TDDD07 Muddy cards evaluation summary 2021-11-12

students at lecture (8.15-10.00): 17, # cards filled: 16

Summary of comments

Thank you all for your feedback! We have reviewed the comments and below you will find some comments/actions. It is very helpful for the improvement of the course to communicate clearly and specifically about things unclear anywhere (e.g. in the compendium) directly to the relevant teacher.

Lectures:

Several comments indicated positive experience with lectures, in terms like "fun", "great", "interactive", "very good", "dynamic", "pretty clear", "helpful". Four students mentioned that the illustrations on the whiteboard help, and four mentioned that the presented examples were useful for learning. Two students said that they learn a lot and two comments the slides positively. One student found the bonus assignments very interesting. One student thought that it would be "nice to spend a little more time on examples during the lecture".

Teacher's comment: Thanks for the encouraging comments. This is a very dynamic and interactive experience for the lecturer too and we hope that the remaining lectures stay on this level of engagement. As usual, if the material is presented at a faster pace that you can absorb it, then mention it during or immediately after the class, and the teacher will try to identify if there are some knowledge gaps and if so, hint about how you can catch up.

Lessons:

One student specifically wrote that the "lesson is good" and that "the questions are related" to the material in the course. Three students asked for answers to the exercises to be presented. Two students asked for going through a couple of examples during the lesson. One student thought it would be good with a "repetition" of the lesson material "(equations, algorithms,…)" which is somewhat unclear for us. One student had "hard to get a feel on" what one can do "to avoid problems".

Teacher comments: The answers to the exercises already covered are now on the course web page. It is hard to help if we are unsure in which sense the student is experiencing problems. Lessons are expected to fill that gap through individual interaction. Going through the covered material in a detailed way would steal time from the individual interactions, but we will try to have 1-2 examples covered on the white board for each lesson.

Labs:

One student gave a positive view of the labs as being "interesting" and included "commented code". One student wrote they needed lab time outside of the schedule. One student did not like the idea of labs at 5-9 pm. One mentioned that the robots were not charged before 17.15. Six students had issues with understanding the lab instructions, mentioning things like having to go through the "long" compendium, needing an example on "how the API should be used", needing hints on how to solve them "specially with C code".

Teachers' comments:

The schedule hours are outside our control (LiU block system) but the charging of robot can be helped by students using them before you. Lecture 1 signaled that we expect the labs to take ~55h for preparation (= reading, thinking), coding and writing. Some difficulty from grasping the lab fast is inherent to the fact that this is a systems course and not a programming course, and we are trying to create a setting closer to a real-world scenario. Less experience with C means that the gap needs to be filled, and the assistants do their best to help. You can get extra access time to the lab environment by agreeing a time with your lab assistant to let you in. According to past experience, once you have done lab 1 you get through lab 2 much faster as long as you do not have C programming issues. So keep on working and we help as much as we can!