Report - DD2380 - 2022-06-06

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

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 invited to a course questionnaire for feedback. The standard KTH course questionnaire LEQ did cover both questions on general course satisfaction and gender and disability.

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 course iteration was held in hybrid remote mode with online lectures and online and in-person options for student consultation hours, presentations, tutorials and labs.

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

The course followed the same design principles as in the previous iteration. The following represents a minor adaption of the design description from the last iteration:

The course is arranged as a series of lectures and three tutorial sessions to deepen the understanding of selected areas. Thanks to the breadth
of AI, several lectures were given by guest lecturers, who are experts in the field (Johan Boye, Gabriel Skantze on Natural Language Processing, Mårten Björkman on Computer Vision, Katie Winkle on AI Ethics/Robotics and Josephine Sullivan on Machine Learning and Tollmar Konrad on an industrial perspective on AI). The rest of the
lectures were given by Jana Tumova, Florian Pokorny and Andre Pereira and focused on topics from three areas: taming uncertainty, problem-solving, knowledge representation and planning.

A criteria-based grading scheme is used with TEN1 1.5hp consisting of a series of 9 online quizzes released after lectures, RAP1, 0.5hp an essay on
ethics and societal aspects of of AI , and LAB1 4hp with 2 programming assignments, and a choice
between an individual pen and paper assignment or an open-ended project on planning in teams of 4 students for higher grades.

The programming assignments are conducted typically in pairs and evaluated in Kattis, and also presented in person to teaching assistants. There is no written exam, the final grade A-F is determined from the grades of LAB1.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

In this iteration of the course the reported work distribution was centered around 15-20h/week which is approx in line with expectation.

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?

The results were in line with past iterations of the course.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students open question answers were mostly positive with students generally enjoying the structure of the course. Some students commented on preferences for classical lectures rather than zoom lectures as we had in this iterations due to the pandemic. The hybrid zoom + physical attendance exercise sessions were also mentioned as not being a totally smooth experience compared to physical attendance.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

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.

This course is in a mature state, having run over several iterations. At this point we plan to only make minor modifications based on feedback.

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 results are quite balanced.

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

Further improvement of the hybrid Zoom/physical attendance setup for the course with gradual return to classical classroom setting after pandemic.