



## Report - ID1018 - 2019-03-12

---

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):**

Fredrik Kilander, fki@kth.se

---

### **COURSE DESIGN**

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

The learning activities consists of course literature, exercises, lectures (20), tutorials (4), and programming assignments (5 mandatory, 4 optional) with supervision.

Examination consists of a closed exam (tentamen) and individual oral examination of programming assignments. Since HT17 additional introductory exercises were added to support students without prior programming experience.

---

### **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?**

The survey yielded 32 out of 207 respondents. Among these 32, 7 reported a weekly load above 20 h/week and 24 report 20 h/week or less. This is consistent with previous years, including the notions that students with prior programming knowledge needed less time, and that students devoted more time to concurrent courses.

---

### **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?**

Out 254 registered students, 117 (48%) completed the course, 131 (53%) completed the exam, and 152 (62%) completed the programming assignments. However, 64 students are without any grade (F included) and likely opted to decline examination. Excluding these 64 the ratios are: 117/181 (64%) completion of the course, 131/181 (72%) exam, and 152/181 (84%) assignments. These figures are more aligned with previous years' statistics.

---

### **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 polar diagrams do not indicate any strong issues, but this could just be a result of homogeneity in the small group (15%) that elected to respond to the survey.

---



#### **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?**

---

The one indication that is visibly distinguishable is a gender diversification to questions 1 ("I worked with interesting issues") and 16 ("The assessment of the course was fair and honest"). Here women declared values of 4.0 and 4.4 (neutral) while men stated 5.7 and 6.4 (agreement). There is no obvious explanation of this that escapes speculation and survives generalization.

---

#### **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?**

---

Do exercises. Start on the programming assignments early. Program something every day. Practice previous exams.

---

#### **PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

The first third of the course should focus more on two things: reaching out to students with no previous programming experience and the concepts involved with solving problems on a computer. The technical properties of the programming environment remain highly relevant, but should not be the sole point of attention.

---