

AH2170/AG2301

Fall semester 2021

Course responsible: Oskar Västberg

Examiner: Anders Karlström

1.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.

Course student representatives were named in the beginning of the course, and course evaluation after the course.

Anonymous course evaluation 2021-11-29 - 2021-12-06

2.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.)

Course representative David Micallef.

It was indicated that many students found the course content difficult. The lectures and the applications of the lectures were modified, as a result of the student feed-back.

3.Course design

Describe briefly the course design, the constructive alignment (intended learning objectives, learning activities, assessment, and how they interact), and the development that has been implemented since last course offering.

The course has been given many years, with the same learning objectives, the same case studies, labs. Some material was added in 2020 and 2021.

However, due to covid, the course was this given on-line. The lectures were recorded and available as video on-line, together with exercises. The lecture experience was, from the course evaluation, lower than previous years.

4.Students' workload

Are the students working to the expected extent in relation to the course credits? If there is a significant difference from the expected, what can be the reason?

This course was given in two different versions, two different programs. The workload per week was very different between the groups.

One program found this course to be very difficult, and reported many more hours than expected, while the other group was less than 20 h/week with a clear margin.

5.Students' results on the course

How have the students succeeded in the course? If there is a significant difference compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

There were considerably more students that received an F at the written examination, than previous years. We believe that this is strongly related to the on-line teaching, without enough interaction with teachers.

6.Students' answers to open questions

What do students say in response to the open questions?

The responses were quite different between the two different groups. In both groups, many students thought that the course was quite difficult, but there were also exceptions.

Some student commented that the exercises (instuderingsuppgifter, new for this course) was very important, and they help very much for the written exam. This is something that should be kept for future years, and could be developed.

7.Summary of students' opinions

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

It is clear that the quality and valuation of lectures has been hampered, given that they were given on-line instead of on-campus.

Many student found the course content difficult. Some struggled with mathematics, some with programming.

8.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 major difference this year was that the lectures were recorded and given on-line. In this course, it seems that this was a serious impediment for learning.

It seems that students this year did not appreciate that the examples given in the course was relevant, perhaps related to the lack of interaction with the teachers this year.

Making the examples vivid, live and interesting for the topic is an important part of lectures and labs, and it should be addressed future year as we are hopefully able to return to the class-rooms.

9.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?

A challenge is always students with different backgrounds, in particular programming and/or mathematics.

10.Prioritized course development

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

Keep and develop exercises (instuderingsuppgifter) in relation to lectures, and highlight their relation to the written examination.

More examples, clarify their relevance.

More exercises classes, instead of lectures.

This is a course in statistical methods. It may be useful to move this examination into a computer class room with access to some software and open books.

Programming is a hurdle to overcome for some students.

Consider, should we continue with Python? In that case, the course AH2307 also should use Python. Another possibility is JASP.

Prune the content, perhaps remove clustering and decision trees.

Make the link between labs and lecture more clear.

11. Other information you want to share

New teachers will be giving this course from fall semester 2022.