

# COURSE ANALYSIS, undergraduate course

Second cycle courses, EECS School, KTH , from 2018

---

An asterix (\*) denotes non-compulsory data.

## Course data

Course name: Machine Learning for Media Technology  
Course ID: DM1590  
Credits: 7.5  
Credits per module: 7.5  
Time period for course: VT2022  
Teachers: Bob L. T. Sturm and André Holzapfel  
Examiner: Bob L. T. Sturm  
Classroom hours: Almost twice a week for 2 hours each, five labs  
Nr of registered students: 70  
Examination rate, in %: 100

## Goals

Global course goals:

To train media technology students to work with, develop and evaluate machine learning applications.

How the course design helps to fulfill these goals: Lectures, labs, a group project and written report

## Pedagogical development - I

*Changes made* since previous time course was given:

1. Theoretical lectures will be made more practical, e.g., especially in the unsupervised learning portion.
2. Each 3hr lab session made as two 2hr lab sessions.
3. Pre-requisites reduced to “Programming and Scientific Computing corresponding to DD1318; SF1919 Probability Theory and Statistics; or equivalent”

## Course evaluation; comments from students

Based on the anonymous questionnaire.

Evaluation response rate:  $4/70 = 5.71\%$

Overall student view\*

Positive comments: “det bra att labbarna var uppdelade i mindre deluppgifter.”

” It covered an extremely interesting area within computer science and did a good job of introducing one to the basics of machine learning.”

“Inspirerande och roligt innehåll, lagom nivå svårighetsmässigt.”

Negative comments: Instructions were sometimes unclear. Grading policy was unclear.

Pre-knowledge, comments\*

Course design, comments\*: “it would be much appreciated if there would be examples of previous projects or other examples that shows us what kind of ideas are doable.”

Literature, comments:

Examination, comments: No exam in this course. Final project and presentation in groups of 3-4.

Particularly interesting\* comments: see above

## Course teacher's impressions from the evaluation

Comments: The student observations align with our own as to what changes should be made in the next edition. The impression from the evaluation is that our changes to the course were successful.

## Course teacher's summary

Overall view: The course ran smoothly online. The weekly exercises worked out well. Breaking each lab into two 2-hour sessions worked out well.

Positive comments: Attendance was good throughout the course, even though it was all on-line.

Negative comments: Examples of final projects should be made available.

View on pre-knowledge\*:

View on course design\*:

View on course material: The material is timely and appropriate for the learning objectives. The labs provided hands-on experience.

View on examination: The project quality was by and large high, given the time devoted to that portion.

## Pedagogical development - II

*Outcome of course changes made since last time course was given:*

1. Theoretical lectures will be made more practical, e.g., especially in the unsupervised learning portion. This worked out well.
2. Each 3hr lab session made as two 2hr lab sessions. This worked out well.
3. Pre-requisites reduced to "Programming and Scientific Computing corresponding to DD1318; SF1919 Probability Theory and Statistics; or equivalent" No problems with students.

*Changes to be made before next time course is given:*

1. A few examples of final projects will be posted at the course start.
2. Handwritten notes will be typed up.
3. Details on grading will be made clear.
4. Ask for two students to be ambassadors, acting as intermediary representatives

## Other

Comments\*