

# Report - DD2480 - 2022-06-15

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):**

Cyrille Artho, artho@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 for the course evaluation, with the key six questions selected. We chose a small number of questions because the response rate to the LEQ has been rather low in the recent past.

---

**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 have not arranged formal meeting this year, but we have discussed the course content with students who joined the lab support sessions in person. This probably results in some self-selection bias, as some groups did not attend the support sessions in person or at all.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

The course has eight lectures that give the key knowledge needed to complete it. The practical learning happens in the labs, where students complete four mini-projects and present them (as a demonstration). We have two four-hour lab sessions for the first mini-project and three four-hour lab sessions for the remaining mini-projects, to ensure that the students get enough support and feedback. The last four-hour slot for each project is reserved for the demonstrations. Students can improve their submission after the presentation, and only the final submission is graded.

The main changes in the course offering was to add more material on communication, collaboration, and team building, in an effort to foster more effective collaboration in "difficult" groups that sometimes happen due to the random group allocation. We still have many more groups that are happy with their random groups than those (few) that are unhappy.

---

**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?**

We have only got a response rate of 18.5 % for the LEQ. The median effort is 20 hours per week, which was the desired course load.

However, there are students who indicated an effort of 30 hours per week. This is in line with past years.

Perhaps this was due to remote teaching or the ambition of the groups to achieve an "A" grade, which was typically possible and predictable as the grading criteria for "A" are very clear and can be achieved with higher effort and more learning.

---

**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?**

Like in 2021, most of the students got high grades (A and B). There were not quite as many "A"s as in the past, perhaps due to the challenges in hybrid teaching. Groups were free to choose how to collaborate, remotely or in person, and the only mandatory attendance was a short presentation slot. We do not have data on how the way of working (remote or in-person) impacted the grades, though.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

The experience depends heavily on the group composition. We used random groups to avoid giving an advantage to students who are well-connected, and to create diverse teams.

In a few cases, the random group assignments did not work well (as in past years), but overall, the feedback for this is positive, with a few groups that had a negative experience.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

The key points from the questionnaire are:

- \* The course organization was good overall but some of the assignments can be more streamlined.
- \* The advance videos and recorded lectures worked well.
- \* The Essence of software engineering material was helpful in the light-weight way it was integrated in the course.
- \* A few groups had difficulties collaborating effectively, with some students expecting others to do most of the work.

---

**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.**

The overall course structure works well, although the assignments are quite fast-paced, so we will look into slightly reducing ancillary tasks where possible.

---

**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?

Female students sometimes felt in the minority in a group, but that is inevitable given the randomized group settings. We could not observe significant differences between different student groups.

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

For 2023, we will make the following changes:

- \* review and streamline assignments and templates again;
- \* explain the rationale behind some assignment items more;
- \* have two distinct group allocations in the first and second half of the course, to minimize the impact of the few problematic group allocations that can happen.

The last change will be evaluated against the current course setup, to decide whether continue with this or revert to keeping the groups throughout the course. It may alleviate problems in a few groups that do not work well together, although it causes the groups to have to organize themselves again, and may provide an "easy way out" in case of conflicts that could otherwise be resolved.

---

**OTHER INFORMATION**

**Is there anything else you would like to add?**

---

There is still some "Zoom fatigue" for lectures and group meetings, and hopefully this will be mostly gone in 2023. We plan to go back to on-campus lectures, even though we will of course still let students choose how to hold their internal group meetings.

---