

# Report - ID1018 - 2023-06-13

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 encouraged to form course councils, however, these offers were met with no perceivable response from the students.

---

**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.)

Questions and topics were addressed either in association with lectures, or through email.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

Each student sees: 20 2h lectures, 4 2h exercises, 7 4h computer labs

Lectures and exercises provide theoretical background. The student trains and applies their knowledge by solving three programming assignments.

---

**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?

Yes, although students with previous programming experience quite naturally get by with a lesser effort.

---

**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?

A total of 273 students were initially associated with the course. After the course 65 were discounted as having never started, suspended their studies, or cancelled their participation. Of the remaining 208 students that participated in the course, 156 (75%) finished with a passing course grade.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

What does students say in response to the open questions?

31 (15%) responded to the LEQ questionnaire.

What would you suggest to improve?

"More laborations for those who found the first three to easy. ..."

"Easier tasks"

"Recorded Lectures available on Canvas."

"The teachers and TAs must come to a consensus on what the finished labs are supposed to look like."

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Students did generally well. Some felt that alignment could be better between lectures, exercises, assignments and the exam.

---

**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.

Teachers should strive to have a cohesive view of what to require from the programming assignments. That said, a large part of that examination is to assess the student's ability to produce their own solutions and their level of skill. This may be done in various ways by different teachers, at different times, and therefore be perceived as uneven if the text of the assignment is regarded as the only common factor.

---

**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?

No significant differences along the suggested parameters has come to our attention.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

Incentives to finish exercises and assignment on time should be investigated further. Procrastination among students inevitably leads to a substantial crunch towards the end of the course. Students that needed more help may have failed to seek it out (or be noticed) while there was still time to give it.

---

**OTHER INFORMATION**

Is there anything else you would like to add?

The HT22 course instance had the advantage of having five qualified staff and two teaching assistants available in (some) labs. For the students that embraced the opportunity to receive plenty of help this was a big advantage. The course as a whole also benefited from their presence and experience.