

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: VT2023
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: 78
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. A few examples of final projects were posted at the course start.
2. Handwritten notes were typed up.
3. Details on grading were made more clear.
4. Asked for two students to be ambassadors, who acted as intermediary representatives

Course evaluation; comments from students

Based on the anonymous questionnaire.

Evaluation response rate: $3/78 = 3.85\%$

Overall student view*

Positive comments: The best aspects of the course were "The project and the "skitsnack"

Negative comments: "Working with the project was interesting and the labs were sometimes stimulating. The lectures did not motivate a lot to study most of the time."

Pre-knowledge, comments*

Course design, comments*: "Make the quizzes pass or fail, open the quiz on Friday but move the deadline to Sunday. If necessary, make it so that once the quiz is opened, the student has X amount of time to complete it. This means that people who want can submit the quiz earlier can do so and those who have the habit of not studying on a Friday can instead do it on the weekend. Start with the project earlier as it teaches a lot and more time to work with it would be fun. "

"I feel like there was no practise without being graded. Even the quizzes were graded with

they should not be in my opinion. “

”One TA per 15+ people or so for a lab session is too little. Hard to get help and ask for questions when needed.”

Literature, comments:

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

Particularly interesting* comments:

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 back in person. Hybrid lectures were delivered, and attendance online was good too.

Positive comments: Attendance was good throughout the course.

Negative comments: A few students have strange expectations over grading, i.e., that some components of the course should not be graded. If exercises are made P/F, but group projects are graded, then how can individual grades be given?

View on pre-knowledge*: Fine

View on course design*: Fine

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. A few examples of final projects were posted at the course start.
2. Handwritten notes were typed up.
3. Details on grading were made more clear.
4. Asked for two students to be ambassadors, who acted as intermediary representatives

Changes to be made before next time course is given:

1. Details on why grading is done the way it is done will be made clear.

Other

Comments*