

Module 3 2014 – 2015 Analysis for OLC HMI/CreaTe

Module 3 (Living and Working Tomorrow) was analysed by Mannes Poel and Erik Faber on July 6th, 2015

Materials consulted:

- 1) UT – SEQ. The general UT questionnaire at the end of the module. A comparison was made with the UT-SEQ of last year
- 2) 2 x CREEC panel discussions held on March 13th and April 23rd 2015
- 3) Informal Questionnaire in module 3 carried out by Eddy de Weerd and Erik Faber in April 2015

Changes as compared to 2014 – 2015

- Interactive Visualisation was now implemented in a sprint week in week 3. Last year it was a course spread out over 8 weeks. The sprint week was chosen to prevent students from overly focusing on the 1EC Int Vis course.
- Last year Math (IMM) had two topics: integral calculus (initially planned in Mod 2 but due to circumstances in mod 2 it shifted to mod 3) and differential equations. This year integral calculus was in mod 2. Mod 3 topics were now Differential Equations and the new topic Vector calculus. The latter is both related to engineering and programming.

General impressions:

- Number of responders is rather low (this year N = 20 (out of 80+ students), last year N = 43 (out of 60 students). How to make sure that more students participate in the SEQ? It would be good to integrate it in an educational setting.
- The overall grade for module 3 is in the table below.

What	Grade	When
Module 3 - CreaTe	5.9 ± 1.3	2014 – 2015
Module 3 – UT average	6.8 ± 1.3	2014 – 2015
Module 3 – CreaTe	5.7 ± 1.7	2013 – 2014
Module 3 – UT average	6.0 ± 1.5	2013 – 2014
Module 2 – Smart Env.	6.5 ± 1.0	2014 – 2015
Module 2 – Smart Env.	4.5 ± 1.6	2013 – 2014

Module 2 deed het voor de 2e keer stukken beter dan de eerste keer in TOM (2 punten stijging). Module 3 daarentegen kreeg een vergelijkbare score tov van vorig jaar. Vorig jaar kwam de score overeen met het UT gemiddelde voor module 3, dit jaar lag de score er significant onder.

Ten opzichte van module 2 en ten opzichte van het UT gemiddelde van module 3 is CreaTe module 3 relatief laag beoordeeld.

- De tijdsbesteding module 3 is enorm gedaald ten opzichte van vorig jaar.
In 2013 – 2014: 30-40u/week (27.3%), 40-50u/week (30.3%) en 50+u/week (42.4%)

In 2014-2015: 20-30u/week (15%), 30-40u/week (45%), 40-50u/week (30%), 50+u/week (5%).

Dit is opmerkelijk omdat er geen stof bij is gekomen en geen stof uit is gehaald. De stof is wel anders georganiseerd (bijvoorbeeld de Int Vis sprint week). Dit kwartiel was wel 2 dagen korter ten opzichte van vorig jaar (goede vrijdag + paasweekend).

Observations by OLC:

- Who will coordinate this module next year? Current module coordinator is also Module 5a (Smart Tech) coordinator → too high work load.
- The schedule in the end was too tightly packed. Especially week 9 was overcrowded with tests, lab sessions, (shifted) deadlines of courses and the project delivery.
- Module 3 is tightly organized with deliverables and assignments that need to be signed off. This gives a bad connection with module 4 which contains a more freedom and a less strict structure with sign off moments. → recommendation for next year is to “loosen” the mandatory sign off activities in module 3. After modules 1 and 2 students should know the ins and outs of studying and be given the steering wheel of their own study.
- Interactive Visualisation: the sprint week was a good choice for implementing this 1EC part of the module. However, for many students the pace was high and little time was there for training the materials. → recommendation of students: choice the middle and make this a 3 week course.
- Intro PS and DB theory: this year weekly assignments with sign-offs were used. Students had to work in the same groups as for the project → this is too risky; good groups thrive in this system whereas members of ill functioning groups get at the same time a hard time finishing this course. Furthermore, the assignments of this course should next year be reconsidered with a view on module 4; make it less strict with weekly sign-offs.
- Intro PS and DB lab sessions: this year there were many complaints about the lab sessions. It concerned: ill prepared student assistants, very late grading of the lab journals with no feedback, the lab manual was not adequate/up to date enough. Action plans for next year: Start earlier with the lab sessions (not in second half of the module); the four sessions will done biweekly leaving enough space for both grading and preparation. This also guarantees a better connection with theory.
- Designing in Context. Students complained that outside lectures is was very hard to get feedback on intermediate assignments. Large group of students did not pass the final assignment due to lack of feedback previous assignments. This course did not have a repair session implemented within the module. Result this year: many students failed this course after 1st attempt and all repairs had to be done during module 4. Two recommendations:
 - Provide timely feedback on students work. Is this course becoming too large (this year 85 students) for a single teacher? Student assistants needed?
 - Implement the resit within the module.
- Mathematics. This remark is general for more modules. Math does not have deadlines and during weeks 7 and 8 the attendance rate drops in the math courses resulting in lower grades on the parts taught during the later stage in the module. → recommendation: schedule math during weeks 1-6 of a module if possible.