Course report Faculty of Technology and Society

This course report is based on student feedback and submitted course evaluations, exam results and the teacher's idea for further development. The course report is published on the course website and Canvas-site.

Course name	Application Development for Android
Course code	DA401E
Semester	Vt22
Number of registered students	37
Course coordinator	Jeanette Eriksson

	Course report is published on Canvas-site
	Course report is published on course webpage

Compulsory course evaluation

Number of responses to the compulsory course evaluation	5

The compulsory course evaluation has been conducted through:

x	Standard template via SSR (Sunet Survey and Report)
	Extended standard template with *own questions* via SSR
x	Own evaluation method by the course coordinator

If own evaluation method was conducted, describe how:
Padlet evaluation of the course structure on Canvas.

Additional evaluations that were conducted during the course

	Separate survey
x	Oral evaluation in class
	Oral evaluation in smaller groups
	Other evaluation method

If other evaluation method was conducted, describe how:
We had an extra meeting at Zoom to discuss how the students experienced the course as some students experienced a lot of stress as the course took a lot of time and they did their bachelor thesis at the same time.

Comments on the course evaluations

Several students think the course was good and they learned a lot. Two students point out problems with Assignment 1 and I agree. Assignment 1 courses too much practical problems so it must be revised next year.

One student is extremely negative. It is expected to look things up as the up-to-date documentation for android development is online, but the lectures contain everything needed to be able to solve the exercises and assignments, but dependent of how the student choose to do he or she will need to look things up, but there has been plenty of opportunities at the labs to ask for help and explanations.

The same student points out that the requirement for the course is object oriented programming and not Java. Some students are not familiar with Java (the main language this year, but it was also possible to write the apps in Kotlin) but they are expected to be able to take on the task as the programming concept on a general level should be familiar to them. That could be pointed out more clearly when advertising the course. Jet the same student complains that the course is in English but is thought in Swedish. All the material on canvas, all the pre recorded videos are in English, but as all the students at the labs spoke Swedish, therefore I didn't think it was necessary to speak English at the labs. On one occasion I was forced to have a lecture at Zoom as I was sick and that one was in Swedish.

Examination results

	Examination results are as expected
x	Examination results are not as expected

The attendance at the labs has been much lower this year than previous years. The course is a campus course and only a few students came frequently to work at the labs. Another small part just came to present their exercises and assignments. I think the attendance and the results are related.

Recommendations and priorities for the course development

Assignment 1 must change. The server is a problem.

The naming of the exercises and assignment must change so Exercises are numbered and Assignments are called A, B and C.

In the course it is possible to use either Java or Kotlin. The Java resources is starting to get old, so my suggestion is to use Kotlin as the main language. There might be a need for a short Kotlin school in the beginning of the course.

The gradings must be revisited to describe more clearly what is required for the different grades.