

TDDD50 Green Computing (VT22) Muddy card evaluation summary – 14th and 18th February 2022

There were **49** students presents in the 5 sessions we polled. **41** cards were handed in (+ one mail later). Thanks for all feedback!

The following were **positive feedback** points that were encouraging for us:

Structure: 21 comments were about the structure/layout/organization being good or “enjoyable”. These included terms like “good group size”, “clear instructions”, “relevant preparations”, good that we are “on-campus”, “effective, learn a lot”, “interactions”, “good + clear structure”, “help understanding” “good to combine...” and so on. Two appreciated that everyone gets a chance to speak, without teacher interference. Two were specific that “you get stuff done” since “have to prepare” and “good to complete at planned time, not end of course”.

Seminar material: 16 commented the articles and topics in positive terms, like “interesting”, “fun to read”, “important”, “new insights”, “have learnt a lot”, “relevant”, “follow a theme”.

Feedback: 9 comments related to receiving feedback e.g. on early sending of slides, good inputs in discussions, assistants being helpful/supportive, encouraging participations done well, great time keeping, relevant feedback after presentations.

Reading: 8 comments related to usefulness of practicing reading of scientific articles, including one who thought articles “were easy to follow” and one who appreciated combination with Exjobb preparations. One considered it was good to get the chance to choose own article.

Presentations: 3 thought that the presentation part is good for training and practicing English

Writing: Two commented that there were “good writing instructions” and “good preparation for thesis”.

The following comments indicated **points for improvement** and are briefly [commented](#) below:

Workload: 7 students commented that the workload was too high for them, one specifically about time to prepare presentations for seminar 1 was shorter than others.

[Those who chose articles from seminar 1 were notified immediately and we placed papers that are easier to grasp in the earlier seminars. This is the best we could do in the current set up.](#)

Examination/Grading criteria: 7 student comments related to examination. Among these 2 two considered retake in June due to sickness/unsatisfactory presentation was inflexible. 5 considered grading criteria as unclear.

[We encourage you to ask about anything that is unclear specifically. Before asking, however, please look at the hints provided in slides 3-13 in the seminar 0 slides and the overall grading criteria that are posted on the examination page of the course.](#)

[We would like to emphasise: A satisfactory presentation is not about speech quality, but about what is conveyed, and a high-quality participation is not judged by frequency of speaking but quality/relevance of questions.](#)

Discussion questions/Feedback: 6 students needed support for finding good discussion questions, individual feedback on discussions, or wanted hints for those uncomfortable with presentations (including 3 who wanted more feedback on participation/leadership).

[We encourage you to look at the Sem 0 slides again but are happy to engage in individual dialogues.](#)

Time spent at presentation: 4 students though that having clear time limits for the presentation is stressful, “crazy” or “scary”.

[We encourage you to prepare well and time your presentations \(see slide 7 in Sem 0\) and use the pre-feedback opportunity, but always point out what is missing or unsatisfactory in presentations that need more practice \(it is not the time that matters\).](#)

Articles: 5 students thought articles could cover different topics, were “heavy”. “required vast difference knowledge” or “bad or weird”, “hard to read or unclear”. We encourage you to use the possibility of asking questions about unclear points before a seminar. We are there to help you.

Information/structure: 6 students had various unrelated comments e.g. how articles were chosen, the size of groups being large, did not see a point with lectures, and thought “a lot of rules can be confusing”, “failed to account for commute time” or that the course could in distance mode.

There is no concrete change that we can make due to these comments. The seminar 0 placement in time this year was due to teacher sickness and could not be avoided.