

COURSE ANALYSIS, postgraduate course

Third cycle courses, EECS School, KTH , from 2018

An asterix (*) denotes non-compulsory data.

Course data

Course name: Music informatics

Course ID: DT2470

Credits: 7.5

Credits per module: 7.5

Time period for course: HT2019

Teachers: Bob L. T. Sturm and André Holzapfel

Examiner: Sten Ternström

Classroom hours: Almost twice a week for 2 hours

Nr of registered students: 10

Examination rate, in %: 100

Goals

Global course goals:

1. Overview of music informatics, its history and applications as well as a review of basic principles, such as music representation, analog to digital conversion and Fourier transform.
2. Feature extraction that shows how music data can be described in different domains e.g. time, frequency and time-frequency.
3. How music content at different levels of abstraction can be expressed and compared with distinctive features.
4. Ways to model music data by means of statistical machine learning methods. Evaluation of models of music data and their application in reality.

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

Pedagogical development - I

Changes made since previous time course was given: This is the first time the course has been offered.

Course evaluation; comments from students

Based on the anonymous questionnaire.

Evaluation response rate: 60%

Overall student view*

Positive comments: workload was manageable, but most time was spent on labs; "It was the first sound course I've taken where I really could see job possibilities"; "I liked that state of the art examples were given.

Negative comments: no lab assistant made the labs difficult; one of the labs was too large;

Pre-knowledge, comments*

Course design, comments*: there should be a lab assistant; students should be able to do the labs in pairs;

Literature, comments: none

Examination, comments: none

Particularly interesting* comments: include some small assignments; “maybe the labs could be slightly more advanced” or include extra parts;

Course teacher’s impressions from the evaluation

Comments: The student observations align with my own as to what changes should be made in the next edition.

Course teacher’s summary

Overall view: The course ran smoothly, and pretty much followed the course book.

Positive comments: Attendance was good throughout the course, with more than 50% showing each time.

Negative comments: There was not enough time to cover all of the material to a sufficient depth. The first lab was too long. There was no opportunity to cover python programming

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: N/A

Changes to be made before next time course is given:

1. Add at least two more lectures to give more time for content
2. Add python programming tutorial
3. Break Lab 1 into two labs
4. Review labs after hand-in during class (perhaps make one student group responsible for presenting their solutions)
5. revise the intended learning outcomes and assessment criteria

Other

Comments*