



Report - IS1200 - 2018-05-30

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):

David Broman, dbro@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 course teaches the fundamentals of computer organization, including both software and hardware. The course is divided into 5 modules:

- C and Assembly Programming
- I/O Systems
- Processor Design
- Memory Hierarchy
- Parallel Processors and Programs

The course is divided into two LADOK parts:

1. Labs and home labs (4.5 hp)
2. Written Exam (3hp)

There are in total 12 lectures, 5 exercise sessions, 4 seminars, 4 laboratory exercises, and one mini project. The course ends with a 5-hour written exam.

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?

Many students think that this is a hard course that requires a lot of work. Some people spend less than expected. The difference can depend both on prior knowledge before starting the course (especially programming knowledge) and ambition regarding grades.

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 performed slightly better this year on the exam (60% pass on first exam attempt), compared to previous year (50% year 2017).

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?

In general, the students are very satisfied with the course.



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?

Pros

- The students seem very satisfied with lectures, seminars, and labs.
- Several students said that the information on Canvas was really good and comprehensive.
- Many students discovered that the course literature is really good.
- The labs were at the right level and teaching assistants have been good and helpful.
- Lunch office hours were very appreciated.

Cons

- There might need to be some more guidelines to the teaching assistants for the labs.
 - Some installation instructions can be improved, especially on Mac
 - The main complain is that the course requires a lot of work. This course is also given for second year students in downtown, and there we do not get really the same response.
-

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?

A summery of some of the comments

- Study hard from the beginning and attend all lectures
 - Do all seminar exercises
 - Start with the project early
 - Find people to study together with
-

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 course is now quite stable, and a lot of improvements have already been done over the years. Here are some suggestions for further improvements:

- Introduce a special teaching and education session for teaching assistants, so that they examine the labs in a more uniform manner.
 - Add special short video lectures on topics that are particularly hard for the students (basic C programming, assembly programming, cache concepts etc.)
-

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

NOTE: For some reason, the LEQ system created two different course evaluations that were not possible to merge. For this reason, only half of the answers are connected to this analysis.

Thank you all students for your great feedback. Please do not hesitate to send me an email (dbro@kth.se) if you have some more feedback.

Kursdata 2018-05-30

IS1200 - Dator teknik, grundkurs, VT 2018 TCOMK

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2018 v.3
Kursen slutar:	2018 v.11
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	LAB1 - Laboration, 4,5, betygsskala: P, F TEN1 - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	David Broman <dbro@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	David Broman <dbro@kth.se>
Lärare:	David Broman <dbro@kth.se> Fredrik Lundevall <flu@kth.se> Gunnar Johansson <gujo@kth.se> Saranya Natarajan <saranyan@kth.se> Gabriel Hjort Blindell <ghb@kth.se>
Assistent:	

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	33
Totalt registrerade:	124

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad ¹ [%]	45.50%
Prestationsgrad ² [%]	68.50%
Betygsfördelning ³ [% , antal]	A 13% (2) B 27% (4) C 27% (4) D 33% (5)

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter

IS1200 - Datorteknik, grundkurs, VT 2018

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2018 v.3
Kursen slutar:	2018 v.11
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	LAB1 - Laboration, 4,5, betygsskala: P, F TEN1 - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	David Broman <dbro@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	David Broman <dbro@kth.se>
Lärare:	David Broman <dbro@kth.se> Fredrik Lundevall <flu@kth.se> Gunnar Johansson <gujo@kth.se>
Assistent:	John Wikman <jwikman@kth.se> Erik Båvenstrand <erikbav@kth.se> Rodothea Myrsini Tsoupidi <tsoupidi@kth.se> Johan Myrsmiden <johanmyr@kth.se> Martin Falke <mafalke@kth.se> Daniel Lundén <dlunde@kth.se> Joey Öhman <joeyoh@kth.se> Fredrik Lundevall <flu@kth.se> Emma Nimstad <nimstad@kth.se> Gunnar Johansson <gujo@kth.se> Saranya Natarajan <saranyan@kth.se> Martin Pola <mpola@kth.se>

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	162
Totalt registrerade:	253

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad¹ [%]	42.60%
Prestationsgrad² [%]	60.20%
Betygsfördelning³ [% , antal]	A 10% (7) B 17% (12) C 26% (18) D 28% (19) E 19% (13)

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter