Report - DD2443 - 2016-06-07

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):

Mads Dam, mfd@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

The 15/16 course round had 15 2-hour lectures, twice weekly, 7 2-hour exercise sessions 2-hour, 4 seminar sessions, 2 hours. Main examination through a half hour oral exam in the January examination period, after the end of the course. All lectures and exercise sessions given by myself. Obligatory to hand in one exercise (1) per week, this was tightened from previous year to help ensure that students are up to date, but it did not do the job and needs to be revised further in 16/17. At seminar sessions students presented research papers. Presentation was obligatory and graded F/G/VG, and a VG grade would up the exam grade one notch. This course component worked well and should be kept in 16/17. The oral exam worked well.

THE STUDENT'S 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?

Students workload was in the lower end judging from the questionnaire. No doubt this is due to the weak hand-in requirements and the examination form.

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?

Grade distribution and overal performance as expected. Pass ratio 65,4 % due surely to students postponing work to the christmas holiday.

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

The polar diagram is not available as I write this. As I recall there were no major unexpected results. Most students found the course highly worthwhile and relevant.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

The polar diagram is not available as I write this.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

The polar diagram is not available as I write this.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Some steps of improvement to be implemented for the 16/17 version:

1. Important to introduce some form of continuous work requirements, as is standard in most other courses. For this I am planning to introduce 4-5 larger handins, examine these orally, and drop the final exam. This should help ensure that students are in line with the course and better increase and distribute the workload.

2. More practical small lab-like exercises should be introduced.

3. The final part of the course on distributed algorithms should be revised. Parts of the material is hard to grasp for the students and better exercises should be identified.

4. Consider adding an exercise on practical systems dimensioning to lecture 1.

5. Model and analysis techniques should be covered more comprehensively in the early part of the course, to make students more comfortable with reasoning. Consider adding a lecture or two on verification, with an accompanying lab. This, however, will require that other material is dropped, maybe one of the lectures on Byzantine fault tolerance (?)

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

That's all

Kursdata 2016-12-16

DD2443 - Parallella och distribuerade beräkningar, HT 2015 pardis15

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2015 v.45
Kursen slutar:	2016 v.3
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	TEN1 - Tentamen, 7,5, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Mads Dam <mfd@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Mads Dam <mfd@kth.se>
Lärare:	
Assistenter:	

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	26
Totalt registrerade:	26

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad[1] [%]	65.40%
Prestationsgrad[2] [%]	65.40%
Betygsfördelning[3] [%, antal]	A 41% (7) B 18% (3) C 24% (4) D 18% (3)

1 Andel godkända studenter
2 Andel avklarade poäng
3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter