

Course evaluation of INFO382 22v

How has previous evaluations and proposed improvement measures been followed up?

There seems to be no previous evaluations for this course (at least none is shown in the *Kvalitetsbasen* at <https://quality.app.uib.no/popup.php?kode=info382>).

Which pedagogical and academic choices is the course based on?

The content of the course was based on the content of its previous edition (autumn of 2020, if I'm not mistaken), but with some changes based on the current lecturer's experience. With respect to assessments, we followed the pre-existing structure (4 graded assignments [30%], a final oral exam [70%]), but with the following changes: (i) giving the students part of the assignments every week (instead of giving them the full set of exercises a few days before the deadline), and (ii) providing the students with a guide for the exercises they need to answer during the final (oral) exam. The reason for the first was to encourage the students to work on the subject every week (instead just a few days before the deadline), and thus being able to notice earlier potential problems in understanding the topics under discussion. (Note: the deadline for submitting the assignments remained as in the course's plan). The reason for the second was to allow the students to review and discuss the exercises among themselves, an activity that hopefully gave them a deeper understanding of the topics.

What feedback do the students give on the course?

The course was evaluated only by three students (out of the six that were present for most of the lectures), and their feedback was strongly positive. (As one might expect, having only six students makes it easier to notice whether they are grasping the subject and making the needed adjustments). Two of them mentioned that the workload of the course might have been too high. There were also two comments on the final oral exam: it might be stressful, and the tasks each one gets might have been a bit arbitrary. Here are some of the ideas about how to tackle this feedback.

1. Concerning the workload of the course, I can try to make the assignments more accessible. However, I felt some students still started working on assignments only when the deadline approached; this makes it hard for them. I suggest changing the assignments' schedule, breaking each one of them into smaller ones (say, weekly assignments that need to be delivered a week after). I expect that this rearrangement can help the students to have a more manageable workload through the course, as they will need to work every week, instead of doing it every month.

2. Concerning the oral exam, a final (oral) exam is indeed stressful. I suggest grading the course based on the assignments only (with some special conditions, e.g., getting an approving grade on all assignments). This might mean more work for the lecturer (grading every week) but, if the number of students remains low, this might still be manageable, and encourage the students to work from the first week.

What results do the students achieve on the course?

Among the 11 initially registered students, 6 of them attended the lectures regularly, and 5 of them submitted all the assignments and presented the final exam. The final grades on the assignments (for the 5 students that submitted all of them) were D (x2), C (x1) and B (x2). My impression is that these grades improved as the students realised the importance of working on the exercises immediately after the lectures (instead of waiting for two weeks or more to do so). The grades for the final exam were C (x1), B (x1) and A (x3). The impression is that the students benefited from having a guideline for the questions to be asked, not only for getting better grades, but also for improving their understanding of the subjects.

Is there a correlation between the learning objectives and the teaching and assessment methods?

The teaching activities (lectures that required the active participation of the students) were designed to meet the learning objectives (namely, to provide the students with advanced theoretical knowledge in the state of the art of formal logics for reasoning about interaction, and to provide them with the skills to use this knowledge to model and analyse multi-agent systems). This explains the choice of making the lectures as interactive as possible. The form of assessment was already decided at the time the course was assigned to me, but the changes we implemented (see the "pedagogical and academic choices" above) were also made with the learning outcomes in mind. (Again, incentivize a more regular work on the subject as well as allow studying and discussing the exercises on the assignments and final exam).

How does the course fit into the study program and / or course portfolio?

The course, an elective one, is part of the master's program on Information Science. In my opinion, the course is a theoretical counterpart to the more "programming-oriented" courses in the program. As such, it provides the students with theoretical tools for understanding interaction within multi-agent systems.

Other?