TDDD50 Green Computing -- Muddy card evaluation summary -- 19 February 2020

There were 50 cards written in the 5 seminar groups (covering in total 68 students) --- 73% response.

1) There were 33 comments that referred to the course content and set up in positive terms such as: “fun”, “interesting papers”, “important insights into the industry we’re part of”, “great way of learning”, “a lot of new insights into sustainability”, “clear exam criteria”, “exciting area”, “good practice”, “interesting topics”, “informative articles”, and so on.
2) Another 22 comments mentioned positively the learning aspects related to discussions, presentations and writing with terms like: “you get a chance to improve discussions on difficult subjects”, “good to read articles before thesis”, “easy to have discussions about”, “good practice for reading papers”, “kursen är klar efter sin presentation”, “train on presenting”, “good for practicing English”, “you learn a lot compared to other courses”, “prepares you for professional life by forcing you to communicate”, “man lär sig metoden att skriva på ett vetenskapligt sätt” and so on.
3) 11 comments related to positive feed back on teachers’ activities, like “the seminar teacher seems to know a lot about the subject/article”, “good feedback from TA”, “feedback on slides before presentation is good”, “good that you can ask about topics in the paper that you did not understand”.
4) 7 students thought the articles were old/boring or uninteresting.
5) 6 students made comments that indicate a knowledge gap with terms like: “some … papers are bit dense”, “articles are often a difficult read”, “exhausting to grasp in its entirety”, “måste ha bra koll inom visa typer av teknik för att kunna hålla en bra discussion”, and so on. Another 10 comments indicated “too many articles”, “too much time needed for preparation”, or “deadline too close”, or difficult to find info” that we also interpret as being an indicator of difficulty or knowledge/skill gap.
6) 14 comments thought improvement in discussions were needed, including three who thought the group was too large. Terms indicating how discussions could be better were like: “discussions can be unrelevant”, “discussions are sometimes about unrelated stuff”, “diskussionsdelen är jättetråkigt, och onödigt lång”, and so on.
7) 3 comments said that presentations (for 20 min) are hard, or cause stress.
8) 9 students referred to uneven level of difficulty among the different articles.
9) 9 comments indicated unclear pass criteria or asked for more guidelines about writing or being a leader.
10) 4 comments were unsure what the goal/relevance of the course is and one student though it should be obligatory for all technology programs.

Teachers’ comments:

Thank you for all the feedback and will do our best to contribute to the rest of the course along the lines that you appreciated. About point 8: that’s why we gave students a chance to choose! Point 10 (relevance) was dealt with in lecture 1 and can be checked in the course syllabus.

About passing criteria (point 9): Seminar 0 was intended for asking questions if anything was unclear. Please do not hesitate to ask now if you have specific questions about passing the presentation part, the discussion part, or the writing part. We welcome questions and will answer you individually.

On improvement on discussions (point 6): The main aim should be to understand the actual claims in the paper (typically mentioned as contributions and supported by curves in later sections).