



Report - ID2213 - 2017-10-25

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):

Thomas Slöland sjoland@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

7*2 hour lectures presents one time per week the material in the course. Simultaneously the students identify and suggest a topic for a project to be performed and presented in a miniseminar before the written exam at the end of the one period course. Bonus points will be provided on the written examination, provided the time constraints are met. The project as such is graded with P/F and the exam with A-F (Fx) grades. The topics covered are accompanied by detailed reading instructions. This includes a list of recommended exercises from the textbook. Alternative and/or complementary literature are given on the course web. In addition a "diary" of what was presented during the lectures is presented in the news feed of the KTH social page to help students who couldn't participate in lectures, or upon studying for the exam. Older exams, most often with suggested solutions, is provided on the course web. The diary was the major novelty this year.

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?

The reported workload varies a lot between different students. This seems to depend on the background of the student. For some the course seems a bit easy, while for others the material constitutes a major obstacle. A background in functional programming, deductive databases, and discrete math, as well as in formal languages such as this is taught in compiler courses etc. seems to be a big help. A general understanding of AI programming is a help also. Of course having studied formal semantics makes this course easy to grasp.

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 group was small, so it is difficult to say anything about the performance of the group compared to earlier instances of the course, but here the results were quite good. Three As, three Cs and one D so far out of nine registered students. Two students from the TMAIM program did not try the ordinary exam or present a project on time. Perhaps there was a conflict about time with other courses for these students.

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?

The students here seem generally content. I can imagine some points of improvement, basically in the form of more structured homeworks, for instance.



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?

not really. The learning could be greatly improved by designing interactive quizzes, or homeworks, provided that more time could be allocated to giving feedback.

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?

"There are a lot of different terms and names of concepts where some are similar or refer to the same concept which gets confusing. To facilitate the learning experience I would suggest that you created a list of the common terms encountered in the course with what they mean and perhaps an example."

"Perhaps a few more lectures early on in the course. They were great but only once a week and a lot of important things were introduced quite late into the course which would be good to know in the early stages of the project part."

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

More work on the content of each lecture. Perhaps accompany each lecture with a dedicated mandatory homework and/or prework, that will be weighed into the total grade.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

It was enjoyable as always to teach this course. A pity that so few students find the course on the master level nowadays, but those that do are highly motivated.

Course data 2018-08-24

ID2213 - Logic Programming, HT 2017

Course facts

Course start:	2017 w.35
Course end:	2017 w.43
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	PRO1 - Project, 3.0, Grading scale: P, F TEN1 - Examination, 4.5, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Alf Thomas Sjöland <sjoland@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Alf Thomas Sjöland <sjoland@kth.se>
Teachers:	Alf Thomas Sjöland <sjoland@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	9
Total number of registered:	10

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate ¹ [%]	77.80%
Performance rate ² [%]	77.80%
Grade distribution ³ [%, number]	A 43% (3) C 43% (3) D 14% (1)

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students