

Report - ID1018 - 2022-05-03

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

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.

Students were offered to form course councils but none presented themselves.
After the ordinary exam the LEQ-6 standard survey was given. 37 out of 297 (12,5%) responded. No issues related to gender presented themselves. During the exam(s) students were provisioned as per their FUNKA status.

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.)

No student councils came forward. Communications with individual students took place in lectures, email, and Zoom. Canvas was used for public address.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course consisted of 20 lectures, four exercises, and 7 labs, as experienced by each student. Lectures and exercises were given on-site in Kista, because the KTH assessment of the pandemic at the time was in state "low". Examinations consisted of five mandatory and four optional programming assignments. Each assignment was examined individually during labs. Each lab was held simultaneously on-site and in Zoom.

THE STUDENTS' 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 workload as stated by the students finds it central mass (57%) in the region 6-17 hours per week. While less, this is not far from the expected 20 hours per week in a half-time course (10 weeks). With answers that range from 1 hour per week to more than 41 hours, it can be expected that variations reflect diversity in previous skills and knowledge.

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 examination rate at the regular exam was 53%. After the first re-exam (April 2022), 63% participants have passed the course. This is somewhat less than desired, but it should be remembered that the course had an unprecedented number of participants (297) and was still influenced by the conditions imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

"Ifall man på något sätt kunde minskat köbildningen under redovisningstillfällena skulle det varit smidigare, t.ex. ifall det hade funnits fler examinatorer."

"Så att lägga till hybridformat på undervisningen vore toppen! Om föreläsningarna även kunde spelas in så man kan titta på dem i efterhand och repetera områden som var svåra att förstå så vore det ännu bättre."

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

A few felt that it was too early to return to the lecture rooms, and appreciated the possibility to present assignments on Zoom. In a similar spirit, recorded lectures were requested, and also for the purpose of spending lecture hours on Q&A. Comments were made to the effect that examination of assignments took a different amount of time with different teachers.

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 teaching staff appreciated to be back on-site. It was good to have the additional support of a new lecturer and five teaching assistants.

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?
-

It was quickly obvious that the limit for the course design was passed around 250 students. At almost 300, the labs were put under pressure. Even with three teachers and five TAs, students experienced a lot of waiting and stress. Extra examination work with the programming assignments had to be done in order to ensure that students were given the opportunity to present for a higher grade than E.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The five-four programming assignments with an A-F grade are changed into three mandatory assignments with P/F, starting in the fall of 2022. This is a pragmatic action in order to reduce the pressure on both students and staff. A secondary objective is to introduce new assignments and thereby prevent copying solutions from internet repositories (e.g. GitHub).

OTHER INFORMATION**Is there anything else you would like to add?**

Having pre-recorded lectures is a fine idea, but one should probably not put the full 90 minutes in. Selected segments of 3-10 minutes in length, with some materials remaining for on-site activities, is probably better. Otherwise students will not come to the lectures, regardless of how appetizing they are set out to be.
