



Report - DD1334 - 2017-12-05

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):

John Folkesson, johnf@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course consists of 11 lectures, 11 recitations, 3 labs, and a group assignment.
There were no major changes made to the course setup this year.

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?

It seems the students did work close to the expected number of hours with some variation. Some worked more and some less. The expected number of hours per week is 16 which is right at the peak in the reported hours histogram. There is a second peak however at 7 hours which perhaps matches the performance curve on the exam. There was a similar distribution of grades with two peaks at C and at F. The general feedback was that the course could be made harder.

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?

There were many more students that got A and B on the exam and many more that passed as well. There were also students that did not seem to learn.
Notice that the 170 students on the automatic stats is fantasy as is the 140 students. There were 128 students that did the labs and that number is more like the number to use when computing the pass rate. The other numbers include people that were not really taking the course.

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?

The polar charts seem to show a generally positive experience.

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?

No alarms in the polar plots



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?

The labs and project seem to be liked and some would have wanted more of this. The lectures can be tiresome which I am aware of. It is partly that there is a lot of details of SQL and XQuery to get through. Overall I do try to minimize this.

One student liked my more open lecture where I left the bounds of the book to talk more in general about current topics in databases.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

I feel that the course is as good as it will be in its current form but that we should consider changing the syllabus to include less on SQL and XML and more on more current topics such as Data Science. This is the plan for next year.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Next year there will be a new teacher for this course.

There seems to be no place here for attaching the kursnämnd protocol. Here is what it said:

DD1334 Student feedback
Protocol from Course board meeting on 20171122

Present:
John Folkesson
Jacob Malmberg

Takeaways

The course survey had too few respondents (27). This makes it less informative. One could make the last exercise session mandatory and have the students do the survey there.

The course was too easy as one can see by the number of hours spent per week. The survey shows about 10 hours on average when 16 should be spent.

Lab 2 was in particular far too easy. It might be good to have parts that were harder and optional for a higher grade.

For the recitation sessions many left after earning the bonus during the first hour. (an observation)

The project was good. It brought all the parts of the course together. One should vary the topic each year and post it on-line earlier.

It would be good if the project was graded and became the main basis for a higher grade with the exam perhaps bringing one to E or C level only.

Book was good and one could learn from it without lectures.

The lectures had too many slides that went by too fast.

In general the content was good.

The topic on stored procedures felt pretty pointless and perhaps did not deserve any HW on it. On the other hand functional dependency could have more time devoted to it.

Course data 2018-09-17

DD1334 - Database Technology, HT 2017

Course facts

Course start:	2017 w.35
Course end:	2017 w.43
Credits:	6,0
Examination:	LABA - Laboratory Assignments, 3.0, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F TEN1 - Examination, 3.0, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Florian Pokorny <fpokorny@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	John Folkesson <johnf@kth.se>
Teachers:	John Folkesson <johnf@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	140
Total number of registered:	170

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate¹ [%]	76.40%
Performance rate² [%]	84.60%
Grade distribution³ [%, number]	A 24% (26) B 28% (30) C 29% (31) D 19% (20)

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students