# Report - HI1038 - 2020-08-12

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):**

Jonas Willén, jwi@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 student during the course hade bi-weekly delivery reflection of the project progress. They should answer the questions what is working and what needs to be improved. This reflection have to most regards included there own work in the project but is also included reflection in regards to the course as a whole. This means that I been able to make minor changes as the course is running. Two changed that accord during the course was adding an extra exercise about SDL_net in combination with animation (threading) and changed delivery dates for some final assignments in order to not collided with the parallel course deadlines.

**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.)**

On top of the Lectures and Sprint demos on Zoom. I also included Zoom sessions with the possibility to do question and answers. After the course there is a planed meeting student meeting not yet sceduled.

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

Normally lectures are in project management, SDL, writing big programs, and collaboration tools. Students are dived into groups of max six persons they should develop a graphical network-based game. A continuous examination was done with sprint demos, a peer-to-peer review final report, and a final oral presentation. They also have an individual summary report and a bi-weekly delivery of reflections on project process.

This year was different as this course was needed to be fully digital.

The first lecture was changed to a 2-minute head shout of me shortly welcome the students and going through the main goals of the course. The theoretical lecture was done live over Zoom, recorded and uploaded, each lecture about 1h. Added to the theoretical lectures where practical tutorials, 10-15 minutes videos, explaining the important programming parts like how to install SDL, compiling SDL, going through some example program code of SDL and SDLnet and running this program. For this course, I also used older students to suprovise every project group

**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?**

There is no indication that the workload deviated from the expected. As the students, themself choices the game they want to development there are a lot of time spent on this course.

**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?**

To be accepted to the course the student needed to have passed the basic programming course and should that they are able to write a report.

All students accepted to the course passed the course.

**STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**
**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

They like to be able to choose the problem themself.
They like to write a big program.
They lied that there were older students that supervised their groups

They disliked that they needed to use VersionOne for project management. Felt cumbersome.
They would have liked a clearer time schedule

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**
**Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.**

Very few answers, but they look like they are happy with the course even thou it was running fully digital.

VersionOne needs to be better explained or replaced.

**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.**

One change that came from last year was to include more SDL_net. This worked out well as every group was able to do communication without lag.
However this was only one of many as the big change was to a fully digital course.

My impression as a teacher is that worked out very well.

**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?**

A new change for this year course was the need to bi-weekly submit individual reflections. This worked well however students identified as female is stronger on this task and student with a non-Swedish background was weeker. As this part is a pass and fail only the exercise to write is a problem even more relevant to thous with non-Swedish bakground without changing the end result.

The learning environment was exceptional this year but my impression as a teacher is that worked out very well.

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

Part of the changes do to Covid-19 will be there even when going back to normality. Code review and using older students are things to keep.

Even more example code also on how to dived a big program into smaller parts.