Faglærers vurdering av gjennomføring INFO323 spring 2014

- Praktisk gjennomføring

  This is my first time teaching INFO323 and it went very well. Students liked the course and learned very much. Although the students can be absent for 20% (8 hours) of the total lecture time, only one student was away for 2 hours in the whole semester. They actively participated in the discussion and did their homework. INFO323 is a tough course for INFO students, and I was very satisfied that they have all finished the course.

- Strykprosent og frafall (studiekonsulent legger ut statistisk materiale, faglærer kan evt. kommentere)

  11 students, nobody failed.

- Karakterfordeling (studiekonsulent legger ut statistisk materiale, faglærer kan evt. kommentere)

  3A, 5B, 3C.
  Students have put very much time in the course work and assignment. They have demonstrated that they have good understanding of the topic in the essay.

- Studieinformasjon og dokumentasjon

  Good

- Tilgang til relevant litteratur

  Good

Faglærers vurdering av rammevilkårene

- Lokaler og undervisningsutstyr

  In Seminarrom 645 the air can be a bit stale after a few hours.

- Andre forhold

  No other comments

Faglærers kommentar til emneevaluering via seminarledere (Elin og Liv har sendt de evalueringene vi har mottatt til dere)

- Oppsummering av innspill

  n/a

Faglærers samlede vurdering,inkl. forslag til forbedringstiltak

In summary, I am very satisfied with the course and the students. Students really had put much effort in learning the difficult topics and they have achieved the goals of the course.

Based on my experience with the course and the feedback from students and external sensor, the exam form ("essay") may not be the best way to evaluate the students' achievement in terms of knowledge, skills, and competence.

INFO331 - emnerapport 2014 høst

Faglærers vurdering av gjennomføring

Praktisk gjennomføring

Hovedinntrykket er at kurset fungerte bra. Kurset er engelskspråklig, men det var kun norske studenter på kurset, så i praksis ble norsk undervisningsspråk. Studentene kunne velge om de ville skrive artikkelen – som er en del av eksamen – på norsk eller engelsk. Det var valgt tema for kurset i år: Smidige metoder. Undervisningen var lagt opp som 8 heldagsseminarer. Seminarene besto av en kombinasjon av forelesninger, studentpresentasjoner, prosjektpresentasjoner og diskusjoner. Første samling var det stort sett forelesninger for at studentene raskt skulle komme inn i temaene og hvilke vinklinger vi ønsket å se på. Studentenes skulle presentere hver sin artikkel fra en liste satt opp av meg. De presenterte artiklene i plenum. For hver studentpresentasjon var en av de andre studentene oppsatt til å forberede spørsmål til artikkelen. Ansvarsfordeling for dette var satt opp på forhånd. Pensum besto av et par klassiske systemutviklingsartikler, noen oversiktsartikler over hovedtema samt listen med artikler som studentene kunne velge blant.

Studentene skulle jobbe på et programvareprosjekt i grupper på fortrinnsvis 6-7 personer. Fordi jeg ønsket at de skulle sette seg inn i en ny teknologi, ga jeg dem mulighet til å velge mellom mobil teknologi (Android). Studentene syntes at dette var interessant. Jeg delte dem i to grupper for å få en jevnest mulig fordeling av kompetanse. Det var flere studenter fra Nye Medier – som jo ikke har så mye programmeringserfaring, mens som gjerne har bedre kompetanse innen design og grafikk – og jeg ønsket at disse skulle være jevnt fordelt på de to teamene. En gruppe valgte å utvikle et spill for mobil, og den andre gruppen laget en app på bakgrunn av ønsker fra en «kunde». Det var satt opp et krav om at de skulle bruke en agil metode, nemlig Scrum. Det var et absolutt krav om at prosjektgruppene skulle bruker versjonsstyring (git) og et «lett» planlegginssystem (trello). Ellers brukte de Google docs til å dele plandokumenter, og en gruppe satte opp en Facebook-gruppe for generell kommunikasjon. Studentene har mest utfordringer med git. I år brukte de BitBucket og SourceTree fra Atlassian.

Studentene skulle skrive en artikkel om en selvvalgt problemstilling innen hovedtemaet for kurset. De kunne skrive artikkelen alene eller i par. Noen studenter valgte å arbeide alene. Det var obligatorisk oppmøte på samlingene (over 80 % av tiden). Det var høyt oppmøte på samtlige med unntak av en.

Strykprosent og frafall

En student hadde meldt seg opp på kurset samtidig som han var i full jobb. Dette viste seg å være for arbeidskrevende for ham, særlig fordi han var nødt til å reise litt i løpet av semesteret. Til sist innså han at han ikke kunne oppfylle kravene til kurset. De øvrige studentene var svært ivrige og deltok aktivt i diskusjoner og prosjekter.
Karakteren på kurset er sammensatt av tre deler: Prosjektarbeid (20%), artikkel (50%) og muntlig eksamen (30%). For prosjektarbeidet vurderte jeg dokumenter som var tilgjengelig og versjonsstyringsforrådet. I tillegg måtte teamene skrive en evalueringsrapport og hver student måtte skrive en egenevaluering. Denne rapporten skulle leveres inn både til teamleder (Scrum master) samt til meg. Ut fra dette materialet syntes jeg det var enklere å vurdere hvordan de ulike deltakerne hadde bidratt til prosjektarbeidet. På muntlig eksamen var det et par som var glimrende, mens det var to/tre stykker som var svært svake.

Karakterfordeling

Muntlig: 1 A, 8 B, 2 C, 1 D, 1E

Skriftlig: 2 A, 6 B, 4 C, 1 D
Prosjekt: 7 A, 4 B, 2C
Snittkarakter: 1 A, 9 B, 3 C

Studieinformasjon og dokumentasjon

Pensumsartikler ble lagt ut på Studentportalen etter hvert som de ble valgt, og pensum besto av 24 vitenskapelige artikler samt et par rapporter som beskriver teknologien. Hele pensum var på engelsk. Studentene kunne selv velge hvilken artikkel de ville presentere, med et par unntak. For hver samling ble programmet lagt ut, samt at en tidsplan for når den enkelte student skulle gjøre obligatoriske presentasjoner. Dette for at det skulle være lettere for den enkelte student å forberede seg. Alle presentasjoner, også studentenes, skulle gjøres tilgjengelig på StudentPortalen.

Tilgang til relevant litteratur

I våre dager er det meste av tidsskriftsartikler tilgjengelig elektronisk, og UiB abonnerer på en rekke relevante tidsskrifter. Studentene var i år jevnt over flinkere til å finne tilleggslitteratur i forbindelse med artikkelskrivingen enn de har vært tidligere. Jeg hadde understreket gjentatte ganger at de måtte ha vitenskapelige artikler og ikke bare tilfeldige vevressurser.

Faglærers vurdering av rammevilkårene

Lokaler og undervisningsutstyr

OK.

Andre forhold

Eksamensformen med å skrive artikkel over selvvalgt emne innenfor rammene av det temaet som var satt opp for kurset fungerte bra for de fleste av studentene. Noen slet litt med å velge tema, men jeg oppfordret dem til å lese, søke og komme og diskutere ideer med meg. For å tvinge dem til å ikke gjøre alt arbeidet i siste liten, måtte studentene presentere sitt arbeid i plenum på den siste samlingen før innlevering. Dette gjorde at de måtte planlegge bedre. Jeg oppfordret de andre studentene til å komme med innspill, men det var heller lite av det. Det var et problem at studentene hadde innlevering omtrent samtidig for to kurs, og dette er uheldig, men kanskje vanskelig å unngå. Et annet problem var at flere muntlige eksamener var lagt tett på hverandre.

Faglærers samlede vurdering, inkl. forslag til forbedringstiltak

Det har fungert bra at det praktiske arbeidet ble karaktersatt, men studentene sier uansett at de får for liten uttelling på dette i forhold til det arbeidet de legger ned. Dette tror jeg er uunngåelig, for studentene hadde på forhånd fått vite hvor mye tid 20 % av kurset ville innebære av arbeid.

Poenget med at studentene skulle jobbe på et prosjekt, var vellykket, men det bør kanskje innføres en praksis med at de har en mentor hele veien gjennom prosjektet. Nå ble dette gjort litt sporadisk. I år hadde begge teamene en ekstern person som fungerte som "kunde" på prosjektene, og dette fungerte bra – spesielt for det ene teamet. I år hadde vi ingen eksterne foredragsholdere, men det bør vurderes om det neste gang skal inviteres en som har en hands-on gjennomgang av en aktuell teknologi.

Hovedtema for kurset bør endres til neste år, fordi smidige metoder nå er mye bedre dekket i laveregradsundervisningen. Alternativt kan vi forutsette kunnskapen om smidige metoder, og kjøre et litt mer teknisk opplegg. Dette vil dog bli et problem for studentene som kommer med litt grunnere programmerings- og systemutviklingsbakgrunn.

Bergen, 18. februar 2015

Solveig Bjørnestad, faglærer

------- INFO352 -- H14 ---------

1. Teacher's assessment of the implementation
1.1 Practical implementation
The course was organized into whole-day seminars, which combined lectures, discussions, and student presentations. The seminars were spread over the semester from mid-august until then end of November, with eight seminars in total. As I was living in Canada during the semester three of the seminars were held with the students meeting together and me joining via skype. There were 2 guest lectures during the course.

Between the seminars the students were reading the course literature and working on their assignments and semester project. A semester project accounted for 40% of the total grade, a portfolio (with a reflection note and assignment) accounted for 30%, and an oral exam accounted for the remaining 30%.

The format seems to acceptable, the students liked having the seminars spread out and liked the topics and the discussions, but it was not ideal with the skype meetings and luckily this was only for this semester.

1.2 Failure rate and dropout
Five students attended the first session, four of which decided to follow the course. One of the students did not manage to complete his semester project. He is a mature student who works fulltime and due to being given an extra workload, could not meet the deadline. Thus, he did not take the exam either.

1.3 Grades distribution
The grade average was B, with 1 A, 1 B and 1 C being given. The distribution appears to be normal for a master's course.

1.4 Student Information and documentation
 Course information, including links to course literature, lecture notes, assignments, and teacher's announcements, was provided in MiSide. We also exchanged email when necessary.

 1.5 Access to relevant literature
 Articles in the pensum were available in a folder on MiSide, and in addition the pensum list included links to the articles when possible.

2. Conditions
 Facilities and teaching equipment were appropriate. We struggled somewhat with the equipment in the room when we needed to link up a student machine to connect via Skype, but got it to function in the end. Skype itself worked fine.

3. Teacher's comments on students' evaluation
All students submitted their reflections on the course through their portfolio. Students' opinions were generally positive. At the same time, they preferred the face-to-face sessions with the instructor to the Skype sessions. They pointed out, however, that even though the

instructor was not in Bergen during the entire semester, they felt that there was good communication via email and Skype so they did not feel abandoned. Several of the students mentioned that they particularly like the guest lecture by a previous Masters student who presented their research, and the research process she followed.

All three students wrote that they really liked the themes of the course and the literature, and found the course very useful for their future Masters work. The students liked being able to decide themselves which articles they would present and lead a discussion on, as they felt that this leads to a deep engagement in the material. They also mentioned that they liked having a range of types of semester projects they would carry out (design, evaluation, or literature survey). One student actually mentioned that they learned not only about the research field of TEL, but also on how to study and carry out research. One student was so pleased with his semester project that he will continue work on this topic during his Masters thesis.

One criticism was that the semester project was due the same week as the other course they were taking. We try to avoid this if possible, but given the time needed by the external examiners to read and grade the projects before the oral exam, it is often difficult to avoid these conflicts. On the other hand, they know from the first days of their courses when the projects are due, so they can plan early.

4. Teacher's overall assessment, including suggestions for improvement.
The course as a whole can be assessed generally positively. There were some very good discussions, covering a wide range of key theme in TEL research. It was unfortunate that there were only 4 students, as more students would have most likely led to more opinions and thus livelier discussions (previously the course has had between 11 and 20 participants). The students, however, did not see the small number as a disadvantage, and as one student pointed out this meant there was room for more personal discussion about what each student meant.

It is very satisfying as an instructor to have the students very pleased with the course. The reflections on the course and what they learned were very positive and showed that they did learn a lot.

The examination forms are relevant for this Masters course. In particular the oral exam is very good for such a theoretical course as one can engage the student in discussion of both course themes and their semester project. The external examination really enjoyed the discussions during the exam.

The class covered a wide range of topics in the area of TEL. One thing to consider is whether or not to focus on fewer themes. The course description opens for this. There are also a number of possibilities for further improvement, such as: (a) including more practical, hands-on activities, (b) have some ways to ensure that the students come to class having read the literature (e.g., hand in small summaries or questions before class).

1. Teacher's assessment of the implementation

1.1 Practical implementation

The course was organized into whole-day seminars, which combined lectures, discussions, and student presentations. Every four weeks there were two seminars taking place on two consecutive days (ten seminars in total). Between the seminars the students were reading the course articles and working on their individual and group assignments. A term paper (group work) accounted for 40% of the total grade, and one-week take home exam accounted for the remaining 60%. The format seems to be generally OK, but some students thought it was difficult to maintain their focus during intense 2-day learning sessions, and would like the course to be more distributed in time.

1.2 Failure rate and dropout

Three students attending the first session decided, almost immediately, not continue with the course. Two (exchange) students only attended the first session, and one student found it difficult to follow two courses at the same time. All remaining students successfully completed the course

1.3 Grades distribution

The most common grade was B, with several A's and one C. The distribution appears to be normal for a master's course.

1.4 Student Information and documentation

 Course information, including links to course literature, lecture notes, and teacher's announcements, was provided in MiSide.

1.5 Access to relevant literature

 Links to the articles, used in the course, were available in MiSide.

2. Conditions

 Facilities and teaching equipment were appropriate.

3. Teacher's comments on students' evaluation

All students submitted their anonymous reflections on the course Students' opinions were generally positive. At the same time, they pointed, as mentioned, that it was difficult to maintain their focus during intense 2-day learning sessions. The students also preferred to have more practical exercises and pointed that it would be good to find ways to involve more students in the discussions. Some students thought the meaning of the "informal backstory", which was intended to help the students frame the home exam assignment, was not immediately obvious.

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

The course as a whole can be assessed generally positively. There have been some good discussions, covering a wide range of key directions of HCI research, and the take home exam appears to be an appropriate examination form for the course.

There are also a number of possibilities for further improvement. If the course is going to be given in the future, several types of changes could be considered, such as: (a) including more practical, hands-on activities, (b) if a "backstory" is provided for the home exam instruction, make is a formal part of the assignment, and (c) finding more ways to ensure active participation of all students in the discussions, e.g., directly ask individual students to comment.

INFO381 autumn 2014

Faglærers vurdering av gjennomføring
    Praktisk gjennomføring

The course went better than expected. With several students from New Media and some more had only the first programming course, I had expected that some might not be able to follow the course. I have tried to minimum the programming part and focused on the understanding of algorithms with examples and hand running algorithms in class. The methods seemed to have worked. Students enjoyed the lectures and projects. They have made much effort in the course.

    Strykprosent og frafall (studiekonsulent legger ut statistisk materiale, faglærer kan evt. kommentere)

Nobody failed and one student registered to the course, but never came to class.

    Karakterfordeling (studiekonsulent legger ut statistisk materiale, faglærer kan evt. kommentere)

2A, 4B, 4C. Average B. Good efforts from both teacher and students side.

    Studieinformasjon og dokumentasjon

Good

    Tilgang til relevant litteratur

There is almost no light literature for master students who are not from informatics in the course area.

Faglærers vurdering av rammevilkårene
    Lokaler og undervisningsutstyr

Good. Turn on the air condition during break was found to be helpful with the air quality

Faglærers kommentar til studentevalueringen (hvis vi har hatt dette)
    Metode - gjennomføring

Only 3 students evaluated the course.

    Oppsummering av innspill

Most of the feedback are positive. One students thought the requirements for the assignments were not clear. Another needed more programming/workshop in class for the algorithms. One thought that the progress of the project should be controlled regularly.

Ev. underveistiltak

Faglærers samlede vurdering,inkl. forslag til forbedringstiltak

The course went well despite the very different level of programming skills and ability to read program codes among students. The following points could be considered for future courses:

1. Control the project progress regularly as some students are not able to make and follow plan for their own projects and tend to wait until the last minute.
2. Repeat requirements for assignment more often in class
3. Consider setting up requirement on programing skills (2nd programming course) to ensure a basic ability to read code and understand how the algorithms are implemented.