Emnerapport / Course report ved / at Infomedia #161

Emnekode / Course code	INFO110
Emnetittel / Course title	Infromation Systems
Semester	Vår 2025
Emneansvarlig / Course coordinator	Ankica Babic
Sist evaluert (semester / år) / Last evaluation (semester / year)	2024

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

The course is composed of lectures and seminars, both of which are mandatory (75% attendance is required). All lectures were given by me, and there were three seminar leaders, one of whom was responsible for slightly more groups. All study material, including lecture slides, seminar report templates, some handouts in the form of articles, and examples of previous student reports, was made available to help illustrate how the reports could be structured. There were also quizzes covering the course content, as well as old exams provided for training purposes.

Oppfølging fra tidligere evalueringer / Follow up from previous evaluations

Compared to the previous year, there has been some progress on most points in the course evaluation, while a few aspects remain at a similar level. As in previous years, however, the number of students who responded to the survey remains low, which limits the representativeness of the feedback. Despite this, the overall trend suggests that the steps taken in response to earlier feedback are having a positive impact.

In particular, I have made a consistent effort to motivate students and keep them actively engaged throughout the course. Together with the seminar leaders, we held regular coordination meetings to ensure that students received consistent guidance and support in their project work. I have also responded in detail to all inquiries from students, created several report templates to guide the different stages of the project, and clearly outlined expectations at each phase.

To improve structure and focus, I presented the learning objectives at the beginning of each lecture, helping students to better understand the broader context and goals of the course. The written exam was designed to cover the full range of course topics through a combination of multiple-answer questions, ensuring a balanced assessment that reflects both depth and breadth of the content.

This course plays a central role in the Information Science curriculum, and I remain committed to its ongoing development—both in terms of academic quality and student engagement.

Evalueringsmetode(er) / Form of evaluation	Portfolio assessment of the groups (40% of the grade) and a written exam (60% of the grade) are graded individually.)

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

The lectures were interesting: 2.5
The lectures were relevant in accordance with the content and goals in the course description: 4.5
The instructor(s) are skilled: 4.05
The instructor(s) care about the students' academic progress: 4.5
The seminars were interesting according to the course description: 3.9
The seminars were relevant according to the course description: 4.15
The seminar leader is skilled: 4.9
The seminar leader cares about the students' academic progress: 5.3
The curriculum was relevant according to the content and goals in the course description: 4.15

The curriculum was updated: 4.1
The difficulty level of the curriculum was just right: 4.4
The assignment(s) were beneficial for my learning: 4.15
The attendance requirement was beneficial for my learning outcomes and achievement of learning objectives: 3.05
The work requirements in the subject were not too difficult and time-consuming: 4.15
The workload in this subject is too much: 3
I am satisfied with my own effort in this subject: 4.35
The subject's teaching and assessment methods fit well with the subject's content: 3.65
I have leant a lot: 3.4
I can recommend this topic to others: 3.65

Emneansvarligs evaluering / The course coordinator's evalutaion
In terms of course improvement, I see the following areas of focus for the next iteration:
The recent student evaluation for the course provides valuable insight into how various aspects of the course were perceived. Although only 21 out of 160 students responded (approximately 13%), making the sample size small and potentially unrepresentative of the full student body, the feedback is still useful for reflection and improvement.
First, I would like to acknowledge the generally positive feedback on the relevance and structure of the course. The students indicated that both the lectures and seminars were aligned with the course description and goals. Specifically, the perceived relevance of the lectures (4.5), seminars (4.15), and curriculum (4.15) suggests that the academic content is well structured and supports the intended learning outcomes. Students also found the seminar leader highly skilled (4.9) and responsive to their academic progress (5.3), which is encouraging and reflects well on the seminar component of the course.
However, an interesting contrast appears between how students rated the relevance of lectures (4.5) and how interesting they found them (2.5). This indicates that while students acknowledge the importance of the lecture material in relation to the course goals, they were less engaged or stimulated by the format or delivery. It is worth reflecting on this discrepancy. While I am mindful that this is primarily a technical subject and not designed for entertainment, engaging students remains a critical part of teaching. It may be beneficial to explore how certain parts of the content could be presented in more interactive or relatable. Integrating more examples, real-life case studies could be considered.
Another important point is the low score related to the usefulness of the attendance requirement for learning outcomes (3.05). This may reflect students' perception of autonomy in managing their learning, or possibly a mismatch between what is expected in attendance and the value it brings. This could be further investigated, perhaps in a future survey or informal discussion with students. Nevertheless, it emphasizes the need to clearly communicate the rationale behind attendance policies and how they support learning.
The evaluation also showed that the workload was generally seen as manageable (4.15), and that students felt their own effort was solid (4.35). However, responses to the open question about time spent on the course revealed a concerning variation: some students reported as little as 1–2 hours of work per week, even though the course includes four contact hours weekly (two lectures and two seminars), and a healthy minimum engagement would be at least 4–6 hours including preparation and study. This may partly explain why learning outcomes and perceived learning (3.4) were somewhat lower than desired. It might be worth discussing study habits and expectations more explicitly at the beginning of the course, to help students self-regulate and better plan their learning time.
1. Lecture Engagement: Explore ways to make lectures more interactive or applied, without compromising technical side. This could include the use of short exercises, demonstrations, or case-based discussions.
2. Clarifying Expectations: Communicate more clearly the expected study time and workload, to help students better manage their time and improve learning outcomes.
3. Broader Feedback: Encourage higher response rates in evaluations, possibly by giving students time in class or reminding them of the importance of their feedback. This would lead to a more representative and robust basis for reflection and improvement.
In conclusion, I am grateful for the feedback received and will use it constructively.

Evt. kommentar til karakterfordeling / Comments on the grade distribution
So far, only the portfolio component (40% of the final grade) has been assessed. The results are strong, with most

students performing very well or excellently. This likely reflects the positive impact of the course structure, the continuous feedback provided throughout the different stages of project development, and the availability of supporting study materials via the course web portal. The written exam, which constitutes the remaining 60% of the final grade, will follow.

Mål for neste evalueringsperiode - forbedringstiltak? / Goals for the next evalution period - what can be improved?
1. Lecture Engagement: Explore ways to make lectures more interactive or applied, without compromising technical side. This could include the use of short exercises, demonstrations, or case-based discussions.
2. Clarifying Expectations: Communicate more clearly the expected study time and workload, to help students better manage their time and improve learning outcomes.
3. Broader Feedback: Encourage higher response rates in evaluations, possibly by giving students time in class or reminding them of the importance of their feedback. This would lead to a more representative and robust basis for reflection and improvement.