

Compact summary of the Module Evaluations of module CREATE-1.1 2014 (We create Identity)

Cora Salm

Available documents: SEQ questionnaire, reports of CREEC evaluation lunches including final end-of module evaluation.

2014 SEQ had 70 respondents the data is compared with 2013 , here only 27 respondents.

The SEQ also makes a comparison with the average of all UT students , but according to the OLC panel (Salm, Poel) the modules are the different and no information beneficial for the Create program can be obtained from this (comparing apples and oranges).

In the document a number of suggested advices of the OLC to the module team is mentioned. These need to be discussed in the OLC meeting, before this document is final (date of entry 14-04-15).

- Compared to 2013 no major shifts

Points for improvement/discussion

- Students find the module not well organized, this is probably due to lack of information and clarity about the procedure as well as last minute changes (e.g. grading scheme) this is perceived as “chaos”.
- For visual communication the criteria on which the students will be judged is not clear to them.
 - OLC advice is to consider a second grader and give better information upfront
- The teacher of Visual Communication can be very harsh in his reactions to the students. This result in students being scared of him and the fear that he is not objective in grading the work.
 - A second grader for topics that are subjective to taste is again a good idea.
 - The OLC asks the module team to discuss the method in which students are approached to be discussed and if possible made homogeneous as not to send mixed signals to the students.
 - The OLC asks the Program Director to talk to the teacher about this, since this is a reoccurring issue for this teacher for several year that might in the end have a negative impact om the entire module and worst case on the entire curriculum.
- If you use a very strict method in assessing (e.g 1 minute late is considered no “vinkje” , no admission to exam and hence module fail), the module team should be absolutely sure that everything is working perfect (enough manpower, no computer glitches etc etc).
 - The OLC asks the module team to seriously consider whether the abundance of assignments that need to be ticked off is instituted to “keep te students working” or to facilitate obtaining learning goals of the module.
 - Additionally if a large number of “ticks” or deadlines is maintained in the module that they should be realistic AND that the module team stick to the rules they themselves have create for this module, otherwise this will have a negative impact

of the state of mind of the students which will have its impact on the following modules.

- The project did not integrate the different topics of the module
 - This is true since it is the old project of the pre-TOM curriculum. The OLC does not object to the project as it is, but we would like to ask the module team to explicitly make the choice for a non-integrating topic and motivate why, or redesign the project (in contrast to the convenience of just continuing an existing project).
 - The students indicate that the study load is moderate (~30% spends 40h/week or more). Additional input from Erik: also talking to students later on in year they confirm that M1 is (too?) easy. The addition of a Math sprint week in the module (compared to 2013) did result in earlier dropouts, but not in more (perceived) work load.
-
- The book Engineering our Digital Future was mandatory but not used. Comment Erik, due to a change in teacher and part of the module contact this book is no longer used in M1. It will be skipped from the materials list next year.