Annual Module Quality Enhancement Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Module details | Module Code: AC41012 Module Name: User Experience Credits: 15 |
| 2. Academic Year | 22/23 |
| 3. School | Science and Engineering |
| 4. Module Leader/Organiser | Gemma Webster |
| 5. Student numbers, achievement and progression | The overall average is on a par with last year but both this year and last year show a decrease from previous year. The module was running the same way as it had been in previous years aside from a change in one member of teaching staff, therefore, there is nothing from the module content or delivery which suggests an obvious influence on the decrease in average. This module is a follow-on to a Semester 1 module (AC11001) and in that Semester 1 module, there had been a subset of students who failed to engage with the module, and this resulted in a larger number of fails after the first sitting (see Table 2 below). It is possible that this same cohort of students are emerging within the data here too. A significant number of students who had failed the module (n = 12) were not offered the opportunity to do a resit because they had not met the criteria (module grade having to be at least >= CF). It could be worth seeking more information about these cases, e.g., was there something about these students that lacked engagement, did they also fail their other modules in a similar way? In total, 4 students were offered a resit. Only 1 out of 4 students attended the resit. The one student who attended has passed (subject to approval at the upcoming Resit Board).  Table 2 below shows a breakdown of student performance in the module for the past five years. The percentage of students achieving an A this year is higher than last year but lower than prior years. The percentage of students achieving a B and a C is broadly the same to previous years. The percentage of fails has increased as noted above (and these figures won’t change dramatically after the Resit Board given that only 1 student has passed the resit and various others weren’t offered the opportunity to do a resit). |
| 6. Evaluation of the operation of the module | As noted, the module operated the same way as it has done in previous years aside from a new member of staff joining the team. An on-campus tutorial was introduced, to provide more opportunities for face-to-face engagement as well as an online drop-in session for further interaction. The module continues to adopt a blended approach wherein students can peruse the module materials and videos in advance of tutorials and practical Lab sessions. Lab tutors are recruited to assist with the practical sessions, and this continues to be an important element of student support. Marking assistance is provided by post-graduate students and this is extremely useful too, to ensure a frequent turnaround of marks to students with detailed comments and feedback too. At the time of writing, no student feedback was available to refer to, e.g., via feedback questionnaires or similar. As noted in ‘5’ above, a number of students failed to engage with the module and failed. The reason for this is not fully clear but conjectures were made in the review form for the predecessor module (AC11001). If certain students had already failed to engage with the predecessor module (AC11001), that could make it harder for them to perform in this follow-on module (AC12001), e.g., if they are lacking a certain grounding in the topic. However, this doesn’t always turn out to be the cases. There are often examples of students who don’t manage to perform so well in the predecessor module (perhaps due to an initial settling-in period) but who then go on to pass the follow-on module. So, it is good to view the trajectory across both modules together and this is usually done when deciding outcomes during examination boards, etc. In the case of students who are identified as possible fails in the predecessor module, it is prudent to communicate with them to offer strategies for review and revision that may assist them to do better in the follow—on module. |
| 7. Evaluation of approach to teaching, assessment and feedback | The assessment was operated in the same way as previous years. Students complete various programming assignments (1 group-based, 3 individual) and an online Exam is held at the end of the Semester. The Exam was similar in structure and content to previous years. The practical nature of the assessment is an essential aspect of this module, and this appears to be working well and effectively. A blended approach to teaching is adopted whereby students can review lecture materials on My Dundee and these are supported by an on-campus practical tutorial and an on-campus practical lab. As noted, Lab Tutor support is an essential aspect of the latter. An online drop-in session is provided for additional student support or queries. These aspects continue to work well. Students receive regular feedback on their work, receiving detailed marksheets with comments and mark-breakdowns for their various assignments throughout the Semester. As noted, the teaching team is embellished with additional post-grad markers to help retain a frequency in the marking and feedback. |
| 8. Inclusive nature of the curriculum | All staff who teach on the module are expected to complete relevant online training programmes, e.g., such as for equality and diversity. |
| 9. Effect of past changes | No major changes were applied this year other than a new member of staff co-teaching the module and a change in the coursework scenario that students complete for their projects. |
| 10. Proposed future changes | No significant changes are proposed. An opportunity will be taken to review the format and frequency of assignments to ensure that students aren’t being over-assessed. An online tutorial will be increased in length from 1hr to 2hrs, to allow plenty of time to explore practical examples with students each week, starting with something simple and progressing into more complex aspects. A new member of staff will be joining the module too. |
| 11. Other comments | None |
| 12. Author and date | Author: Craig Ramsey Date: 2024-03-30 |

Annual Module Quality Enhancement Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Module details | Module Code: AC10001 Module Name: Software Engineering Credits: 20 |
| 2. Academic Year | 22/23 |
| 3. School | Science and Engineering |
| 4. Module Leader/Organiser | Heather Currie |
| 5. Student numbers, achievement and progression | Grades |
| 6. Evaluation of the operation of the module | Operation |
| 7. Evaluation of approach to teaching, assessment and feedback | Teaching |
| 8. Inclusive nature of the curriculum | Inclusive |
| 9. Effect of past changes | Past |
| 10. Proposed future changes | Future |
| 11. Other comments |  |
| 12. Author and date | Author: Ross Coombs Date: 2024-03-30 |