Report - DD2380 - 2021-05-05

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):
Iolanda Leite, iolanda@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.

A criteria-based grading scheme is used with TEN1 2hp consisting of a series of 9 online quizzes released after lectures, and an essay on ethics and risks of AI (with individual reflection and a team discussion part), and LAB1 4hp with 2 programming assignments, and an individual pen and paper assignment. There is no written exam, the final grade A-F is determined from the grades of LAB1.

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.)

In addition to the lectures and tutorial sessions, students met with the teaching team during consultation sessions (mostly about the lab and pen&paper assignments) and during the presentation sessions for obtaining their Lab grades. We also have discussion forums that are quite active and student can of course email the course teachers.

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 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 and Gabriel Skantze on Natural Language Processing, Danica Kragic on Robotics, Mårten Björkman on Computer Vision, and Josephine Sullivan on Machine Learning). 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. The programming assignments are conducted typically in pairs, in C++ or Java, evaluated in Kattis, and also presented in-person to teaching assistants.

This year, Iolanda Leite was the course responsible. Some minor improvements were introduced also to the programming assignments, for example, the list of questions asked by the TAs for evaluation was revised. The essay assignment also followed the same format as in previous course rounds, with individual reflection and a team discussion.

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?

There was large variability in the reported students' workload, but the majority reported to work 21-23h/week or lower. The differences might happen because of the fact that students can choose which grade their aim for in the Lab assignments and adjust their time commitment accordingly.

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 students who passed did approximately as well as the year before. When compared to the results from vT-19 (which is the more similar course round in terms of the type of students who register) there were no significant differences.

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

The course was in general well received and most student feedback was positive. Nevertheless, there were two recurring aspects that we should try to improve in the next round:

1. The course workload was not very well balanced among the different weeks because some lab assignments are way more challenging than others.
2. Some students were not happy with the way tutorial sessions were organised and suggested improvements for A3 (pen&paper exercise).

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.

Different students highlighted different components of the course as the "best aspect" (e.g. specific labs, quizzes, the broad coverage of the course, etc.) which suggests that there are several positive aspects of this course.
One interesting aspect of the survey was that the more negative feedback was from students who reported dedicating fewer hours per week to the course. This could have happened because they felt not motivated to dedicate their time or, as a consequence of that, did not take full advantage of all the offered components (lectures, tutorials, etc.) to end up finding the course more rewarding -- as the students who reported to work the recommended number of hours per week seemed to find.

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?

It is difficult to draw strong conclusions because the response rate of the survey was quite low (only 14 answers out of 114 registered students).

Regarding gender, one student who identified as female seemed to appreciate the fact that there were several other female students in the course, unlike many other courses she attended before.

Because this course round especially has many international students, it seems that their integration was not an issue, from statements such as "The whole course was in English, so I had no problem at all regarding my condition of international", and "There were a lot of exchange students and we knew each other from the international reception. That was very helpful when it came to group works".

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

Short term:
- Develop new lab assignments with a more balanced workload;
- Include more training sessions for the TAs who deliver tutorial sessions.

Long-term:
- Improve and update lecture content.