

Report - IK2215 - 2023-05-22

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):

Markus Hidell, mahidell@kth.se and Voravit Tanyingyong, voravit@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.

We informed about the course evaluation procedure at the first lecture in the course. We then also solicited for volunteers to the a course panel. After some reminders, a course panel was formed and communicated to all students, so that all students were given the possibility to contact course panel members with input. After the exam had been graded and results reported, we launched the LEQ to the students and notified them about the importance to contribute to it. After the LEQ closed we arranged a meeting with course panel where we discussed the LEQ and the course in general so that the course panel could give feedback. The course panel meeting was held in December 2022.

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.)

We did not organize any specific meetings for students to give feedback during the course. A meeting with the course panel was held after completion of the course (described above in the course evaluation process). Students had lots of informal opportunities to bring up issues, during and in conjunction with the learning activities and also through discussionforas in canvas.

COURSE DESIGN

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

We use a mix of learning activities in the course, something which has worked really well over several years now. The learning activities are based on 12 lectures, 6 networking labs, one programming assignment, and one project assignment during the later parts of the course where all different topics are brought together in practice. In the course, we run continuous digital examination in computer rooms in three different parts. The sum of the exam parts is graded A-F.

The changes since last course offering were as follows: Lectures: A yearly revision of the lectures was made. Lectures were mainly given as in-class lectures, with a few exceptions where they were given over zoom. Earlier versions of the lectures have been recorded in zoom and the video recordings were made available in canvas.

Labs: We decreased the number of labs from 7 to 6, in favor for a new programming assignment, which was developer for this year. Project: Conents have been updated and new report templates in Overleaf have been introduced. The workload in the projects have been reduced thisQ year, due to the new programming assignment.

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?

This year's new programming turned out to be more demanded than intended. This was reflected in the LEQ as well as in the course panel meeting. Earlier course rounds have been perceived as more manageable from a time-consuming perspective. However, the response frequency to the LEQ is low and there are also a few deviations to lower level of workload.

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 students' results after the exam were overall good. The absolute majority passed the labs and the project. 80% of the students taking the exam passed the final exam. Slightly over 30% of the students who took the exam scored a grade C or higher, which is somewhat lower than last year. At the first exam, 74% of the attending students passed. Overall, the results are quite similar to earlier course offerings

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The answers to open questions are positive in many aspects (lectures, availability, labs, project). There are also lots comments about the programming assignment being too difficult and taking too much time to complete.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The majority of the LEQ responses for this course are normally rated as an either slightly below or above 6 out of 7. However, this year several of the responses unfortunately were a bit below these values. Based on the answers to open questions as well as on the comments from the course panel meeting, this was solely due to the problems we had with the newly introduced programming assignment. The assignment came out more difficult than intended and it took a majority of the students too much time to solve it. We tried to make adjustments several times along the road, but by then the damage was already made.

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 general impression is that the course works well from a learning perspective in all aspects apart from the problems earlier described with the programming assignment.

We introduced continuous digital examination in computer rooms with locked exam browsers, and it seems to have worked really 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?

The response frequency to the LEQ was unfortunately low and it is difficult to draw any conclusions in differences among different student groups (the groups are very small in these cases). We had no students with disabilities.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The most important thing to next year is to reorganize the programming assignment. It has to be better adapted to the students' prior knowledge and skills in programming and organized in a way that results in a more balanced workload for the students.
