



Report - EP2420 - 2022-01-16

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):

stadler@kth.se

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS

Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

The course evaluation included the student questionnaire, a course review with the students during the last course lecture and a review meeting of the instructor with the two TAs. Students were expressing their opinions through the questionnaire and in the course review meeting.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

The course review took place during the last lecture of the course. The instructor led the discussion and brought up the following points: course structure, learning goals, grading, work load, prerequisites, difficulty level, group work, grading, feedback. Students brought up additional topics including the number of projects they can choose and attending the course while working full-time.

COURSE DESIGN

Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

This project course introduces students to data-driven engineering of networks and cloud systems. The course is structured as two consecutive project blocks. Each block starts with introductory lectures that give background and discuss concepts for the specific project, followed by project execution, and the writing of a report.

The learning activities include the modeling of network analytics tasks; data processing to create predictive models; assessing and interpreting the results of model prediction; producing a report that describes and explains the project results.

The grading is based on the project report, the project interview, and the presentation of work status at weekly project meetings.

Since the last course offering, all course projects have been revised and an additional project has been developed.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

While the average workload per student corresponds quite well to the expected workload of 40 h per 1.5 credit, the variance among the students is high. The reason is that some students have a good background in machine learning and statistics, while other students know very little. Students with a background in machine learning make faster progress and have a lower workload. We help students with little background knowledge to catch up by providing material for self-study. Students who take the course are generally well-motivated and do not mind acquiring knowledge they lack in order to perform the project tasks.

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?

This year, 19 of 21 students passed the course, and most performed very well. One student dropped the course, and one delayed the course until next year since he was working full-time. The results are similar to earlier course offerings.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Unfortunately, only 5 of 21 students used the opportunity to fill out the questionnaire, which makes it hard to draw conclusions with high confidence. We gave them only 5 days to submit the form and will give more time next year.

All respondents appreciated the course format and the support they received by instructor and TAs.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Students have different opinions whether it is better that each student works on single project throughout the course or on two projects consecutively. We probably keep two projects per student for the next year.

Some of the students would prefer an online version of the course with no physical in-class participation, some of them prefer physical classes.



OVERALL IMPRESSION

Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

The overall impression related to student performance and TA performance is very good.
For planned changes, see comments below.

ANALYSIS

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?
 - international and national students?
 - students with or without disabilities?
-

I did not find such differences.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

We have identified a number of improvements we want to make in the projects we will be offering next year.

We plan to provide additional degrees of freedom for students in the way they execute the projects.

We plan to provide improved guidelines for student presentations during the course.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Reduce the number of questions in the course analysis, please.
