

Report - DD2380 - 2024-06-04

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.

We used the standard LEQ questionnaire that included average response per gender and average response per 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.)

During the course I and other lecturers interacted with students mainly in lectures which allowed me to directly address any questions or concerns and maintain a line of communication with the class. In addition, a dedicated team of Teaching Assistants (TAs) was also available to students. The TAs held consultation hours, led tutorial and lab sessions, and addressed students' questions. Regular meetings between myself and the TA team ensured we were aligned and responsive to students' needs and feedback.

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 course is arranged as a series of lectures and four 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, Josephine Sullivan on Machine Learning and Robert Matilla from SEBx on an industrial perspective on AI). The rest of the lectures were given by Jana Tumova, Iolanda Leite 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 AI, and LAB1 4hp with 3 programming assignments, and an individual assignment on planning and logic.

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 there 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 12-20h/week which is in line with the expectation. Some weeks and assignments were reported more time-consuming than others, in particular, the HMM assignment (as it was reported also in last years).

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 performance on the course remains consistent with previous rounds.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students appreciate especially the breadth of the covered topics, the guest lectures, and the assignments. Some concrete suggestions for future improvements include more detailed slides, more alignment between quiz questions and lectures, and complexity of requirements for higher grades. As in the previous rounds, students recommend their peers to start on the assignment early on.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Overall, the students are positive about the course with average responses to 6 LEQ statements between 5.2 and 6.6 and 4 of these statements above 6. Positive impressions from the course were also presented at the ML program link meeting, where majority of the students come from.

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.

Overall, the course feels well-established, well-functioning and rewarding both for the teaching team and the students. We believe that minor changes that have been introduced helped to mildly raise the average response in most of the LEQ statements compared to last year HT23 P1.

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?
-

Stronger areas in the learning environment are tied to the course content, working with interesting issues and being fairly graded. Weaker ones relate to feedback and support (for both of these categories, the average response is still above 5 though).

Gender: The data provided indicate a slight difference in the course experience between students identifying as female or male. This year, female students appear to have a slightly higher appreciation of the course.

International/National students: The available data indicates that international exchange students had lower appreciation of the course.

Students with/without disabilities: The data provided also shows that students with disabilities reported lower average response to LEQ statements relating to collaboration and support. Going forward, we will improve communication about opportunities for students with disabilities in collaboration with Funka.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- Continual course content update
 - Enhanced support and feedback
-