

# 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: VT2024  
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: 65  
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. Details on why grading is done the way it is done will be made clear and posted to canvas

### Course evaluation; comments from students

Based on the anonymous questionnaire.

Evaluation response rate:  $3/65 = 4.62\%$

#### Overall student view\*

What was the best aspect of the course?

What was the best aspect of the course? (I worked: 6-8 timmar/vecka)

I think the lectures honestly, they were very interesting and I loved the "skitsnack" segment because it was interesting to learn how machine learning can be used in misleading ways as well as how it can help.

Learning to explore deep patterns in data, differentiating between correlation and causality in interesting ways I didn't anticipate.

What was the best aspect of the course? (I worked: 9-11 timmar/vecka)

The amazing lectures!! Very interesting, Bob really knows how to keep you engaged. I also found the course book good and pedagogical.

What would you suggest to improve?

What would you suggest to improve? (I worked: 6-8 timmar/vecka)

Maybe not grade the quizzes? Or at least give them a makeover, to have a quiz that is only open for one day and then having it be a part of the garde can be a bit stressful, especially if you have a lot of other things that day. I did like the quizzes, they made sure that you kept up with the lectures and the workload so they were good, just reform them a bit to next year's students!

The canvas quizzes are good, but should not be graded A-F. The most conscientious students take the quizzes first, and then pass the correct answers on to friends. The quizzes should be P/F, in my opinion.

What would you suggest to improve? (I worked: 9-11 timmar/vecka)

Maybe a little more instructions on how to work on the project, what should be included in the report etc. There was only a part of a lecture on this and the structure was not entirely clear.

What advice would you like to give to future participants? (I worked: 6-8 timmar/vecka)

Start in time with your project and choose something that sounds interesting! It makes it easier to both understand and work with. And go to the lectures! You get so much from attending when sitting with the labs but also just to understand what machine learning truly is  
Keep up with the labs and don't hand anything off to your lab partner – make sure you understand everything on your own. Find ambitious project group partners.

What advice would you like to give to future participants? (I worked: 9-11 timmar/vecka)

Stay on top of things from the beginning, especially in the project.

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Is there anything else you would like to add? (I worked: 6-8 timmar/vecka)

I really enjoyed this course, thanks Bob and André!

Is there anything else you would like to add? (I worked: 9-11 timmar/vecka)

Made me sure of my choice of master!

## 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, and attendance was good throughout the course

**Positive comments:** Responses to most aspects of the course were positive.

**Negative comments:** The projects were ok, but many lacked a meaningful engagement with the datasets chosen.

**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. Details on grading were made more clear and so there were fewer complaints.

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

2. The template for the final project report will be fleshed out more, including explicit directions for what is expected.
3. A model project will be provided along with the teacher assessments.

## Other

Comments\*