



Study board conclusions of the semester and teaching evaluation report

Year:	2019
Campus	Copenhagen
Semester	LiD7
Coordinator:	Ellen K. Hansen
Date:	May 20, 2020

This document represents the public version of the evaluation of the semester. The document forms together with the semester and teaching evaluation report the basis of any adjustments to the semester's description, planning, execution and/or evaluation of the next iteration of the semester and are used by the coming semester coordinator and semester planning group.

The document also represents the study board's response to the students, teachers, coordinators and other interested parties about possible consequences of conditions that the students of the semester have pointed out.

The public conclusions and recommendations of the semester coordinator

In general, the students rate the semester as: 17% very good, 39% good 33 % average and 2% bad. We introduced a new structure where each course is introduced with a kick off week, this was a success. The structure with supervision and pin-up's works well. Students are satisfied with the supervisors. "Having supervision helped to keep track of the process and move forward with it. Similarly, the pin-up presentations gave the opportunity for an open talk and valuable feedback from the other teachers."

This year we introduced the UN Goals in the assignment, which we will continue in future assignments. "Also the goal of the project to tackle the UN goals, the identity of AAU and imagine future educational contexts, represented a challenge that gave a sense of responsibility over how and why we design."

Still, few students find that there are overlapping (too many) assignments. The students ask (again) for better organization, more information, less last-minute changes of the schedule. Most of the students express their satisfaction with the structure and effort to deal with the challenge of introducing three different fields during the first semester. The PLB introduction course was according the students input at the SGM not useful enough, to basic, there is a potential for a better PBL introduction.

Meaning of Light course: Some students ask for clearer exam format – we will stress to explain the format and expectations next semester. To support the students, who are new in this field we will meet their suggestions to split up the assignment to smaller assignments related more direct to the concepts and methods presented in the lectures.

Lighting Fundamentals: Well given lectures. Some students ask for more information on the slides, to support the self-study. Other students ask for explanations about the measuring tools and more information about how do we utilities the knowledge outside the walls of the university.

Rendering and simulation: It is always challenging to teach technological courses in a non-homogeneous class. But the students seem to appreciate the effort by the teacher's group to create a challenging and interesting learning environment for all students. The mini-portfolios created by all students containing all the assignments that they had to do during the semester were really impressive and very creative.



Conclusion of the study board

The Study Board (MSN) has processed the semester evaluation report and offers the following observations/conclusions:

- Student survey response rate: 18/29 – this is quite good; MSN is very grateful for quality feedback from the semester and the surveys are a major part of that
- The semester appears to have run smoothly and MSN is pleased to note that, as opposed to previous years, there does not appear to have been the same problems with integrating students of highly differing background and limited experience in problem- and project-based learning
- MSN notes that students have requested more timely, and less dynamic, information regarding schedules, hand-ins, lecture content. Unfortunately, this semester is not the only semester experiencing this. It is an element we as an organization must keep working at improving