Report - DT2300 - 2018-12-21

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):
Roberto Bresin, roberto@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.
The 2018 edition of the course has almost followed the same design of the previous edition: 11 lectures (given by 6 different researchers), 1 study visit (at Europa Foley and Adr), 3 laboratory sessions, 1 project, and 5 assignments.
The main differences from the 2017 edition of the course, were 4:
1. The schedule of the project start, that was further anticipated by some working days for giving students more time to dedicate to the project as emerged in previous year course evaluations. In 2018, students had about 38 working days between the project workshop (January 29, 2018) and the final presentation (March 16, 2018), compared with 31 working days in 2017 (and 30 days in 2015-2016, 25 in 2014, and 20 in 2013). This has allowed a less stressed completion of the project and the development of much complex projects.
2. A new lecture dedicated to sound design mixing both theory and a hands-on session, used as preparation to the laboratory sessions.
3. New laboratory sessions in which students were adding sonic tracks to both concrete and abstract short movies. Sonic tracks were developed using three different techniques for each of the three labs: (1) sample sounds found in internet repository, (2) synthesized sounds realized by using different available softwares, (3) sound synthesized by using body /hand gestures tracked by sensors (such as Leap Motion). Each lab session was introduced with a crit session in which solutions of the students were discussed ny all participants.
4. We reduced the paper reviews from 3 to 2 as suggested by students in previous years.

THE STUDENT'S 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?
Unfortunately only 4 students out of 13 completing the course completed the course evaluation questionnaire. Therefore, it is not possible to get a general impression on the students' workload. Looking to the answers by the 4 students, 3 of them reported to have a work load between 12 and 14 hours per week, and 1 student dedicated between 9-11 hours per week.

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?
There were 13 students registered to the course. All completed the course.
Overall the students succeeded well on the course. The final results for 2018 include 3 As, 8 Bs and 3 Cs, compared to 4 As, 6 Bs, 4 Cs.
The results are in line with previous years (In the period HT2016-VT2017 the course was given twice with following aggregated results: 6 As, 8 Bs, 2 Cs, 3Ds).

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

From the data summarised in the polar diagram, it seems that the overall impression of the learning environment is positive. Still there were only 4 students completing the course evaluation, and therefore we can not generalise the results. Overall, as in previous years, by talking to the students, it seems
that they were satisfied with the course, its learning environment, and the new changes that we made for the laboratory sessions.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

Again, it seems that the overall impression of the learning environment is positive. Still there were only 4 students completing the course evaluation, and therefore we can not generalise the results.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

According to the students the course gives a deeper understanding of the use of sound:
"Getting a deeper understanding of how much information there is in sound and doing the project."
"That we had so many inspiring lectures with people from different parts of the field."
"Instructors are very good to approach for helping, advising, answering questions, and teaching."

The following advices from students are particularly interesting:
"Take the opportunity to get creative in the project and take advantage of that there is not many people attending the course i.e. ask a lot of questions and take help from teachers if needed. Also, go to all the lectures if possible. They are really worth it. "

We were very happy to read the following comment by one student:
"Thank you for the best course I have attended so far! This course has made me view my degree and possible career in a completely new way.
"

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should primarily be developed? How could these aspects be developed in the short or long term?

For 2019 we will have 6 new iMacs installed in the Multisensory Studio in which students work on both lab sessions and projects. The computers are also equipped with the new Max 8 software.
Following students suggestions we will introduce more small sound design exercizes.

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?

The addition of new laboratory sessions based on sound design was really appreciated by students, and it also served to sensitize them on the use of sound and its qualities in interaction and design.