Emnerapport / Course report ved / at Infomedia #157

Emnekode / Course code	AIKI200
Emnetittel / Course title	Bachelor Thesis in Artificial Intelligence
Semester	25V
Emneansvarlig / Course coordinator	Fernando R. Velazquez Quesada
Sist evaluert (semester / år) / Last evaluation (semester / year)	This is the first report (emnerapporter) for this course.

Hva er emnets undervisnings- og vurderingsform? / What are the teaching methods and forms of assessment used in the course?

During the course, students write a report under the supervision of a mentor (in almost all cases, a member of our department). The report can be on the contents of a research paper or a project from their workplace. In the case of reporting the contents of a research paper, the options are provided by the department's academic staff, and thus students 'bid' on the paper they would prefer to work on. The course consists of four meetings throughout the semester (three mandatory, one optional): two for explaining the course's methodology and two for presentations. Each student's final grade comes from the report (75%) and a presentation of its contents (25%). In turn, the grade for the report itself comes from the grade given by the student's mentor (70%) and the grade given by the coordinator (30%).

Oppfølging fra tidligere evalueringer / Follow up from previous evaluations

In the previous evaluation (the only one so far, answered by only 7 students), students commented on not enough guidance and meetings, asking for more information regarding how the report was to be written. For the latter, this year's document specifying the requirements for the report was improved. For the former, due to the already heavy workload of our department's academic personnel, this was not possible.

Evalueringsmetode(er) / Form of evaluation	Student evaluation

Sammendrag av studentene sin evaluering / Summarize the results from the student evaluation

Eight students submitted the form. The answers to the general questions (their opinions on statements such as "I found the syllabus/seminars interesting/relevant") varied widely, including both extremes (1: fully disagree; 6: fully agree). (Note that the course does not have a syllabus.) The opinions on methods and forms of assessment varied in the same way, with an average of 3.8. On the course's workload, the average score was on the lower side (2.3, with opinions in the [1..4] range). Finally, the average on "I learned a lot from this course" was 4.3, with the lone student providing an answer below 3 being fully dissatisfied with their own effort (score of 1). The comments included suggestions for making this course based on actual projects.

Emneansvarligs evaluering / The course coordinator's evalutaion

This year's course ran more smoothly than last year, even considering that the option for writing a report on a workplace project was added. Out of the 28 students bidding for papers, 25 got one of their three most preferred options (on average, a student got their second-best option). It seems also that most students spent with their mentors more than the single mandatory 30mins meeting (note that this is only because of the mentors' availability/flexibility). Finally, and this is only a subjective opinion, the reports included more original content from the students (comparison with other alternatives, personal reflections).

**Last opp karakterfordeling her
(Du finner den i Inspera, alternativt kan du ta kontakt med administrativ kontaktperson)**

**Upload the grade distribution here
(You'll find it in Inspera, you can also**

contact the administrative contact person)

Evt. kommentar til karakterfordeling / Comments on the grade distribution
Nothing worthwhile to highlight, except that most students (27, corresponding to 82%) did a good or very good job. The three that failed did not submit the project.

Mål for neste evalueringsperiode - forbedringstiltak? / Goals for the next evalution period - what can be improved?
Originally, the plan for this year was to have an actual bachelor thesis course, with members of the department's academic staff proposing projects and supervising the students. Unfortunately, this was and is still not possible: the department's personnel are already under a heavy workload, and asking additionally to write projects for bachelor's theses as well as doing a supervising job is not feasible now, and also not feasible in the foreseeable future. In an attempt to compensate for that, this time there were two more options for 'selecting' a project: a student could work on a self-selected research paper (provided a mentor of the academic staff was willing to vouch for the paper's quality), and they could also work on a workplace project. The main goal for next year is to streamline this workplace project option, first by making more students aware of it, and second by making the requirements needed for carrying it on more precise.