

Notes taken by Veine from the course meeting of LH216V, 2019-03-25

Viggo: Changes from previous course offering:

- More clear assignment instructions.
Containing how you plan to use the criteria in your teaching.
- Peergrade was used previous course offering, but we used Canvas this time for peer review.
- Student feedback was new.

Student feedback part is excellent. Most student programs have a student representative. They appreciate getting the information that changes are happening.

Not very clearly communicated that student feedback was expected. Came as a surprise in the final assignment. Communicate earlier in the course.

Before the course started we were supposed to pick a course and change the ILO:s and criteria, to work on in the first meeting. But during the first meeting was discussion about ILO. Where do you start? What are you expected to do before the first meeting?

Quite good to work on both ILO and Criteria E and A, but we didn't use the work done before the first lecture. More discussion during first lecture, then work on the first assignment.

I usually don't like assignments before first lecture, but I appreciated having time to think about this for a longer time. Took some time to be positive to the subject.

I appreciated discussing the ILO:s on the first meeting, but make it more clear "Think about what might be problematic", for example.

V: In the second meeting we had presentations from Ida, Veine and Emma. Can we make them even better in some way?

One thing I appreciate is different implementation of ILO. Uppsala was very interesting, a different approach showing the span of possibilities. Would like more different cases. "I want an exam, so I take Ek:s example". With more examples it is easier.

There are examples on the web, takes time.

Would like to discuss more different types of courses.

V: Remember that figure skating was also given as an example!

Encourage people to read more pieces of the material.

A good short paper by Chris Rust.

Could have reading also to class 2.

The first reading (Rust) was a very good background to the course.

Peer review, is it a benefit to have people with similar course review criteria?

One of my peers was similar to my course, but the other course was very different, and was difficult to make good peer review.

V: I think about this when I make the review groups. Not perfect, but at least some sort of similarity.

For the first assignment we get peer review, and for the second one we get feedback from teachers. Would it be possible to get some feedback from the teachers? Sometimes we disagree on things as peers and did not know what was right or wrong.

V: We have more experience on giving feedback on criteria, but peer review should be useful. It is a cost and resource issue. The teachers can only read once.

Good that the peer review was before the second meeting.

Appreciated to get feedback in the peer review, even if it is not perfect it is good to have someone else "hey, I don't understand that". Like, you can think of it that way too.

V: Another use of the peer review is to look at other courses and get some ideas.

Would be cool to be able to follow each others' process and progress somehow, open source development, browse and comment and small commits. It is interesting to see what is developed, where did I go wrong etc.

Veine: Would you like a quiz?

Silence.

Why not, try it?

V: We appreciated your assignments this course offering, they were better and easier to read.

When we discussed our ILO and criteria you often discuss with new people, but it is hard to understand the background, how many students etc. Could have in the top of the assignment some basic data on the course. Masters level, this many students. Good to know a bit more than the ILO.

Maybe before this last meeting also know before who is in your group. Read the submission before.

V: But this is not mandatory, would you do it? Maybe fewer would come.

I would definitely read it to get some new ideas.

V: We would like to collect more good examples, your good examples, then you have to submit them on canvas or email the version that you would like to put on the web. There is no special structure that you should use, but clear description of the ILO, assessment and how they are aligned. Also useful with your reflection on why you have constructed it this way. The rest of the feedback you can remove.

Planned changes for the next course offering

- Introduce a concept quiz after the first meeting.
- Inform earlier about that student feedback should be collected for assignment 2.
- Course data (course code, course name, number of credits, number of students) should be given in the beginning of the assignment 1 submission.
- Give a reading assignment from the course book to meeting 2.
- Add more good examples of grading criteria to the web page.
- Go back to Peergrade for peer review, if possible.