

Protocol for the final course evaluation meeting of the course DIT961 Data Structures

Programme: N1COS

Academic year: 1

Term: 2

Date: 2019-10-14

Attending: Ana Bove, Alex Gerdes, Ellen-Britta Fernell Foufa, Emma Lockington & Bashar Oumari

Absent: Emanuel Olaison & Sophia Thanh Pham

Summary

Registered: 50 students

Course: 29 students completed the course, 21 students did not complete the course. 3 students passed with distinction, 26 students passed (6 of these students passed the course in the re-examination in August or October).

Written-examination: 3 students passed with distinction, 31 students passed, and 7 students did not pass the exam (11 of the students passed the exam in the re-examination in August or October)

Labs: 38 students passed the labs and 16 students did not pass the labs. 16u, 38g (2 students passed the labs during the re-examination in August or October)

18 students who attended the course has answered the course evaluation survey, which makes 33 percent of the whole class.

The students were pleased with the examiner and the course in its totality was appreciated by the students. The negative comments were primarily about the short amount of time the students had to complete the fourth lab about graphs. A pattern through the answers from the course evaluation survey was that there was too little time to complete the fourth lab and that there was much higher work-load in the end of the course than in the beginning.

The majority of the students felt that they had the prior knowledge to complete the course. A few students disagreed and there were some comments about students lacking the prior knowledge about Haskell that was needed for the course.

Learning outcomes

The majority of the students agreed that they were aware of the learning outcomes of the course. The examiner mentioned during the meeting that the learning outcomes of the course were presented during the introduction and that the learning outcomes were available to read in Canvas throughout the course.

A comment from the course evaluation survey was that there was a natural flow throughout the course and a separation of different topics which made it easy to know what was meant to be understood by the end of the course.

Execution of the course

The majority felt that the course administration worked well. The examiner brought up that it worked well to create modules in Canvas which made it easier to keep a structure throughout the course. The student representative that participated during the course evaluation meeting also liked the arrangement in Canvas and thought it was easy to find information on the Canvas page. A problem in Canvas that was mentioned by the examiner was that it was not possible to see the group members in the groups. As a consequence, the students could change group from assignment to assignment.

Another problem was that there were a lot of national holidays which interrupted the schedule. The program manager brought up that study period four is a tough period because it causes a lot of problem with the schedule when there are multiple national holidays that creates interruptions in the course structure. It was also brought up by both the program manager and the examiner that it's difficult to make a good, well-functioning, schedule that doesn't collide with the students other courses during study period four.

There were comments regarding the students feeling that the difference between passed and passed with distinction on the written examination was too big. The examiner agrees with the comments but also brought up that the reason for it is because the grading system for GU should be equal with Chalmers grading system U,3-5, and that's why the level between a pass and passed with distinction is much bigger. The primary comment regarding the labs was about the fourth lab. The examiner agreed that the planning of the fourth lab was not optimal and that they will try to improve it for next year.

Most of the students agreed that the teaching was good and there were comments in the course evaluation survey about that the examiner really made sure that everyone understood what was presented during the lectures. The student representative also said that it was good that the examiner frequently asked if everyone understood the information that was presented. If someone didn't understand, the examiner tried to explain it in a new way. The lecture slides seemed appreciated and gave the students sufficient information for the exam. It was brought up that the consultation time and the lab time were kind of the same thing. The examiner explained that the consultation time is for the students to ask about anything in the course, but it ended up only to be questions about the labs so that's why it may have felt like repetition.

Work climate

In comparison to previous years, it was mentioned by both the examiner and the program manager that the workload this year was more adequate to the number of hp.

Regarding how many hours per week the students spent on the course, the majority answered around 20-30 hours per week. The examiner commented that maybe the students who answered with a higher number based their answer from the last part of the course because of the little time they had to spend on the fourth lab.

The majority felt their own work effort was sufficient to obtain the course's learning outcomes. A few students didn't agree and comments from the survey were that it was difficult to follow the course in the end and that some key concepts from the last weeks of the course didn't stick.

The cooperation between teachers and students worked well and the teacher assistants and the examiner got comments about being very helpful. The teacher assistants worked well but there were some comments about the students feeling that they didn't get the help they needed for the fourth lab. The group activities were both commented as functioning well and less good in the course evaluation survey. The examiner mentioned that the purpose with having two students in each group was so everyone could be active and learn.

Suggested improvements

For next year, the primary suggested changes were to improve the schedule and have more lectures in the beginning of the course. The program manager also suggested that there should be some repetition of Haskell in the beginning of the course.

The examiner brought up that an improvement could be to compress the lectures in the beginning of the course to gain more time at the end of the course.