



Kursnämndsmöte: Protokoll

<i>Kursnamn:</i>	Stochastic data processing and simulation	<i>Kursägande program:</i>	Teknisk matematik
<i>Kurskod:</i>	TMS150	<i>Programkod:</i>	TKTEM
<i>Läsår:</i>	2024-2025	<i>Kursgivande institution:</i>	Matematiska vetenskaper
<i>Läsperiod (start):</i>	Lp1	<i>Programmets utbildningssekreterare / handläggare:</i>	Joakim Norbeck
<i>Läsperiod (slut):</i>	Lp1	<i>Datum:</i>	2024-11-22

Fyll i alla fält ovan. Välj läsår, läsperioder, program, programkod, institution och datum från respektive rullmeny.

Mötesdeltagare: Studentrepresentant TM: Ellinor Olesen,
Programansvarig: Julie Rowlett,
Utbildningssekreterare: Joakim Norbeck,
Examinator: Umberto Picchini,
Lärare: Annika Lang, Moritz Schauer,
TA: Niki Wilhelmson, Isac Boström, Ioanna Motshcan-Armen,
Övriga: Carl Elofsson (studentrepresentant GU), Ribal Darmoush (Tm:are)

Protokollföreläsare: Ellinor Olesen

Ett gemensamt möte har hållits för följande kurser:
MSG400 (GU-course)

Summary

The overall impression of the course was highly varied, with an average score of 3.21, so no immediate actions are required. Only 22% responded to the survey. Out of the 107 students who completed the course, 57 passed, of which 21 received a grade of 4, and 33 received a grade of 5. Responses throughout the course survey were very scattered, making it difficult to obtain clear answers to various questions. However, it was evident that A4 and A6 were difficult to understand due to a lack of knowledge in the subject and poorly phrased questions. The levels of the different teachers varied. Grading by different TAs also varied, but it was considered fair. There were indications of a high workload, and discussions revolved around either simplifying the reports or reducing the number of assignments.

Prerequisites and learning outcomes

Responses were scattered. TM students' programming skills felt insufficient. There was no prior programming in R and limited programming in MATLAB and Python. There were no comments on this. It was challenging to follow when sigma algebra was presented. Annika Lang mentioned that this topic had been removed previously, but the TA who delivered the lecture reintroduced it. Ribal noted that it was challenging to have a project entirely focused on Brownian motion without it being introduced beforehand. He suggested solving the issue by scheduling this course after Stochastic Processes and Bayesian Inference MVE550. Annika Lang mentioned that the entire A4 assignment would need to be removed if Brownian motion cannot be used. However, it was noted that it is an interesting subject and valuable to work with topics not encountered previously. Annika Lang's lectures will delve further into what Brownian motion is.

Learning, examination, and course administration

Opinions on learning were again mixed. Ellinor mentioned that the knowledge levels of the different teachers varied. The first teacher's level matched the knowledge TM already had. The second was too advanced to follow, while the third was too basic, covering material that was already expected to be known, leaving less time for new and more complex topics.

Regarding the examination, opinions remained divided in the survey. It was stated that A4 and A6 were difficult to understand, partly due to vague questions and poor structuring. Annika Lang was surprised that the A4 questions were found difficult, as the answers had already been covered in lectures. Some student commented that different TAs graded somewhat differently, but overall they felt the grading was fair even though not identical. The assignments themselves were created by three entirely different teachers, each with their own expectations for students. Ellinor felt that the main issue lay in unclear questions, but the grading was fair and reasonable. Some students used different templates for their reports, and it was suggested that a standardized template would have been helpful. : Although a standardized template was available for the reports, students commented that they were not aware of it. It is not clear how to address this because there was quite a lot of information provided about this template: linked to the main course page, slides of the first lecture, course PM in 2 places, and the pages on report writing and tips about plagiarism. The survey also showed that the assignments and theory included a lot of unnecessary information, making it difficult to find what was relevant.

Work climate

The survey suggested that the workload was too high. For most students, the report writing contributed significantly to the workload. TM students generally lack experience in writing reports. It was discussed that a clear template with short answers for the first assignment could be introduced to familiarize students with report writing, while more comprehensive reports could be required for later assignments. It was also suggested to reduce the number of assignments by removing smaller tasks with only presentations, and possibly making the remaining tasks slightly larger. This would provide more time to work on each task.

The collaboration between students and teachers worked well.

To keep for next course round

Skipped, as it was deemed that there were not enough responses to provide a reliable indication.

Suggested changes

Mostly skipped as well.

Switching to a single programming language is not possible, as the syllabus states that students should gain knowledge of different programming languages.

Other matters

There were scheduling issues as lab sessions overlapped with lectures in complex analysis. The examiner could contact the complex analysis examiner or resolve the issue when receiving the proposed schedule.

Very few responded to the course survey. Ellinor suggested posting a notification on the Canvas course page when the survey is uploaded. At a higher level, solutions are being considered.