

Get ready for a story. Feel free to approach me, Tycho Tuitert, for a vocal explanation of this. So first of all, I completely disagree with pretty much everything, wanted to get that out of the way. I followed a similar course, academic writing on the university of Twente and while I agree that this should be easier and different, the entire structure and planning was awful.

I will start with the rubric. The rubric was extremely unbalanced, with a lot of points being awarded to sources and barely any to content. I feel like sources itself should not award any points at all, and should merely be a pre-requirement. Right now, if you just add a bunch of random sources which are relevant, and by decent authors, you can score 41 points for the paper while completely disregarding the structure and content. Having good sources is crucial for writing a good paper, and it should not even be a question or a reward to use them. Of course, for some topics exceptions should be made by just not grading too harsh on the pre requirement, but content should weigh way more. Finally, in the rubric I feel like EVERYTHING needs to be a sufficient to pass, especially in the paper. Any insufficient should lead to a does not meet pre-conditions just like any other course.

Then we get to the actual assignment. The poster is neat, but I feel like it's completely useless other than the "presentation". I understand you want something to show during the presentation, but remove some of the weight or just remove it entirely. I feel like, while it's useful to show your work in a different way than just the paper, the poster as of now offers little help without any guidelines and just adds more complexity to an already awfully planned assignment (which I will get to later). Leaving the poster aside, the paper is also a joke at the moment. By just allowing 1500 words you cannot go in-depth at all, leaving very little actual content and barely any *useful* conclusions to be made. When so much attention is given for this assignment to be "useful for your portfolio", leaving us with this little to work with makes this paper completely useless for showing it to future employers. You also need to get together to *properly* discuss what you guys want in a paper. It was a confusing mess with all teachers having a different opinion on how papers should be done, and in the end you just had to either go by feeling or prepare your paper for your specific teacher. This made giving feedback to students from other classes annoying because "teacher X wanted it to be like this" instead of following simple rules or guidelines. Way too little attention during lectures was furthermore given to how to actually write the paper. We had some useless English classes and a lot of ways on how to write the introduction but the actual structure felt very rushed. While sure, we got the overall structure, actually a guide on how to write paragraphs was not discussed much (for example just a simple "Topic/Transitional Sentence > Supporting Sentences > Conclusion or link to next paragraph" with some exercises would have gone a long way. Same would go for making subquestions for example, while not useful for all paper types they can help a lot with the structure of the paper and would make for nice exercises during labs.

Leaving the assignment on hold, maybe I will get back to it I don't know, let's move to the planning. The labs were useless other than being "gezellig". They were short, and while there was some time for feedback, this was not enough for all students to actually know whether their attempts to writing were good. The groups were actually a nice idea, they were useful and allowed for feedback (if everyone within said group is motivated). I got lucky and had a great group, so keep that up. Then, as discussed in Tims labs, just extend the lectures to be way longer. This allows for better feedback and makes sure students actually get the proper time to work on their paper. And you might argue that we get enough time sure, but then PLAN your things correctly. Two weeks before the holidays, people were still working on the introduction because the lectures and labs were still discussing them. Then suddenly the week after some teacher decided that to follow the planning you should be done that week? Ha. No. This was probably not discussed with the entire team, but still a better planning could go a long way. This also leads me to believing that the entire course could be

prolonged. The course gives 5 study points, and IMT&S is 25. This means that for the first quartile we have 17.5 study points and for the second 12.5. A full quartile with full working hours is 15 study points, so technically, if we would spend the suggested time per study point, we would have to work Saturdays to be able to finish everything in time (although pretty much no one actually does work that amount of time of course). By just prolonging the study you would already relieve some of the load, and allow for a proper feedback moment somewhere in the quartile where teachers can spend some time giving feedback to everyone who wants it. Then you can spend some more time on the introduction (because yeah it is important), and move to the actual body later while discussing all the different required headers (methodology, context, body/results, discussion, conclusion, (references)).

OK let's move to the use of AI, feel free to agree to disagree. While sure, chat gpt makes everything useful, I am opposed to using it in the way it's used right now. It's a tool, not a writer, so don't make it out to be one. The advertisements for the platform feel like you all are getting money for each usage, where not using the platform made me feel the odd one out. I think yeah, ChatGPT can help forming some of the content, the way the papers are right now makes them just written by ChatGPT and not by the students themselves. The writers voice is lost completely, and sure you can use prompts to get a better result, what does the student learn from this? Why use it this much to the point where AI is pretty much a normal. I think students, by using the AI tool, don't learn how to write which was the point of the entire course I hope. It can be a helpful tool for research (for example by analyzing sources), and possibly it can help with making the structure, but have students rewrite it then to not use ChatGPT and for grading you can throw it in an AI detector tool to check if not too much or everything was AI (some is fine of course).

Thus, to conclude, in my opinion the rubric requires a full rework, redefining what needs to be in the rubric and what is a pre-requirement to not just promote adding a lot of sources. The assignment as it stands feels useless and inconsistent, wanting to promote something useful for your portfolio but failing entirely by adding requirements or adding unneeded complexity in the form of an unstructured poster. Furthermore, I believe that the planning needs to be discussed and altered to promote more feedback moments and to have a solid understanding of what the course entails between each teacher. Finally, I think that the use of AI removes the essence of the course by promoting it as a "how to use AI" instead of a "How to research and write papers" course. These opinions combined lead to my initial statement of "I completely disagree with pretty much everything".

While I know this is a prototype, I feel like some things could have been changed along the way. In future courses, please try to talk to students (or class representatives) to make sure everything is clear and to adjust lectures where required. I would also advocate for a mid-term evaluation for the course in pilots like these, allowing for some time to re-evaluate what needs to be continued and allowing for adjustments on the fly for the most crucial parts. The source of this review was only one guy, so please take this with a grain of salt and take this as pure feedback. Feel free to ignore parts or ask for more explanations where needed. Have a nice day!