Report - SK2551 - 2023-04-25

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, uvogt@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.

LEQ questionnaire sent to all students, individual discussions after oral exam

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

See course-memo. New version of the course for 7,5 hp including both lab and workshop.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

Workload in line with the course credits.

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?

Results in line with previous years, 100% pass rate and good grades.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

I really liked the examination format where we got to prepare a presentation and then have an oral exam about our topic!
Interesting materials, the course was delivered in a variety of ways (lecture, laboratory work, seminar, workshop) which gave the students not only new knowledge about X-ray physics but also valuable skills such as presentation and teamwork.
Perhaps a little more guidance on the workshop - maybe take one lecture two/three weeks after the workshop to answer questions and see how everyone is doing.
None, everything was perfect.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Very positive feedback, although only 4 out of 18 students answered. Not a single negative comment.
Lack of answers must be seen positive.

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.

Transition from 6 to 7,5 hp worked out as planned.
Workshop as a new examination moment needs small adjustments, as mentioned in one comment.

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?

All learning experiences score similarly high.
Not enough data to look into certain students groups.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

Improve workshop.
Change some homework problems which are easy to answer using chat-gpt.
Guidance on how to use chat-gpt during beamtime proposal writing.