

COURSE ANALYSIS, postgraduate course

Third cycle courses, EECS School, KTH, from 2018

An asterix (*) denotes non-compulsory data.

Course data

Course name: Artificial Intelligence and Creativity

Course ID: FDT3300

Credits: 7.5

Credits per module: 7.5

Time period for course: HT2022

Teachers: Bob L. T. Sturm and André Holzapfel

Examiner: Sten Ternström

Classroom hours: About once a month for 2 hours

Nr of registered students: 10

Examination rate, in %: 100

Goals

After passing the course, the student shall be able to

- give an overview of the domain of computational creativity
- describe objective and subjective approaches to evaluating creative machines
- use an existing AI system in a creative practice and reflect on the experience
- discuss ethical issues around creative machines and their application
- audit the sustainability of a creative machine

How the course design helps to fulfill these goals: Monthly seminars, reading group discussions, small projects

Pedagogical development - I

Changes made since previous time course was given: This was the first offering

Course evaluation; comments from students

Based on the anonymous questionnaire.

Evaluation response rate: 30% (3 of 10)

Overall student view*

The best aspect of the course:

“The discussion sessions.”

“Maybe the 2-hour ChatGPT essay task”

“Keeping up with the latest development in the field”

Negative comments:

Suggestions for improvements:

“More time for the final presentation.”

Pre-knowledge, comments* None

Course design, comments*

“Please add some way to make people participate more in the sessions, like maybe

submitting questions ahead of time or some way to make people actually read the papers.

“Fewer papers with more discussion per paper.”

Literature, comments: None

Examination, comments: None

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, but meeting once a month for a year was a bit protracted.

Positive comments: Attendance was ok throughout the course and there was plenty to talk about each time.

Negative comments: It is hard to get everyone to actively participate each time.

View on pre-knowledge*: Fine

View on course design*: Perhaps this should be shrunk to occur over 6 months.

View on course material: The material is timely and appropriate for the learning objectives.

View on examination: There is no examination really. The final session where individuals present papers needs to be extended to accommodate more in-depth discussion.

Pedagogical development - II

Outcome of course changes made since last time course was given:

- **Changes made since previous time course was given:** None

Changes to be made before next time course is given:

1. Schedule will be shrunk to occur Sep-May.
2. Assignments will be added, e.g., each student should write and submit reflections on assigned readings.

Other

Comments*