

Academic and Professional Skills – 1

Results from 07-02-2018 till 21-02-2018

Respondents (n) 49 of the 185

Total average

Below are the total averages of all evaluations of this program. These averages are composed of all results on all questions. Except if a question meets one of the following constraints:

- It is a "Yes / No" question
- It's an "Open question"
- The question is part of a set of questions where is explicitly stated that they may not be included in the average.

| TOTAL | SUBJECT | TEACHER | EXAM |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 6.8 | 6.1 | 8.4 | – |
| Deviation (σ) 2.0 | Deviation (σ) 1.8 | Deviation (σ) 1.4 | Deviation (σ) – |
| Questions 9 | Questions 7 | Questions 2 | Questions 0 |

Total average per question

Below are the total averages per question of this evaluation.

| | |
|---|---------------|
| The learning objectives (what you should know and be able to do by the end) of the course were clear to me. | Neutral (3.0) |
|---|---------------|

Disagree to agree | 1.0 σ | n 48

| | |
|---|---------------|
| The coherence between the different components of the course is | Neutral (3.3) |
|---|---------------|

Very little to very much | 0.8 σ | n 48

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Studying the course materials was necessary to successfully complete the course. | Neutral (2.8) |
|--|---------------|

Disagree to agree | 0.8 σ | n 48

| | |
|---|---------------|
| The organisation (e.g. the planning, scheduling, method of information provision) of the course was good. | Neutral (2.7) |
|---|---------------|

Disagree to agree | 0.9 σ | n 48

| | |
|---|---------------|
| The information provided before and during the course was sufficient. | Neutral (3.1) |
|---|---------------|

Disagree to agree | 0.9 σ | n 48

| | |
|--|---------------|
| The time that I spent on this course was less/more/equal to the number of course credits (EC). | Average (3.2) |
|--|---------------|

Less to more | 1.0 σ | n 48

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| My general opinion of the course is | Neutral (3.1) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|

Bad to good | 0.9 σ | n 48

| | |
|--|------------|
| My general opinion of the lecturer(s) is | Good (4.0) |
|--|------------|

Bad to good | 0.8 σ | n 72

| | |
|---|-------------|
| The lecturer had a good command of English. | Agree (4.3) |
|---|-------------|

Disagree to agree | 0.5 σ | n 72

Open questions

Below are the results of each open question of this evaluation.

If you see areas that could be improved in the course, what are your suggestions?

n 48

1. More writing tips and feedback, not peer-to-peer but actual proper feedback, and more presenting tips or practicing.
2. Clearer goals for what we are supposed to hand in, on what level.
3. As the course was being built while it was being given a lot of information was spread quite late. The good will of Frank to improve the course on the go resulted in uncertainties about regulations. This made adapting to the course more difficult.
4. x
5. The method of grading can be improved by making it more clear what certain amount of points mean in terms of a grade.
6. Planning, there were some unclear moments about what to hand in and when. More feedback moments where you receive feedback from the TA our teacher and not just from group mates.
7. Scoring system was very unclear and it is impossible to get a 100% score. Also the criteria changed over time for the paper which led to stress.
8. Scoring system, writing in groups, no possibility of scoring a 10
9. No possibility to gain a 10 as final grade, little to no real help for writing the actual paper
10. The scoring system was flawed in my opinion, for 1-3 is quite a small range and some people give each other extremely high points on purpose while other people divide them more realistically. The blackboard page is a maze, it took me a long time to find the pages I needed to reach.
11. Make more clear what is expected of the students
12. Better communication and a lot of things were vague.
13. -Try to bring more structure in it (e.g. more concrete time plan for the upcoming weeks)
14. We already had a feedback session with Frank and my other evaluation form states a lot of things here and in the improvement section. So, won't do that again.
15. - a lot of difference between workgroups - not clear what for you do stuff - grading by students varied a lot - less members is not taken in consideration a lot
16. The theory; we were told to write something without any theory or guidelines on how to actually write properly; do's and don't and the like
17. more clearness
18. The way the information about assignments and the course itself was announced, was a bit chaotic. There were continuous updates on BB, so it felt like searching for the final instructions
19. Nvt
20. Sometimes it was difficult because the teammates give you your scores so if you, like me, disagree with the scores you are given you cannot do a lot about it. So for example sometimes I felt like it was

really unfair.

21. Lack of proper writing instructions, lack of direction, unclear goals and somewhat too abstract

22. -That the grading we gave ourselves or our peers during the workgroups is taken into account for the final grade is somehow wrong. The grading should be solely done by experienced teachers/TAs!

23. None

24. The academic aspect seems quite forced as someone that would never want to become a researcher

25. The Blackboard page was quite a maze, this could be ordered better. Also more time should be taken to create groups I hadn't even got time to look at the pros and cons of others and groups already formed around me leaving me with two others in a group without even having a choice.

26. The information should have been communicated in a more efficient way, this year there were a lot of last minute changes/things that were communicated late

27. The grading of the course is questionable. After putting in a lot of effort to write an essay, it is disappointing to see that it weights about the same (10 vs 15 points) as the feedback you handed in for others. The grading of yourself every week can be a good concept, but unfortunately was a bad experience. It seems to punish you if you are self critical and reward you when you are abusing it. Also a grade for every meeting was too much, quite often there not much to grade.

28. so many headings in blackboard i never quite knew were to look to find certain information

29. N/A

30. Have all things clear beforehand so you don't run into trouble later on

31. None

32. A bit stricter overall

33. Having to work with people that you don't know it's a great gamble. Furthermore, the self grading system can be abused or made useless - of the team is careless of the self grading, no member can insist on using it.

34. Know what you want to do with a course, AND communicate clear deadlines and 'what to do' in general to both your students and TA's. Next to that, most of us still have no clue how to write a proper paper. Mostly because we did nothing/ had no time to do anything with the feedback, which was written by students that have no clue what they are doing either. Presentatio-wise we almost learned something, but mostly from the amazing lecture from suhas. Not really by practicing it ourselves. All of the sudden we heard we had to do a presentation within a week, so we didn't have enough time to prepare it. It would have been better if we had a deadline for the presentation, present it to our own mentorgroup, get feedback and after had our final presentation.

35. It's not always clear what's expected from you, sometimes information is provided a little bit late. There is also A LOT of information on blackboard, sometimes you can't find what you're looking for anymore (you can't see the forest trough the trees). That is something that really should be improve. Make more clear what you want. I'm really happy that I don't have autism because if I would have had it I wouldn't be able to pass this course because it's just not clear.

36. Planning Clearness towards students Quality of workgroups A fair grading system More explanation on writing the paper instead of a lot of lectures of people working in AI (also interesting, but not as important)

37. The scoring system was a bit vague and not really fair in my opinion.

38. Everything

39. Little explanation how to write

40. clearer view of the precise deadlines, because sometimes there was some confusion

41. Better organisation: be more clear on what has to be done and when. Clear deadlines. Less asking for feedback, less announcements on Bb

42. The self-evaluation criteria were at the start unclear, with the "character sheet" that was not used.

43. I did not enjoy the course that much and I don't feel like I learned a lot from it. The lectures in the beginning were interesting, but were unrelated to anything we did later on (I know that their purpose was to help me choose a topic for the paper, but people rapidly stopped attending them, because they were just informative). The workgroups were fun, but I did not find them that useful either. I also feel disappointed that, after attending and putting time into a course that was supposed to teach me how to write, I don't feel that my writing skills got any better, as I did not get any real, professional feedback (and even though I appreciate the feedback I got from other students, I don't think that it really helped me evolve, cause I don't know what piece of advice is valid and what is not). I also disagree with the grading, getting graded by people you see once a week for your collaboration and independence through the whole week seems unfair.

44. The grading of the papers was completely unfair in my opinion. Each student only reads one other paper, so obviously the grading will be very biased because the chances are the student doesn't really know what is expected, and doesn't have any comparison to judge whether this paper deserves more or less points than the very average points everyone seemed to give to everyone else. I understand that the teachers don't have the capacity to grade this many papers, but at least the students should be made to compare different papers, so that the better papers will actually get more points than the bad ones.

45. grading system

46. .

47. Time to write the final paper and do the presentation was relatively short compared to all the pre-work. Also for the meeting where feedback was given on your paper from other groups in your mentor group, feedback was supposed to be given first to one person, after scanning through their paper, and then to the other, after scanning through their paper - however we are not yet able to really scan and so this resulted in very general and not very useful feedback. Better would've been to first both read the paper of the other and then give feedback one by one. This takes about an equal amount of time and results in more in depth and likely more helpful feedback.

48. - The grading system... It's just terrible. How can a student evaluate others? And especially in the first few meetings? I did not know anyone and we did not do anything? How can I evaluate someone's independence? At least give me the context or definition of the independence. Not only that but also the grading range from 0 to 3. What the hell? It was said in the beginning that you logically can't give 3 because it means you are perfect and there is no room for improvement. Then people started to evaluate themselves too low or if they evaluate themselves very good then they get substracted nu TAs, so in the end, it became a total nonsense; - If the grading system wouldn't be so terrible then we could create groups later in the course and not find ourselves in groups with lazy and irresponsible people who we don't like; - I don't like how Frank provides information i.e. the blackboard is overcrowded with sections and tabs and posts and everything. In the end, it was hell to find the information on about anything there; Same goes to Brain btw... - Paper evaluation by other students was insulting. E.g. we got evaluated 1,5 and the person's comment was "Looks good"...

What do you think are the strong points of the course?

1. I really liked the coziness of the subject, but it lacked seriousness and learning actual skills. It was no academic course, more like a fun tutor hour
2. Skill development is important, and I do think this course manages to teach you some important skills such as writing, reading, speaking, collaboration
3. The course encourages you to really delve into the subject you write about and present. It also makes you aware of the fact that you are responsible for your own development.
4. The workgroups get you in contact with other students, which is nice especially at the beginning of the year
5. It focuses on essential skills It is clear what you are supposed to do
6. Good to write a paper but maybe bit too early in the year. Also there was little to no feedback on our papers before the deadline. Which would have been nice to improve your final version.
7. The learning carts were nice
8. The general idea to learn to write and speak
9. The cooperation is nice and the fact you learn how to write a scientific paper
10. I liked the freedom we got regarding the essay
11. a good introduction to the study
12. - Perspective on academic and professional skills: it is really an advantage when you start to work for a company and they see this subject on your diploma/CV
13. first 8 lectures about different AI topics
14. We already had a feedback session with Frank and my other evaluation form states a lot of things here and in the improvement section. So, won't do that again.
15. It prepares you for academic writing
16. The mentor meetings; Ellen is amazing <3
17. enthusiastic teacher, 'has a lot of potential'
18. You get the chance to learn academic and professional skills, which are priceless throughout your whole life
19. Nvt
20. I liked that I learned to work together with people I normally wouldn't work together with. I liked that it was about all skills and not just writing. I also liked the fact that we were free to choose our own topics.
21. Collaboration and Writing
22. -The introductory lecture to the study. -Writing a research paper -Giving a presentation
23. I think it is a good experience to learn to write. Also, grading each others work is an important skill
24. It may be useful to be able to write professionally in a later job.
25. Really getting a chance to make your public speaking and writing better
26. It gives students a good introduction in writing academic texts

27. Being able to write about something that you find interesting is a great motivation.
28. there's more depth concerning how to present yourself(not only in making presentations)
29. N/A
30. Communication
31. Interesting lectures but somehow not useful enough
32. The principle is really good, and writing the paper has been a really good exercise
33. Learning to write academic text early enough is very good. Also, the introduction lectures were wonderful.
34. .
35. They really try to let you learn things in the progress on all different kind of fields. I also really liked (most) of the introductory lectures because at the beginning of the year you don't know much about AI and this way they already introduce you to AI
36. Good learning objective, important subjects
37. The lectures with guest speakers were very interesting to get a good view of the field of AI
38. Cooperating with others
39. Learning how to write
40. good workgroups were you were helped a lot
41. Learning objectives were clear, the meetings really helped
42. Interesting and useful subject
43. I had a really nice mentor. The lecture given by Suhas was also really interesting.
44. Engaging lectures about important topics, nice general introduction to the AI BSc, student-centered and well-prepared course
45. writing an academic paper
46. .
47. It was a good way of using all of our skills in practice
48. Lectures by other teachers were awesome; Paper writing was useful; Presentation was interesting to prepare for;

Other comments and/or explanations regarding the answers you gave to specific questions.

n 48

1. I think the course lacked seriousness
2. .
3. for the question: "The time that I spent on this course was less/more/equal to the number of course credits (EC)" my answer "Very much" means: Much more
4. x

5. No comments

6. Nope

7. No

8. No

9. -

10. I think the maze-y blackboard page plays a big part in my lack of understanding some parts of the APS course. I did have fun, though. It's an interesting course.

11. nothing

12. Be more concrete

13. -

14. We already had a feedback session with Frank and my other evaluation form states a lot of things here and in the improvement section. So, won't do that again.

15. Your experience really depends on your teammates

16. nvt

17. no

18. Thank you everyone for the enthusiasm for the course, it helped me going through the harder parts as well, like writing and speaking

19. Nvt

20. no

21. nope

22. -

23. None

24. I dont like reading big, dull texts (dyslexia & ADD) so the writing of my review was not my type of thing

25. -

26. -

27. There was quite a bit of ambiguity regarding practical issues, such as the word limit and the number of references. Having one definitive set of rules from the start would have been helpful.

28. none

29. N/A

30. None

31. None

32. no

33. So much effort into getting the students to write a text and even more so that noone but 3 students read it.

34. Frank is a great lecturer, but this course just had a really bad design/structure, sorry.

35. No

36. The grading system was unfair because even when a person did a really good job, doing more than expected and with excellent quality, it wasn't allowed to give a near maximal grade. If we as students are granted the responsibility to grade our peers, we should be able to use the whole scale instead of giving a standard 5-8 grade.

37. .

38. I don't know what was the worst anymore

39. None

40. -

41. .

42. nothing

43. -

44. -

45. ...

46. .

47. -

48. None.