

Report - SK2551 - 2024-04-25

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 course evaluation send out to students after the course.

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.)

Personal discussions with course participants.

COURSE DESIGN

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

Second year with the new 7,5 hp version of the course with homework problems, workshop, lab seminars and oral exam.
Guest lecture on x-ray technology for sustainability which was highly appreciated.

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?

Only two out of 23 students answered the evaluation so I don't see any feedback.

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?

Everybody passed the course who started.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Only two out of 22 students answered the evaluation so I don't see any feedback.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Only two out of 23 students answered the evaluation so I don't see any feedback.

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.

Record number of participants since the course was first given 15 years ago. Good mix between international and KTH students. Level of presentation was lower than average, as well as the attendance to the lectures.

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?

Only two out of 23 students answered the evaluation so I don't see any feedback.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The future of the lab is a major concern since the access to in-house lab x-ray imaging systems is insecure. Discussion with Excillum AB started if students can do the lab at the companies facilities. This might be a good opportunity for both the students and the company. Activity of the students in the first introductory part of the course is hard to judge, students copy the answers of the homework problems from each other. The access to ChatGPT doesn't make it easier either. A major change is needed so that the homework problems actually serve its goal, that students review and work with the material presented in the lectures. A possible solution might be short oral exams for home questions, a system tested successfully in some basic physics courses. This is something I want to test next year.