

# Kursrapport

## Course report

<b>Course name</b>	<b>Emerging Digital Technologies</b>
<b>Course code</b>	DA621E
<b>Semester</b>	HT21
<b>Number of students registered</b>	19
<b>Course responsible</b>	Dipak Surie

<input type="checkbox"/>	Course report is published on Canvas-site
<input type="checkbox"/>	Course report is published on course webpage

### Course evaluation

Number of answers on obligatory course evaluation	4
---	---

Obligatory course evaluation has been done through:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Simplest standard template via SSR (Sunet Survey and Report)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Standard template with added questions via SSR
<input type="checkbox"/>	Own way of evaluation by course responsible

If own way, describe how:

Any further evaluations during the course:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Separate survey
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oral in class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oral in smaller groups
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other way
<p>Q&amp;A sessions were conducted mostly focusing on the assignments. Such sessions were quite valuable to understand student expectations and look into ways to update the assignment specifications that are relevant to students.</p>	

Comments to student course evaluations

<p>The student course evaluations on the course DA621E - HT21 was answered by 4 students which amounts to about 21.05%. The comments provided (even though it was just from 4 students) are extremely valuable for us as teachers to improve this course for next year.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Students have overall appreciated the fact that a good overview of the emerging technologies was provided through very productive workshops and</p>
--

in working in teams. The course seems to have given the opportunity to take responsibility to do independent learning on the subject. One student expected deeper learning on the emerging digital technologies and this could have been because we wanted to introduce several cutting-edge emerging digital technologies instead of just one or two. We will review this comment and try to provide a balance between the number of different technologies taught and how deep we go within them individually.

The previous comment is connected to one student's comment that he/she wanted to get deeper into blockchain technology and that the course focused purely on emerging digital technologies. The suggestion was to help the student get deeper into one technology with a long-term project. The student also felt that they did not implement the technology as a key aspect of a product. The idea is for students to get deeper into one technology as part of their project work. The suggestion would be to gain further assistance for their project during the supervision time and actually go deeper into one technology. It is a shame that the project duration is short on this course but we can see if there is an opportunity to widen the time period beyond what was provided this year. Another student wanted to get deeper into robotics and overall, the impression is that there were too many technologies (and methods) instead of allowing the students to go deeper into one technology. We take this comment seriously and will do our best to strike the right balance. One student wanted better support for students who were new to the Swedish education system. This comment should and will be addressed at the program level including this course.

The students have spent an average of 27 hours per week on this course. The number is surprising considering the course is studied full time. A minimum of 10 hours is dedicated for self-development on specific technologies building on the introduction provided during the workshops. The teacher would be interested in understanding why the transition from workshop hands-on introduction to deeper specialization on specific technologies have not materialized. Suggestion on interesting ways to make this transition happen is also most welcome.

### Examination result

X	Examination result is like expected
	Examination result is not like expected
The exam result is mostly as expected. The overall quality of the assignments and the project work has been excellent. There were a few students who did not manage the examinations. We as teachers would help them to ensure that they meet the course standards and at the same time complete their assignments.	

## Recommendations and priorities for course evaluation

- Ensure that students are able to gain deeper knowledge and practical skills on implementing at least one emerging digital technology as part of their project work.
- Ensure that students spend the expected time for a full-time course at the master's level with the possibilities for independent exploration of specific technologies.
- Ensure that students new to Swedish education system are provided additional support to help them get accustomed to the system.
- Continue to provide relevant and useful practical skills through workshops and project work focusing on emerging digital technologies.

## Instructions and instructions

This part of the course report is only intended as support for the course coordinator to create the course report and the pages are removed before publication.

Course name is the complete course name that the course has in the syllabus. For example Computer Science: Research Methodology or Introduction to Programming and Embedded Systems

Course code is the code with which the course is identified, for example DA350A or MT158A.

The semester is the semester / course opportunity that the course report refers to, for example Spring 20 or Autumn 19.

Number of registered is the number of registered students on the course three weeks after the start of the course (ie number of registered after early interruptions).

Course coordinator is the name of the teacher who is the course coordinator and who is responsible for writing the course report. Other teachers may, however, have been involved in the course implementation and compilation of the course report. Other teachers' names are not given.

The fields above are filled in by the study administration if course evaluation is done via SSR under the auspices of the study administration.

It must be registered in the course report if it is published on the course website and the Canvas page of the current course opportunity. This is filled in by the person responsible for the publication.

#### Course evaluation

The number of responses to compulsory course evaluation is the number who submitted a course evaluation or otherwise actively participated if an alternative method was used in-house (to be filled in by the study administration if course evaluation is done via SSR under the auspices of the study administration).

Mandatory price valuation has taken place by reporting which approach has been used for the price valuation. Methods are indicated by checking the current option. There are three options of which only one should be ticked:

- Only standard template via SSR (Sunet Survey and Report): This is what the study administration organizes unless otherwise stated to the study administration for the course. Check this option if you used the standard template via the study administration without making any adjustments.
- Standard template extended with own questions via SSR: Check this option if you have extended the standard template that the study administration organizes with its own course-specific questions. Added questions do not need to be reported here. They are archived with the course evaluation itself.
- Under your own auspices by the course coordinator: Check this alternative if the course evaluation has not been carried out with one of the two alternatives above. The course evaluation has then been organized by the course coordinator outside the study administration. The course coordinator is then also responsible for compiling the course evaluation. If the course coordinator has organized a course evaluation in-house, the approach must be described briefly. Specific questions do not need to be reported here, but are reported via the summary the course coordinator then makes of the course evaluation. For example, course evaluation has been conducted anonymously on paper in connection with presentations at the end of the course or course evaluation has been conducted anonymously with Mentimeter in connection with lecture week 22.

If additional valuations have been made, these are described as follows. It is not necessary to carry out additional valuations. If this has not happened, the fields below are left blank.

Comments on course evaluations mean that the course coordinator must comment on the results of the course evaluations. The comments are aimed at current and future students on the course. It is therefore not necessary to explain in the comments what different course elements mean or the like. The reader can be expected to have knowledge of the course's structure and

structure. Relevant things to address here are, for example, commenting on whether there is any result in the price evaluation that was not expected or whether there is any common criticism or results that may need to be explained or put in context.

**Examination results**

Examination results refer to results from all forms of examination that have taken place on the course (examination, laboratory work, assignments, etc.). Indicate whether the examination result overall was as expected or not. If there are separate examination parts that differed greatly in how they turned out in relation to the expected result (for example, the expected number of passers on a written exam but a very low number of passers on an assignment), then both alternatives can be checked.

If the alternative is that the examination result deviates from what was expected, this deviation is commented on and what any reasons for the deviation may consist of. Comment can be given even if the examination result looks as expected, but there is some aspect that needs to be highlighted.

**Recommendations and priorities for course development**

Briefly state which recommendations and priorities should be made for the upcoming course opportunity based on the results of course evaluations and in relation to examination results.