

----- INFO352 -- H2012 -----

1. Teacher's assessment of the implementation

1.1 Practical implementation

The course began with an introductory lecture, in which the subject, logistics, logical structure, literature, and first assignments were introduced to the students. Following this different themes were covered on subsequent weeks.

The course was organized with (almost) weekly three-hour seminars (9am – 12) on Mondays. The seminars comprised lectures (by the instructor and guest lecturers), discussions, and student presentations. Four activities were given throughout the semester: an article review with presentation, a presentation of a learning technology; one evaluation of an intelligent tutoring systems; and a reflection over own learning. The article review and the reflection over learning were submitted in the portfolio for evaluation. The course project entailed either a literature review or a mini-empirical study.

Between the seminars the students were reading articles, evaluating technologies and working on their individual and group assignments.

A term paper accounted for 40% of the total grade, a portfolio assessment (2 assignments) for 30% and an oral exam for 30%.

The content of the course was met with enthusiasm, but we all agreed (instructor and students) that the 3-hour seminar is too short. More time is needed when there are student presentations and feedback to each other, mixed with discussions and lectures. It is highly recommended to have a 10 am - 15 pm seminar in the future.

1.2 Failure rate and dropout

All 10 students successfully completed the course.

1.3 Grade distribution

The most common grade was B, with 5 B's, 3 A's and 2 C's. This distribution appears to be normal for a master's course.

1.4 Student Information and documentation

Course information, including course literature, lecture plans, lecture notes, and teacher's announcements, were provided in MiSide. The admin bulk email function was used occasionally, as was email to private (often gmail) accounts.

1.5 Access to relevant literature

The articles used in the course could be downloaded from MiSide.

2. Conditions

Facilities and teaching equipment.

The classroom was fine for the number of students. We needed to have skype

installed on one of the machines and book this room for the 3 lectures we had over Skype. Skype worked well, although it would be good to have some good audio speakers available for such Skype sessions.

3. Teacher's comments on students' evaluation

Six of the ten students completed the anonymous survey. The course was ranked from Good to Excellent and all the students said they would recommend the course to others.

The students pointed out several things they liked about the course including the theme, the smaller class size, interesting topics, and very good guest lecturers. I was also happy reading to see that all 6 rated me as excellent. All the respondents mentioned that it was unfortunately to only have the 3-hour meeting times (we did discuss this several times in class). This meant there was little time for discussion of the literature, and I agree 100%.

One student pointed out that the course about technology enhanced learning did not use technology for teaching. This is an excellent point and it was considered when designing the course, but would require a student assistant for the course, which there was not this semester.

While all the students thought that the literature was appropriate, a few students thought that some of the literature was difficult to understand, and some commented that discussions could address the literature more specifically. The students were asked if they came to class prepared, and their answers favoured fair and good, indicating as I suspected that not all had read the literature when they should have. This is a key issue in a theoretical course and there need to be mechanisms to ensure that they read and come prepared to class.

4. Teacher's overall assessment, including suggestions for improvement.

My overall assessment of the course is positive. It was a struggle when developing the course between having a survey of the field (which it was) versus a narrower course that goes in depth on one or two themes. Although 1 of the respondents would have preferred a narrower course, I think it was the right choice given that it is a new topic for all since none of our undergraduate courses cover technology enhanced learning.

As always, there are some areas for further improvement. In the future, (a) hold full day seminars, (b) introduce the course project earlier, (c) structure discussions in the class so that active participation of all students is ensured and preparation for the lectures (i.e., having read the literature) is necessary, and finally, (d) change the weighting of the assessment to be: course project 40%, ePortfolio 20%, oral exam 40%.
