

DT2012 (Programmering, HT 2025, Halmstad, H3416)

Antal möjliga respondenter: 184

Antal svar: 50

Svarsfrekvens: 27,17 %

Studietakt: 50 %

Examinators kursanalys

Vilka styrkor har kursen?

First, we have to clarify that we did not use officially the ambassador model. Even though a self-proclaimed ambassador established direct communication, not all students agreed with this and continued direct communication with the lecturer. Thus, students who actually engaged in the course activities had opportunities to provide direct input, which we responded to during the course. We also take into account the action points proposed in the past course analysis to assess the progress (if any) in course quality.

Strength 1: Direct Communication With Students Who Actually Participated

Even without official ambassadors, students who attended lectures, demos, exercises, and contacted us directly consistently reported fast, responsive, and helpful instructor communication. Many students explicitly highlighted that we were quick to respond, supportive, and available when contacted via email or in person. This shows a strong teacher–student communication channel, one of the core goals of the ambassador model (getting real feedback early from engaged students).

Strength 2: High Quality Practical Programming Elements

In practical terms, the most praised part of the course was the hands-on programming. The new practical format (Skill Tests + demos + code-alongs) became the primary strength. Together, these show that the practical, hands-on nature of the course is a core, repeated, stable course strength. Although there were issues with fairness and alignment (those will belong to weaknesses), the concept and intention of the Skill Tests themselves were repeatedly praised. This is a major new strength introduced in 2025.

Strength 3: Additional resources

This came from direct input from students this year, who asked for videos and extra materials which we provided them with. A repeated positive theme in 2025 was the quality and usefulness of the additional materials you provided. This indicates that the course offers strong asynchronous learning support, which students value highly, especially beginners.

While not an asynchronous resource, we strengthened the quality of our code-alongs – which is a practice we inherited from the previous course responsible but it took us some time to curate to that level. These were repeatedly listed among the best parts of the course in 2025, and aligns with 2024 feedback where some students wanted more practical explanation. Recovering the demos addressed that gap in explanation. Unfortunately, many students decide not to attend, and then wonder why concepts that we mention there appear in the exam.

Strength 4 Course structure

We have now a clear separation between theory and practice in teaching and in assessment. Previously, students were required to answer theoretical questions during practical examinations and to code extensively during the written exam. Now, there is a clear separation. Although not appreciated by everyone (and some parts are in need of refinement), several students praised aspects of the new structured format:

- Alternation between learning new material → assignments → skill test
- Clearer weekly rhythm
- Separation between theory and practice

Vilka svagheter har kursen?

There are weaknesses that persist from previous iterations but in a new form. In the past, students

perceived unfairness in the seminars since three different people would be conducting them and asking “different” questions (even though for 2024 we had a common bank of questions). For 2025, fairness re-emerges around Skill Tests: reports of unequal help across invigilators, variation in task difficulty, and inconsistent grading. The locus changed, but the equity and standardization problem persisted.

There is also a perceived weakness that we have to mention even though it reveals the bimodal nature of students’ personalities. In 2024, students asked for less atomized exercises (to which we agreed and decided to bring more overarching exercises). However, some answers in 2025 asked for smaller, incremental tasks that mirror Skill Test demands. It is important to clarify that exercises are not meant to teach you how to pass a Skill Test the same way the lecture is not for you to pass the written exam: we are here to teach you how to solve problems through Java programs. In that regard, we think the new exercise packages are a better tool, and the skill tests are a way to show you have developed certain skills during the solving of the exercise packages.

In terms of lectures, there are continued calls for a clearer, beginner-oriented progression; several comments describe pacing and structure as confusing or “flummig.” The pedagogical through-line is still a challenge. However, we have 8 weeks to cover content that shall be covered in at least 15 weeks. This is a structural problem in HH, not unique to this course, and that is something we explain to students during the first lecture – to which only around 60 attended. If you have too few weeks to learn this skill and you still decide to skip lectures, there is not much we can do to solve this structural problem.

Another weakness reported is the lack of support from SI-leaders. I am sorry to inform the reader, now in my role as a SI method responsible, that DT2012 does not have Supplemental Instruction (SI). This is a product of misinformation distributed by students that do not really attend course activities, since it was explained several times during the first lecture how exercise sessions are run. We have three older students heading them and the lecturer’s presence was not anticipated in any of them (so those “short periods” with the lecturer were actually extra). Students would like exercise sessions more akin to their math exercises, however, we need to have them in computer rooms. However, moving from D to R is too much to ask for according to the replies.

Several comments perceive “mid-course shifts” or unclear expectations (e.g., on exam code length or pass thresholds), eroding confidence. The minimum requirement to pass the exam is still the same: show knowledge of the majority of the content. Since now you are not required to write perfect code (which you were), the threshold in points is increased. This was explained during the first lecture, and there was never a “mid-course shift” on this regard. The length of expected code was even explained during the zoom session in January (to which 42 students attended).

We finalize with a comparison to 2024 and the weaknesses that were mitigated:

- Weekly “seminars” were replaced by Skill tests. Now everyone gets asked. However, the perceived unfairness is something to be addressed.
- The technical issues at lectures (e.g., in 2024 we did not use the microphone) have disappeared. Even screen visibility has been praised.

New weaknesses emerged around assignment gating/scale, support quality in exercises, and Skill Test standardization. This, combined with the drop in indices, suggests the redesign solved some problems but introduced others that disproportionately affected some students. One could argue that it affects beginners, but anecdotal evidence suggest that some beginners actually thrived, and it was less-consistent students (those who do not attend all necessary sessions) that were more affected by disinformation and misinformation.

Kommentera samarbetet med kursambassadörerna

There were no formally selected or officially functioning course ambassadors.

Although no official ambassador existed, a self-appointed spokesperson attempted to take on the role informally.

- This person was not recognized by the course.
- Several students expressed individual dissatisfaction with having someone claim to speak for them without being elected or endorsed.
- Students preferred to communicate directly with instructors, a dynamic more aligned with the ambassador model’s goal of bottom-up feedback rather than centralized representation.

This situation suggests that, without a formal process, self-appointed representation may distort or

mischaracterize student opinions.

For HT 2025, students who attended activities reported that they:

- Could raise concerns directly,
- Felt that their feedback was heard,
- Saw changes implemented during the course, e.g., Q&A sessions, additional material on Blackboard, demo sessions, and iterative improvements noted by students.

This shows that direct instructor–student communication served as the primary and effective feedback mechanism, substituting for the expected ambassador structure. As a result, the course operated without formal ambassadors, but collaboration with students still occurred successfully via direct, decentralized, and responsive channels, aligning with the ambassador model’s purpose even if not its structure.

Slutsatser samt eventuella förslag till kursutveckling eller beslut som redan fattats

The HT 2025 iteration successfully modernized the course’s practical assessment and significantly improved instructional resources. Students clearly noticed these changes and expressed appreciation for the direct responsiveness and engagement of the teaching staff.

While major 2024 weaknesses were resolved (e.g., the logistics of seminars, lack of practical explanations) other structural weaknesses persisted and new ones emerged, especially around support consistency, assignment design, and assessment fairness.

The next iteration of the course will prioritize:

- Better standardization (Skill Test fairness)
- Better support (adoption of SI)
- Better communication (finding new ways to engage students)

With these adjustments, the course can build on what already works well and deliver a more coherent and equitable learning experience for all students.

Övriga kommentarer

A notable outcome of this year’s course iteration is the significant improvement in student performance on the written exam, with a larger proportion of students passing on their first attempt compared with the previous year. This represents meaningful progress in one of the most challenging components of the course.

Furthermore, a clear division of the cohort into three distinct groups has emerged:

One third passed the written exam and actively participated throughout the course (63 out of approximately 190 students).

One third did not pass the written exam but successfully completed the Skill Tests, showing tangible learning progression even if they did not reach full examination readiness.

One third did not attend the written exam at all, suggesting disengagement, insufficient preparation, or external factors impacting their participation.

This pattern is consistent with the conjunctural conditions of the course:

- a)□ The course is compressed into half a term, which intensifies cognitive load and reduces the buffer time first□ year students typically need to build foundational knowledge.
- b)□ Most students are in their first semester of university studies, still adapting to expectations, academic discipline, and self□ regulated learning.
- c)□ The university’s policy of breddad rekrytering means that a larger proportion of students enter the program without the traditional prerequisites expected at other institutions. This places additional pressure on introductory courses, which must simultaneously support true beginners and students with prior programming experience.

Despite these systemic challenges, the course has taken substantial steps forward in mitigating their effects. The introduction of practical Skill Tests, improved learning materials, clearer structure in demonstrations, and expanded support resources have all contributed to better learning outcomes and a more effective preparation. Many students’ feedback reflects that these changes have already had a positive impact on their progression and confidence, even if overall throughput remains affected by broader structural factors.

Jag är sammantaget nöjd med kursen.

	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)	Index (%) Jag är sammantaget nöjd med kursen	
0 = Instämmer inte alls	6	12%	48	
1	10	20%		
2	10	20%		
3	11	22%		
4	8	16%		
5 = Instämmer helt	5	10%		
Ingen uppfattning	0	0%		
Summa	50	100%		

Hur mycket tid har du lagt på kursen i förhållande till kursens studietakt?

	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Mindre tid än kursens studietakt	17	34%
Motsvarande kursens studietakt	22	44%
Mer tid än kursens studietakt	11	22%
Summa	50	100%

Kursens utformning (undervisningsformer, litteratur, pedagogik etc.) har underlättat för mig att uppnå lärandemålen i kursplanen.

	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
0 = Instämmer inte alls	10	20%
1	9	18%
2	15	30%
3	3	6%
4	8	16%
5 = Instämmer helt	4	8%
Ingen uppfattning	1	2%
Summa	50	100%

Index (%) Kursens utformning (undervisningsformer, litteratur, pedagogik etc.) har underlättat för mig att uppnå lärandemålen i kursplanen.

41

Jag har under kursens examinationsmoment haft möjlighet att visa att jag har uppnått lärandemålen i kursplanen.

	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
0 = Instämmer inte alls	4	8%
1	6	12%
2	6	12%
3	10	20%
4	12	24%
5 = Instämmer helt	8	16%
Ingen uppfattning	4	8%
Summa	50	100%

Index (%) Jag har under kursens examinationsmoment haft möjlighet att visa att jag har uppnått lärandemålen i kursplanen.

59

Jag upplever att den sociala studiemiljön varit god under kursen.

	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)	Index (%) Jag upplever att den sociala studiemiljön varit god under kursen
0 = Instämmer inte alls	4	8%	62
1	3	6%	
2	6	12%	
3	15	30%	
4	10	20%	
5 = Instämmer helt	10	20%	
Ingen uppfattning	2	4%	
Summa	50	100%	

Kursens nöjdhetsindex

Nöjdhetsindex % (summering alla påståenden)	52
---	----

Markera alla tillfällen eller sätt du brukade kontakta lärarpersonalen

Markera alla tillfällen eller sätt du brukade kontakta lärarpersonalen	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Föreläsningar	31	65%
Övningar	23	48%
Konsultation utanför lektionstid med föreläsaren	10	21%
Blackboard	26	54%
E-post	23	48%
Summa	113	235%

Vilket av följande alternativ skulle du känna dig mest bekväm med för att bedöma dina praktiska programmeringskunskaper?

Vilket av följande alternativ skulle du känna dig mest bekväm med för att bedöma dina praktiska programmeringskunskaper?	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Muntlig tentamen under seminarium och författande av kompletta program under den skriftliga tentamen (som gjordes fram till 2024)	8	16%
Skill tests (från och med 2025)	44	88%
Annat (specificera)	3	6%
Summa	55	110%

DETTA ÄR ENDAST FÖR STATISTISTISKA ÄNDAMÅL: Deltog du i dessa kursaktiviteter?

Lecture 1 - Your first program, basic data types and expressions (Oscar)

Lecture 1 - Your first program, basic data types and expressions (Oscar)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	49	98%
No	1	2%
Summa	50	100%

Lecture 2 - Control Flow - Conditional Statements and Loops (Oscar)

Lecture 2 - Control Flow - Conditional Statements and Loops (Oscar)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	45	90%
No	5	10%
Summa	50	100%

Exercises 1 - Installing Java in the university computers

Exercises 1 - Installing Java in the university computers	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	38	76%
No	12	24%
Summa	50	100%

Demo 1 - Demonstration of the first two lectures (Oscar)

Demo 1 - Demonstration of the first two lectures (Oscar)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	39	78%
No	11	22%
Summa	50	100%

Mock skill test (simulating two dice)

Mock skill test (simulating two dice)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	44	88%
No	6	12%
Summa	50	100%

Lecture 3 - Standard Input and Arrays (Oscar)

Lecture 3 - Standard Input and Arrays (Oscar)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	37	74%
No	13	26%
Summa	50	100%

Lecture 4 - Methods in Java and Programs that Can Draw (Felipe)

Lecture 4 - Methods in Java and Programs that Can Draw (Felipe)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	27	54%
No	23	46%
Summa	50	100%

Demo 2 - Demonstration of programs from lectures 3 and 4 (Joel)

Demo 2 - Demonstration of programs from lectures 3 and 4 (Joel)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	26	52%
No	24	48%
Summa	50	100%

Lecture 5 - Abstract Data Types with Colors and Images as Examples (Aurora)

Lecture 5 - Abstract Data Types with Colors and Images as Examples (Aurora)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	33	66%
No	17	34%
Summa	50	100%

Demo 3 - Demo of abstract data types - we drew flags and swapped colors (Oscar)

Demo 3 - Demo of abstract data types - we drew flags and swapped colors (Oscar)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	37	74%
No	13	26%
Summa	50	100%

Lecture 6 - User-defined Abstract Data Types: Complex Numbers and Bouncing Balls (Oscar)

Lecture 6 - User-defined Abstract Data Types: Complex Numbers and Bouncing Balls (Oscar)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	32	64%
No	18	36%
Summa	50	100%

Demo 4 - Demo on user-defined abstract data types - we solved an example with coordinates (Oscar)

Demo 4 - Demo on user-defined abstract data types - we solved an example with coordinates (Oscar)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	32	64%
No	18	36%
Summa	50	100%

Lecture 7 Graphical user interfaces, event driven programming and Model-View-Controller (Oscar)

Lecture 7 Graphical user interfaces, event driven programming and Model-View-Controller (Oscar)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	27	54%
No	23	46%
Summa	50	100%

Demo 5 - Demo on GUIs and MVC (Joel)

Demo 5 - Demo on GUIs and MVC (Joel)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Yes	23	46%
No	27	54%
Summa	50	100%

DETTA ÄR ENDAST FÖR STATISTISTISKA ÄNDAMÅL: Hur mycket deltog du i dessa kursaktiviteter?

Övningar (totalt 8)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
Ingent	8	16%
Cirka 25%	17	34%
Hälften	5	10%
Cirka 75%	11	22%
Alla	9	18%
Summa	50	100%

ENDAST OM DU DELTAGIT I 4 ELLER FLER ÖVNINGAR: Tycker du att de hjälpte dig att förstå programmeringskoncept bättre genom att utveckla självständiga problemlösningsfärdigheter? Vad skulle du lägga till, ta bort eller ändra från övningarna?

ENDAST OM DU DELTAGIT I 3 ELLER ÖVNINGAR: Förklara tydligt vad som hindrade dig från att delta i de schemalagda sessionerna (t.ex. överlappning med andra kurser, bristande intresse, schemaläggningskonflikter, att du inte fick förväntat stöd från instruktörer)

Förklara kortfattat sambandet mellan den tid du investerat i kursen, det stöd du fick från instruktörerna, den hjälp du fick från dina egna klasskamrater, dina prestationer i de utvärderingssituationer du har ställts inför (t.ex. skill tests) och dina självupplevda framsteg inom programmering.

Med tanke på dina svar, hur säker är du på att du kommer att klara det skriftliga provet (från 0 till 100 där 100 är mycket säker)

Med tanke på dina svar, hur säker är du på att du kommer att klara det skriftliga provet (från 0 till 100 där 100 är mycket säker)	Antal svar	Fördelning (%)
0 - 10	9	18%
11 - 21	2	4%
22 - 32	5	10%
33 - 43	1	2%
44 - 54	6	12%
55 - 65	6	12%
66 - 76	2	4%
77 - 87	6	12%
88 - 98	6	12%
99 - 109	7	14%
Summa	50	100%