COURSE REPORT

Background information (To be completed by course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD402C	**Scope (hp): 7,5**
Course title: Programmering	
Course coordinator: Love Lagerkvist	**Number of registered students: 60**
Semester in which the course is conducted: HT22	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. TGIDE22h1	

Administration's perspective (To be completed by course administrator)

The administration's views:

Forms of evaluation and feedback (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Formative course evaluation: Various Programråd meetings during the course.	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 2 class representatives.
Summative course evaluation: Reflex survey.	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 61
Feedback to students: (Feedback was given during Programråd and during an end-of-course seminar.	

Student's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Summary of the students' course evaluations: Student reception was largely positive, particularly regarding the assignments and lectures. The composition of a wide array of study materials and the practical application worked well, and students found the communication with teachers and TAs responsive. The Puck.js workshops were an appreciated addition. Most students would have preferred to have the course on-site instead of the hybrid, largely remote setup we employed this year. Some thought the pace was a bit brisk and that it was not easy to deal with two courses running side by side.

Teacher's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Summary of the teacher's views/Results: The course was, overall, a success, with high-quality final assignment submissions. Large parts of the course were reworked to fit better into the educational approach employed by succeeding programming courses, to which students responded positively. An updated array of study material and learning references encouraged students to seek multiple sources and find the one that jived best with their learning. The core issues faced are mainly a symptom of the hybrid structure, requiring the student to take on more responsibility for planning and working through the course material. The parallel course scheduling further amplified this stress, where students found it difficult to judge their progress and how to structure their studies.

Analysis and action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Analysis: The basic structure of the course is mature and has come to work well. Further integration into the rest of the curriculum is always possible, but this year took significant strides in making the overall experience more coherent. The hybrid model, motivated primarily by logistics, caused some friction, and both students and teachers expressed a strong desire to return to on-campus teaching.

Action plan: Aside from returning to an on-campus learning model, we propose implementing self-supervised Canvas quizzes. Weekly, corresponding to the programming concepts introduced, would give both the teacher and the student a way to gauge the level of understanding and make changes accordingly. Quizzes take some time to create, but if done well, they could be used over multiple years. It might also be worth evaluation cloud-based, collaborative programming platforms to make it easier for students to share code and get access to course material.

Publishing and archiving (To be handled by the course administrator)

☒ The course report is published, and the students have been informed about the publication,

☒ The course report is archived according to the university's archiving rules,

☒ The course report is shared with the programme coordinator (if applicable),

☒ The course report is saved according to any additional requests on behalf of the department.