

# Report - DD1334 - 2020-01-30

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):**

Florian Pokorny, fpokorny@kth.se

---

## COURSE DESIGN

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

This is the second year that I have been responsible for DD1334. The course has a strong practical component consisting of 3 labs. The labs grade is "A" if completed in time and then decays if deadlines are missed to submission in time and result in the LAB grade for the course. There are also 11 tutorials/exercise sessions where students are able to obtain up to 10 (of 100) bonus points for the exam part of the course (TEN1) - the focus of these tutorials is mostly on some of the more theoretical components of the course and to help with the understanding of that. Since the last iteration of the course, I have reorganized some of the material. For example, some of the technical "syntax" aspects of SQL were not very engaging to discuss during lectures, and this part has instead now been covered in more detail by means of practical exercises in the Labs. I have also put a little more focus on the theory in the exam while practical aspects are examined in the labs.

---

## 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?**

The course has a large continuous assessment component due to the frequent tutorial and 3 lab deadlines that encourages students to spread their workload throughout the semester instead of cramming only for the exam. In a conducted student interview with 3 students the students confirmed that this structure was effective in spreading out the work. The statistics in the survey indicate that the students do approximately spend the required amount of time on the course.

---

## 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?**

An issue, I have observed last year that is still present is that the student-results are somewhat bi-modal as a distribution with one group with excellent results and a second group that was having more difficulties and is not taking the opportunity to gain bonus points by attending the majority of tutorial sessions. For next year, I am considering to double the amount of exam bonus points that students can earn by attending and completing tutorial work to encourage more participation in tutorial sessions for the second group.

---

## 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.**

There is an interesting difference between students in year 1-3 and other students in answering the questionnaire - more senior students and exchange students appeared to be on average more satisfied with all aspects of the course. A reason could be some of the initial difficulties some students face who had little experience with either using a command line prompt or remote shell environment. In future, I am considering to replace the remote KTH database server for the course with a simpler SQLite database to make the transition easier for these students.

---

## 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?
- 

Overall, results are well above neutral opinion (4.0), however one area to improve further could be the way in which we give regular feedback by TAs during tutorial sessions. Keeping a uniform quality of teaching across multiple TAs is a key focus that we will address by more intensive preparation meetings with any new TAs joining the course.

---

## PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

In the short term:

Further improvement to lecture slides: declutter/less material per slide  
Ensure uniform TA experience by providing more detailed instructions to TAs beforehand.

In the longer term:

Consider replacing the remote postgresql database for the course with a local nosql or other simpler to install solution.

---

## OTHER INFORMATION

**Is there anything else you would like to add?**

For more detailed reflections based on the student group interview suggestions, please see the student interview summary document.

---