

Report - DD2380 - 2023-07-12

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):

Jana Tumova, tumova@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.

The students were offered to give opinion through the LEQ questionnaire generated on KTH social.

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.)

The students met with the TAs during presentation sessions. They were also encouraged to use the discussion forum on Canvas to ask questions.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course is arranged as a series of lectures and three tutorial sessions to deepen understanding of selected areas. Thanks to the breadth of AI, several lectures were given by guest lecturers, who are experts in the field (such as Josephine Sullivan on Machine Learning, Johan Boye on Natural Language Processing, Gabriel Skanze on Speech Recognition, Mårten Björkman on Computer Vision). The rest of the lectures were given by Jana Tumova and Iolanda Leite and focused on topics from three areas: taming uncertainty, problem solving, knowledge representation and planning.

A criteria-based grading scheme is used with TEN2 1.5hp consisting of a series of 9 online quizzes released after lectures, an RAP1 0.5hp essay on ethics and risks of AI (with individual reflection and a team discussion part), and LAB1 4ph with 3 programming assignments and an additional assignment on planning. The programming assignments are conducted typically in pairs, in Python, and also presented to a teaching assistants. There is no written exam, the final grade A-F is determined from the grades of LAB1. This year, the main changes included a brand new set of programming exercises. The lecture topics were updated and the quizzes were revised.

Due to Covid, the lectures were held over zoom and recorded for later viewing. Tutorials were offered both on-site and over zoom. The presentations were held virtually.

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 reported students' workload varied quite a lot. Compared to last rounds, it corresponds a little bit more to the expected level, which may be due to the change in the assignments. To a large extent, the students have a choice on how ambitious they want to be with their programming assignments, so the varying workload is not surprising.

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?

Similarly as in the previous years, approx. 80% of students fully completed the course by the end of the re-examination period. More students than before managed to score A for which a demanding project was needed before.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

In general, the students appreciate the assignments. They ask for a bit more complexity in the assignment on reinforcement learning. They also point out some hurdles in formulations of the assignments, practicalities, and organization of the presentations, which will be addressed. They generally advise other students to start on the programming assignments early on.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The course seem to be well received and the students found it interesting, for details see above.

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 course is on a good track, the change of the assignments was meaningful and will be fine-tuned in future years.

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?
-

The strongest points are working with interesting issues, that the grading was fair and that they could collaborate. Learning and evaluating through the programming assignments seems to be a good choice. This is however associated with weaker points -- receiving feedback without being graded and getting support if needed. This is an indication that we may need to offer consultation hours with TAs. The average response per gender showed slightly higher evaluation in point 22 - I was able to get support if I needed it, by men than by women; however, the written comments mention that no difference in experiences for the two genders were perceived. Point 22 received also lower evaluation from students with disability, which is something we will look more into in future years. Slightly better evaluation was received from international students than Swedish ones in years 4-5.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Introducing consultations.

Fine-tuning the assignments.

Updating the content of the lectures to the newest development.
