Report - EQ2445 - 2019-01-02

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):
James Gross, jamesgr@kth.se

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

This analysis applies to the three courses EQ 2443 - 2445, which have been run in parallel (analysis below takes the feedback from all three questionairs into account). The total course was run with 26 students, from which 14 participated in the course evaluation. The course is a project course, where the students realize a research project. While technical skills (algorithm design, programming, performance evaluation, experimentation) are required, the course also requires the students to manage their project. The course is examined by taking all presentations into account, the weekly work of the students as well as a final report they hand in.
The major change of the project course in comparison to last year has been the reduction of the amount of credits handed out (down from 12 to 7.5 credits). To make this change possible for the students, the duration and the offered topics were adjusted, which also included a reduction in the size of the assigned students per project (down from previously eight to three on average).

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?

Student workload was varying around a mean of 21 - 23 hours per week. With 7,5 credits, the total workload is supposed to be 200 hours, while the course was running for 8 weeks. I.e. on average the workload apppears to be slightly below what can be expected. Having said that, there are significant deviations, with some responses indicating down to 9- 11 hours of workload per week, versus at most 33 - 35 hours per week of workload. These extreme deviations come from the EQ 2445 track of the course. While some deviations are expected, this extreme deviation should be avoided.

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?

The impression from the students results as well as from the questionair is that the students generally succeeded. The reduction in the load of the course from the previous year seems to have not changed the learning experience of the students much.

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?

The overall impression is that the learning environment was good. The feedback from EQ 2445 indicates a balanced learning environment, where males are slightly more in favor of the course than females. There is no apparent reason why this should be the case. The feedback from EQ 2443 indicates somewhat lesser feedback regarding category 4 (challenge of the course) and category 16 (assessment). A cause here could be the inclusion of project supervisors from within KTH as well as from outside KTH, which appears to have produced different expectations. The feedback from EQ 2444 indicates somewhat lesser results in category 16 as well, with an indication that different groups were subject to different workloads which is not experienced as fair.

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?

See above.

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?

Positive answers:
- Researching a certain topic was very rewarding
- Only positive was meeting teachers and staff
- work together to solve difficult problems
- Project management
- We got the chance to focus on a relatively larger project for a while

Areas of improvements:
- Better equipment (GPUs)
- Make projects more practical
- And I also think that if this course could provide students with opportuny for publishing a paper, because if we want to apply for a phD degree in the future, this can be a very good research experience, and it is good to have a paper to support.
- Make the same project work equally fair and make sure the students don't waste time with unecessary steps of the project.

Advice for students of the next year cycle:
- Only take this course when don't have any other courses
- It is a good idea to continue the project topic to be a master thesis.
- Organize your work with your partner earlier
- More communication with group members to work efficiently.
- Do the things in advance, try not to procrastinate

###########
Analysis:
The feedback corresponds very strongly with the feedback from the previous years.

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

One potential for improvement could be to make the topics more relevant. For instance, the topics could be targeted to lead to a first research publication, and could also be integrated better into long-term efforts at the department. However, the examiner sees no urgent need to address this as students typically need some 'exercise' experiences first before they can execute meaningful research, which is typically provided by such project courses. In addition, the span of topics in this project course is quite wide, perhaps requiring next year more attention from different fields (i.e. more senior staff being present in the group appointments).

Course data 2019-01-05

EQ2445 - Project in Multimedia Processing and Analysis, HT 2018

Course facts

Course start:	2018 w.44
Course end:	2019 w.3
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	PRO1 - Project, 7.5, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Markus Flierl <mflierl@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	
Teachers:	Markus Flierl <mflierl@kth.se> James Gross <jamesgr@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	0
Total number of registered:	11

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate[1] [%]	*There are no course results reported*
Performance rate[2] [%]	*There are no course results reported*
Grade distribution[3] [%, number]	*There are no course results reported*

1 Percentage approved students
2 Percentage achieved credits
3 Distribution of grades among the approved students