



Report - SK1105 - 2018-11-26

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):

Ulrich Vogt, Carlota Canalias

COURSE DESIGN

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

New this year:

Quizzes for all labs, short weekly lab reports after every lab

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?

Majority spent 6-8 hours, like last year. Some more students at 9- 11 hours, so a trend towards a higher workload probably because of weekly reports.

Even with this workload, students do not come up to 80 hours (4 hp). Nevertheless, some complains about high workload and a large spread in the answers.

To summarise, workload seems to be on an acceptable 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?

All students that continued with the course to the end passed, same result as last year.

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?

Rather strong agreement with the statements (LEQ 6), but a bit lower for meaningfulness. Feedback (15) one point lower for men answers.

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?

Weakest agreement for question (4), if the course was challenging. In line with the idea of the course design for a first basic lab course.

Strongest agreement for question (21) collaboration, must be seen as a consequence of the group work. 3 students in one group works fine.



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?

Weekly lab reports needs faster feedback, and for some labs clearer instructions what should be included.

Check lab instructions for language and clarity.

Some complains about preparation material. Not always relevant, since there are pedagogical ideas behind the structure.

Quizzes seen negative by some, same as above.

Better instructions for final report.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Instructions for lab report should be developed, maybe as a separate module/seminar.

Better handling of weekly reports, feedback should come before next lab.

Course data 2018-11-26

SK1105 - Experimental Physics, HT 2018

Course facts

Course start:	2018 w.35
Course end:	2018 w.43
Credits:	4,0
Examination:	RED1 - Presentation, 2.0, Grading scale: P, F RED2 - Presentation, 2.0, Grading scale: P, F
Grading scale:	P, F

Staff

Examiner:	Ulrich Vogt <uvogt@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Ulrich Vogt <uvogt@kth.se>
Teachers:	Carlota Canalias Gomez <ccg@kth.se> Marcin Swillo <marcin@kth.se> Ulrich Vogt <uvogt@kth.se> Anna Burvall <at@kth.se> Martin Viklund <bmw@kth.se> Ying Fu <fu@kth.se> Jonas Sellberg <jonassel@kth.se>

Assistants:

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	0
Total number of registered:	126

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate ¹ [%]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>
Performance rate ² [%]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>
Grade distribution ³ [%, number]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students