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*Summary*

The general impression of the course for students was good (mean score of 3.58 and median of 4.0 out of 5). The general opinion on learning outcomes and the course structure was also very good (mean score 3.8 and 3.79). The course literature, the Lecture Notes pdf, worked well. The response rate was not very high, 29.23%.

Students had, in general, the required prerequisites (mean score 3.95). The C intro worked well. The students felt the workload was relatively high (mean score 3.79). It was decided to replace/remove E5. It was also decided to switch to digital hand-in from printed.

It is positive that there are a lot of points to get, if you want a higher grade you can simply put down more time. It is also positive that this course fits well alongside the statistical mechanics course TIF305.

*Prerequisites and learning outcome*

The students generally felt they had the proper prerequisites. Many of the students had not used C before, the intro helped them a lot.

The students who participated in the course agreed that the learning outcomes of the course clearly describe what was expected to learn in the course.

*Learning, examination and course administration*

The course structure (divided into lectures, exercises, lab sessions etc.) was considered to work well in order to reach the intended learning outcomes of the course. The teaching also worked well in both the lectures and the computer lab sessions. The course literature supported learning well, especially the lecture notes written by the examiner.

Something that would’ve been good for the course would be if the TA:s had more knowledge about C.

Many student began working on a problem (specifically H2) before they had joined a group in Canvas, to later learn that the group corresponding to the task they had chosen was full. Additional groups were created for these students. Since the student distribution was uneven, the grading of H2b took a long time. Suggestions were put forward on how to avoid this next year.

*Work climate*

The students generally had a very positive impression of the working environment (mean score 4.21 out of 5). The students impression of the workload was relatively high but lower than last year. This is likely due to changes from last year: More divided up tasks and example solutions in the lecture notes.

*To keep for next course round*

The grading system worked well.

Double deadlines, one for feedback, and one for grading.

The problems H1/H2/H3 work well.

The C intro.

*Suggested changes*

To have some code example to show how to structure code properly.

Include, in the lectures, more concrete examples of how to solve problems using coding.

Remove/replace E5.

Let the TA:s suggest a debugger for C.

Digital hand-ins.

Make sure there’s a way for students who have not found partners yet to find each other. Maybe by letting students post on Canvas.

Put up the problem description on Canvas some days before the signup opens. Also have the signup open a specific time. This is to avoid the problems discussed in course administration were H2b took a long time to grade since many more students choose it than H2a.

Compose a list of bugs and errors found in the code in this course.