Report - DD2480 - 2024-05-27

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.

Learning evaluation questionnaire (LEQ), discussions with students, comments from PROSAMM (reflections on courses and tracks).

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.)

Discussions during lab sessions with students who wanted to share their feedback.

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

Combination of:
- Self-learning (short videos giving guidance, reading materials, sometimes short quizzes).
- Lectures and discussions.
- Mini-projects (as supervised labs).
- Mini-presentations/demonstrations (of assignment in progress).

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?

According to the LEQ, yes. One student reported a much higher workload, but many others a slightly lower one, so on average, the workload is/was as expected.

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?

Yes, the rate of completion was high as in past years.
We always have a lot of students who sign up but then do not take the course, so we cannot give exact statistics.
A very small number of students may also discontinue the course and resume it next year.

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

Overall positive opinion. The random group composition is controversial (as in past years), but we believe it fits the course content best and gives students from different Bachelor's programmes or exchange students equal chances.

Some students would have preferred one large project instead of mini-projects, but we want this course to be different from a similar third-year Bachelor's-level course, so we keep the assignments short and focused.

Some students with different backgrounds struggled with basic tools, so we will add a small self-study module for Week 1 for next year.

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.

We did not change much for 2023, and we plan slightly larger changes for 2024:

- A self-study module for Week 1 for students who have very little experience with git.

- A few mini-assignments to be done in person as a way to improve the final course grade by one (in case at least one regular assignment has not been completed with distinction). The assignments will not be available outside the lectures, in order to encourage attendance.

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?

- Some international students (or perhaps students from different study programmes in Sweden as well) do not have the full technical prerequisites. They have taken an equivalent course as stated in the prerequisites, but their course was very theoretical and did not impart the necessary skills to carry out work in a real development environment.

- Students commended the video material, but this results in lower in-person attendance.

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

1. Week 1: Self-study materials for students on git usage who need it. Because all the work is done in groups and we cannot create groups before Week 2 (when the course sign-up closes), we can slightly increase the workload in Week 1 for some of the students.
- git branching and merging.
- conflict resolution.
- Using patch and diff.

2. Entire course (after Week 1): Create 7 mini-assignments (ca. 5 minutes) that students do during the lecture. A complete solution to all or all but one of them can be counted as an extra grading point, in cases where students would not get an "A" grade with the regular assignments otherwise.
In exchange, the extra work in the final group assignment for an extra point can be dropped; the final assignment is not easy to split into extra tasks, and this feature has not been used much.