and TEN1 was the overall grade obtained by the student in INL1.

The formats for the lectures and seminars were the same as that followed in the past years. The format of the examination was also the same as that followed in the past years

---

**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?**

---

Yes, the students' workload approximately corresponds to the expected level.

---

**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?**

---

Students have performed very well in the course.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

---

Student response not visible.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

---

Student response not visible.

---

**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.**

---

Student response not visible.

---

**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?
- 

Student response not visible.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

The course structure has been very stable. Students might be benefiting less from the seminars. In the next offering of the course, we will try to remove the seminars and see how the students respond to that.

---