

Course evaluation and analysis ID1214 2019

Artificial Intelligence and Applied Methods

ID1214

Course credits 7,5 hp – 4 hp written exam 3,5 hp assignments

The number of students in the course was 52.

Number of students finalized the main task: 38

Number of students passed the first written exam: 42

After first written exam: 63% of the students have final grade (33 of 52).

Activities: Lectures, Seminars, and Labs

The course is a problem-based learning, with lectures introducing the area and then seminars where the subject can be discussed. The labs are for consolidating the knowledge.

Teachers: Fredrik Lundevall

Anne Håkansson (Examiner)

Course evaluation

The evaluation was carried out via:

- a mid-course evaluation,
- a questionnaire in the end
- a physical meeting

Number of participants for mid-course evaluation was about 50% of 52 students.

Number of answers, in the questionnaire, is 10 and the frequency of answers is 19.23 %

The number of students in the meeting was one.

This evaluation is made on a small number of students, why the data cannot be regarded as statistically reliable.

Students own evaluation of number of hours spend per week:

The number of hours send per week ranges from 0-2 hours to 26 hours, where most number of students spend 12-14 hours.

General comments:

- The project takes a lot of time, the lectures don't take any time
- Was good
- the project took a heavy amount of time, so not sure if this is too much or too low.

What was the best aspect of the course?

- The lectures were great, the project was interesting, the tasks were a good way to learn each subject.
- Interesting topics!
- The materials
- What would you suggest to improve?
- The slides need to be of higher quality and more coherent with a lot more structure than just cherrypicking different facts across the whole subject. Also, the labs should have clear instructions and steps in a lab instructions paper rather than a canvas page with instructions mixed up with links and pictures.
- maybe having some quizzes to have the common knowledge in check
- I think the course structure should be reconsidered and also the labs. I couldn't do the labs although I was very interested because of the lack of enough time.
- Canvas was a bit messy and I would have liked Anne to use the whiteboard more. I learn a lot better that way then just with a powerpoint. The power point could also have been a bit more readable and easier to understand.

What advice would you like to give to future participants?

- begin with the project early on, it takes time to do it.
- to just try to get an overall understanding of the whole subject and to begin with the main project as early as possible.
- Start in time with the project.

Is there anything else you would like to add?

- Thanks for such an amazing course, really needed for IT students to expand our vision in the area of the future of technology and how far human can get :-)
- sugar
- reformat the course, this is not "sustainable". Bad seminars, bad exam, bad slides. It is all-around bad.

Analysis

Course evaluation from 2018:

- Written exam should have better balance in between the grades A – F
- Seminars were good
- Seminars were too long
- Some labs were too difficult

Actions taken after previous course analysis:

Balanced the exam's grades A-F better. The labs were changed. Some were cancelled and some were modified to make them easier.

General comments:

The course evaluation is only answered by males, on a Swedish program, third year.

It seems as some students liked the working-load and some thought the project took a lot of time. The course shall require 20 hours/ week. Anything less is too little. Moreover, the project and assignments are 3,5 hp of 7,5 hp.

Best aspect of the course:

The lectures were of good quality and the slides seem to work fine.

Suggest to improve: the slides for the lectures need some clarifications. The instructions for the lab shall be improved. Use whiteboard when possible.

Summary:

The seminars were not conducted as before, which was unfortunate. Some students really liked the slides, and some did not. This is probably due to the fact that students who participated the lectures liked the slides whereas students who only read the slides at home disliked them. Everything on the slides was explained during the lectures.

This year, we had a couple of 4 hours lectures and that was too much for the students.

Final remarks:

The discussion folder in Canvas was not answered due miss of getting this information. The emails from these students were answered, though. This means that the students who wanted information also got it.

Next course:

Ask for course evaluation board with 2 students before starting the lecture. Otherwise, none will take the job.

Check the slides to see that the students get the necessary information. This is especially important those who do not attend the lectures.

Check Canvas for broken links.

Change lab instructions to have a step-wise instruction. This is a problem that followed from changing the instructions to make them easier.

Explain the seminars and the benefit of attending these. Explain the procedure for the labs. Maybe cancelled the seminars.

Mid-course evaluation showed that the seminars and labs did not work as expected. This need to be changed.