



Date: 30.1.2013

Semester evaluation ArT1 2012

Study programme:	Art & Technology	1st semester 2012
Semester Coordinator:	Jakob Sabra, Betty Li Meldgaard	
Note-taker	Andreas Jørgensen and Jannet Schenkel Høgh	
Meeting attended by:	Students:	Simon, Jannet, Nicoline, Lise, Sofie, Andreas
	Coordinator:	Jakob Sabra, Betty Li Meldgaard
	Supervisor:	Jakob Sarbra, Betty Li Meldgaard
	Teacher:	-

This document contains:

1. Semester evaluation report made by the students 22.01.13 (page 1-2)
2. Semester report made by the coordinators (page 3-4)

1. Semester evaluation report

1. Follow up and approval of the minutes of the last meeting
All steering group meeting minutes (26.9.12, 28.11.12, 22.01.13) approved.
2. Announcements / guest lecturers / excursions
Nothing to add.
3. The semester modules (purpose and content)
In general the composition and combination of the modules and courses we had during the 1st semester were a great introduction to the study, and we felt we got most of the tools we needed to create our semester project.
4. The courses (purpose, content, syllabus, pedagogy, relationship to the relevant module and the semester).

The different courses complimented each other well, except Sensors and Actuators. This course should have been more structured with actual lectures, so that everyone gained the same basic knowledge that could function as a foundation that we could develop further during the workshop.

It is very demotivating when *active participation* is just sitting in the classroom. We as students also feel it is very upsetting to see a lack of consistency regarding the active participation across all modules. We find that the rules about active participation stated in the studyguide are not being adhered to by all lecturers.

The admission requirements in the course Basic Electronics are too low and should be higher, as most of the groups had a very hard time following and fully understanding the teaching. We suggest a Basic Electronics summer course before the beginning of the study, or a demand of physics on a higher level.

Some students could have been more well-prepared for each course. In general we should have been way more active in the classroom discussions.

The course Academic and Artistic Methodology was well placed, and here we also got a lot of experience that were extremely useful regarding the semester project exhibition.

The individual course evaluations can be found in the attached minutes from the steering group meetings and the individual course evaluation attachments below this



part of the document.

5. Project work (organisation, process, supervisors)

To begin the semester with the Park(ing) Day project, was a good introduction the study and the group work. For new inhabitants of Aalborg it was nice to do something in the community. During the Park(ing) Day project we also had our first meeting with places where we could source materials -this was extremely important for the semester project later on.

Putting lectures in the end of the writing period in December, is only putting extra stress on us. Also having an info-meeting three hours after hand is a bad idea, as the attendance is really low and many already are on their way home for Christmas.

In general the supervisors did a great job, and most groups felt guided in the right direction. However there is a big difference in the way the supervisors supervise their groups; it would be nice if it was possible for them to coordinate how to do the supervision, so every group get somewhat the same guidance and information.

6. Communication channels (venues, labs, materials, etc.)

The acoustics in the classroom are really bad - there is a lot of noise! We need group rooms, where is it possible to work in peace. The different workshops in the Utzon Center and on Gammeltorv are good to have available. The staffs in the workshops are exceptionally helpful.

We consider it a problem that our room cannot be locked up, when Tegnesalen are used for events that are not connected or relevant to us.

7. Social conditions (groups work, general social environment etc.)

Nothing to add

8. Any other business

Nothing to add

9. Next meeting

Nothing to add

10. Problems that the study board should be aware of:

Nothing to add



AALBORG UNIVERSITET

ArT
Art & Technology

2. Semester report by the coordinators
Jakob Sabra, Betty Li Meldgaard

1. A general description of the semester

The first semester is always challenging in relation to confusion and getting settled. It was a semester with a high students number and a high degree of participation, but the students were actually very compliant in relation to involvement and patience. From the beginning there was a good atmosphere and a will to work and study.

The first big assignment of the semester was Parking Day, which served the purpose of initiating group-work in correlation with experiencing what it means to display things in public. Both students and supervisors experienced this as a very positive event.

Under the theme, "Sculpture and technology" the students worked with scrap materials that they had to find themselves. Here the students were very industrious in getting what they needed. The final exhibition was done in cooperation with the 3rd. Semester, which was beneficial in relation to the students and in relation to the final result, which displayed all together 17 projects. Overall the students have shown a higher level of ambitions and work ethic, than we have seen before.

2. What should the future coordinator and planning team be aware of?

The coordinator should be aware that new students demand extra careful communication regarding structure, schedule, dates and semester content. There will be a lot of confusion which the coordinator must take care of through information meetings, steering group meetings, Moodle, Facebook or other media. A high level of attendance and "being around" at ArT is recommended to avoid too much confusion.

The coordinator should early on (before the semester kick off) invite the Rus planners to a meeting, where the content and dates are aligned with the planning by the coordinator(s) to ensure that Rus events does not collide with the main content of the semester.

The introductory content of the semester should integrate the Rus planning events and educational content, guest lectures, Rus-Trip, welcome event, tour of the facilities etc.

The coordinator(s) should plan for introduction to Moodle, AUB, printing facilities, laboratories, workshop safety courses in accordance with the service personnel and secretary.

The coordinator should not specify a minimum amount of pages for the report, in the study guide. Declare a maximum of 6 normal pages per student, but stress that the group invest time and energy in graphical layout and representation in conjunction writing text. The representation and graphical documentation is considered very poor on previous semesters.

The coordinator(s) should make sure that 2-3 relevant courses are documented in a common group portfolio, which is part of the group report. The group report should consist of 3 parts; 1) main project, 2) PpBL section and 3) Course reflection. See the study guide for ArT1 2012 for a more in-depth description.

The supervisors should stress that the students more actively use their sketchbooks and documentation and representation skills at pinup, presentations, documentation and communication throughout the semester.



The coordinator(s) should stress that the supervisors use more time and effort in strengthening the group's academic reading and writing skills. This can be done through active supervision where texts are read, written and commented on.

If exhibition of the main projects is planned, then be aware that non-participation in the exhibition does not directly affect the exam grade of the group. If the students cannot, for some reason, exhibit their project at that date, then it is the supervisors responsibility, together with the group, to come up with a solution for the presentation at the exam.

The planning of the exam week should be stated in the beginning of the semester. The dates for the group exam should be planned with respect for the workload of the censor. More than 2 group exams per day are ill advised. The coordinator(s) should plan for 1 free day between the exam days in order not to stress the censor.

3. What should the lecturers be aware of?

The lecturers should make sure that the course content and assignments are consistent. Do not make last minute changes to assignments to avoid confusion. All students must be evaluated on the same level. Be strict and consistent with the rules of attendance and assessment. All rules regarding a module should be clear from the start and not change during the module. For hand-in of written module assignments use the assignment module on Moodle.

4. What must the department and service personnel be aware of?

It is crucial to the execution of events, hand-in, exhibitions, guest lectures workshop etc. that the secretary and laboratory staff is present at these pivotal dates, and if not, that it is planned together with the coordinator so measures can be taken in advance.

The laboratory personnel and secretary should inform in depth new teachers regarding general rules for ordering materials through the laboratory.

5. What should the Study Board act upon?

The study board is advised to oversee the initial planning of the Rus-Trip in order to make sure that the Rus-Trip has the proper amount of educational content. It is advised that the Study Board continues to support the partial funding of the Rus-Trip.

The study board is advised to fund the transportation of the students to AROS or similar exhibition venue/museum in the beginning of the semester in relation to the courses History of Art and Technology and Art in Context since the outcome is very beneficial to both students and teachers of the different semesters.

The study board must support that it hires the same censor to evaluate all the 1st. Semester main projects to secure a fair and transparent group examination process for the 1st. Semester students.