Report - DD2438 - 2022-09-07

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):
Petter Ögren, petter@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 standard online course evaluation form was used (from the same webpage as this course analysis).
The form enables separation based on gender etc.

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.)
We had meetings with the students every week of the course, to give feedback on their progress.

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 a project course with pass/fail grades. It is examined through 4 project assignments that are being presented both orally and in a written report. For all assignments there is also a competition among the students to enable them to see benefits/drawbacks of different approaches.

For assignments 1-3 we use the freely available tool Unity3D.
The setup of the assignments are updated and improved each year.

The biggest change from 2021 to 2022 was that the number of students increased from 28 to 50. To handle this we had some sessions in parallel with the TA handling one and the course responsible handling the other session.

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?
A 15-credit course running over 2 periods, which corresponds to a nominal workload of 20h/week. The median response in the course evaluation is 24-26h/week which is reasonable.

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?
As of September 2022, the number of students that passed the course are 45, out of the 50 that started. This outcome is good.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?
Some quotes from the course evaluation:
The course takes a lot of time if you want to win, but it's worth it.
The learning process is challenging and rewarding. We can always find some methods to improve our strategies, which can improve our ability on solving multi-agent problems.
I think this is the most fun course I have taken in my four years at kth. I liked how we got to try our own ideas from reading papers and how differently people then solved the assignments. I also really liked that we got to work with different people for each assignment, which I initially thought would be a bad thing.
The whole course was great but the best aspect was the competition style of the presentations since you could see a lot of different approaches.
Maybe reduce the assignment with 5 tasks to 4, since it was quite stressful to get done in time

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.
Overall the students are happy with the course. They like the unusual format and the freedom of choosing their own approach to solving the problem.
Some students find it a bit stressful, and some student would prefer another programming language than C#.

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 works well.
Throughput is good. Feedback is positive. Workload is reasonable. The quality of the final reports are in many cases very high.

The continuous updates of the assignment seems to be working well.
But there are still areas that can be improved upon for next year.

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, the learning environment is working very well.
All rated items had an average above 5.5, and more than half of them above 6.5 on a scale from 1 (worst) - 7 (best).

There were no students with disabilities (at least according to the course evaluation responses).
Swedish students were slightly more positive regarding items 10-11 (learning from examples and key concepts) and 20-21 (influence and collaboration), whereas international students were slightly more positive regarding 13-15 and 18 (feedback and reflection).
Gender differences were very small.

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

We will continue to develop the assignments.
There was some difficulty in running the code of other students in some of the competitions. We will investigate approaches to make this smoother.

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?

If the number of students continue to grow we might need to have 3 sessions in parallel.