Course Report WASP Graduate School

Date: 2025-09-20
Authors[1]: Per-Erik Forssén, Michael Felsberg, Christopher Zach

Learning Feature Representations, 6hp
Semester: Fall 2024

Number of registered students: 38
Answering frequency (course evaluation): 30% (11/38)

Examination results

Number of students examined: 33 got certificates, 2 got local credits for parts, 2 completed parts and waits for next round. One dropout.
Fail: 2.6% incomplete 13.2% (see above)
Pass: 87%

Brief summary of student viewpoints and suggestions

Results of WASP base-line quantitative questions (11/38)

- What is your overall rating of the course (1-5) avg. 3.91
- Did you enjoy the course? (1-5) avg. 3.91
- Was it time well spent? (1-5) avg. 3.82
- *Workload: 6: moderate, 5: somewhat hard*
- *Communication channels: 2: neutral, 5: good, 4: very good*

Answers to free text-questions to be (shortly) summarized under "Strengths" and "Weaknesses"

- What was the best aspect of the course?
- What would you suggest improving?
- What advice would you like to give to future participants?
- Other comments. Is there anything else you would like to add?

"Strengths" according to students[2]

- the topic is very advanced and close research
- The practical projects, especially the one from the second module, were very helpful.

---

[1] *The report should be written by the examiner together with the teachers and possibly others, such as teaching assistants*
[2] *Based on both quantitative results and key viewpoints from students' free-text answers*

- Really nice mix of theory and application.
- The final module. Actually contained up-to-date content.
- Open-ended project allows for trying out fun things
- Course paper discussion and project collaboration.

"Weaknesses" according to students[1]

- Some students wanted us to leave canvas, or to have information both in canvas and over email. The majority said all was fine though, and even listed canvas as a plus.
- Make it easier to connect the homework to own research.
- The content was perceived by some as ”too domain specific”.
- The first module has too little connection to the other two and is ”extremely theoretical”.
- Only joint dinner at one one of the modules.
- Maybe the course teaching the material could be updated to some latest work in recent month etc. To show how it has evolved from previous to now?
- all of the WASP courses are either very basic (ie. introduction to SWE or intro to AI/ML) or very specific (like this one). The requirements for students to take so many WASP courses should be significantly relaxed as these courses often add no value.
- Module 3 dates were changed on too short notice. (One student)

Debriefing session on WASP elective course

Learning Feature Representations HT 2024

Date: 2025-08-13

Present:

Adam Miksits. Student representative, PhD student at KTH.

Per-Erik Forssén. Course examiner, and lecturer in Module 2

Michael Felsberg. Lecturer in Module 3

Discussion format:
The discussion was structured around the three modules.

Module 1: The first module was more theoretical than the other two, where the other two modules clearly had a computer vision focus, there was less of a connection to any specific input modality here. Some of the students perceived the module as heavy, while students who had more background perceived it as interesting and very relevant.

Module 2: The second module had a clear computer vision focus. Some of the students perceived the introduction to be a bit too basic, while others were less familiar with computer vision and appreciated this. The reading and discussion of articles was appreciated. A downside was that some of the concepts in the articles was

not known to the students before, and was only introduced in the lectures after reading the papers. It was agreed that some additional preparatory material could be useful, but this should not be too extensive, as there already is plenty of preparations.

Module 3: The third module had a similar setup with articles, but these were perceived as slightly more difficult. The home exercise was appreciated as interesting, but a bit difficult to get into. The notation was slightly different between different parts of the preparatory material and the lecture slides, which was a bit confusing. Several students appreciated the flexible requirements in the home assignment.

Comments from teachers on the implementation and outcome of the course[3]

- **On module 3 move:** The module was moved one week forward (Nov. 28-29 to Dec. 5-6). This was announced to the participants on October 2nd.

- In March 2025 certificates were sent out. The list of students that got certificates was **not** the one submitted by the examiner. This has hopefully been corrected by now.

Proposed changes/comments/measures

- For the next round of the course, Christopher Zach is no longer participating, so we will need another lecturer for module 1. E.g. Fredrik Lindsten at LiU.
- A list of background papers and textbook chapters will be added to the instructions sent out before module 2.

[3] *Including changes effected during the course*