Comments for proposed course changes to Computer Graphics

<u>Mary Cryan Comments</u>

I have some comments for the proposals for Computer Graphics, Advanced Databases, and the DPT for the DS apprenticeship.

For CG and ADBS, the comments are basically to explain that the suggested changes don't fit our in-School policies.

On the "Computer graphics" proposal, two comments:

- concern that this is another course run as 100% coursework (that's my own issue, we have many of these courses, and students take more and more of them. It causes the plagiarism problem and also clashes with time for their project).

- It's *not* possible for students to re-enrol on the same course code on a second year. So the comment about having two variants of CG running alternate years with different material getting swapped in and out ... no way could a student enrol for the two variants. To achieve this outcome Kartic needs to make a CG (A) and a CG (b). Though ... I'm not sure that works well either, as he plans to have a substantial introductory section which will be common to both offerings. I am surprised that they didn't consult someone who would explain this to them.

Advanced Databases proposal:
Seems to be to keep the course as-is but to increase the number of courseworks. We have a in-School policy, formed in 2015 after Ian Stark did a review, which sets rules for how much coursework we can have in 10/20 point courses.
http://web.inf.ed.ac.uk/sites/default/files/atoms/files/course_workload_assessment.pdf

I quote:

"A 10-credit course may have at most one piece of summatively-assessed coursework; or two if assessed wholly through coursework."

ADBS is 10points and only 30% coursework, 70% exam.

In 2015 many of us revised our existing courses to reduce our summative coursework, even for courses (eg my own one RC, also CMC, etc) where we felt that time spent on coursework helped them prepare for the exam. There was lots of debate about it at TC but the policy was passed and we agreed to change.

For ADBS to now plan to switch from 1-summative, 1-formative, and not just to make the initial one summative but to actually have 2-formative, 2-summative is a massive violation of our policy.

Again, I'm surprised no-one has filled-in Milos with this background. I don't think this change should get "waved through" in conflict with our policy just because it ended up at a last-minute special meeting.

Comments for proposed course changes to Computer Graphics

The proposal most relevant to my roles is the DPT for the DS Apprenticeship (since I am involved with the DS course development). My comment on that: "I agree with Sharon's view that Facets of Maths (or something else, FoM is a kind-of open-ended course and not all love it) is probably better than Prog and Data Analysis.

While there is an advantage of getting them to do the Physics course in that it would enable them to do some practical analysis, all the same it does overlap a lot with many courses they'll take during their degree. And given that these students are already taking fewer taught courses anyhow (because of the in-house training counting for some points), I think we should avoid allowing them to take courses with overlapping content if at all possible."

Sharon Goldwater Comments

I made similar comments to Mary's to Milos and Kartic re ADBS and the two versions of CG.

Milos has actually already modified his proposal and it looks like the new version is posted but somehow you saw the old version(?) - the new version is still not quite in line with the policy but much better than the old version (and no worse than the course as it stands). You may of course still disagree with this but have a look at the new one anyway.

I've suggested to Kartic that we consider only one version of CG tomorrow, as two versions would require creating a new course which wouldn't run in the coming year anyway, so we can revisit it later.

Kartic Subr Response

Thanks, Mary. Just to clarify, regarding the CG course...

"...the suggested changes don't fit our in-School policies. On the "Computer graphics" proposal, two comments:
- concern that this is another course run as 100% coursework (that's my own issue, we have many of these courses, and students take more and more of them. It causes the plagiarism problem and also clashes with time for their project)". – Mar Cryan

I understand and appreciate this. To tackle these problems:

1) The students will each have a creative component to their projects. This is quite common in Computer Graphics courses (across the world). Further, they will each need to write a report discussing choices and alternative choices, along with their impact on the final result.

2) The coursework will be designed considering the recommended workload (numbers in the document).

I taught the course with a final exam in its last offering, and it was very difficult to assess learning outcomes because the course relies so heavily on programming. A programming

Comments for proposed course changes to Computer Graphics

exam is a possibility, but the testing will need to be at a very superficial level due to time constraints.

"- It's *not* possible for students to re-enrol on the same course code on a second year. So the comment about having two variants of CG running alternate years with different material getting swapped in and out ... no way could a student enrol for the two variants. To achieve this outcome Kartic needs to make a CG(A) and a CG(b).   Though ... I'm not sure that works well either, as he plans to have a substantial introductory section which will be common to both offerings.

I am surprised that they didn't consult someone who would explain this to them." -Mary Cryan

You probably are referring to an earlier version, when I was hoping to propose this as a possibility (for feedback from BoS). The document tabled for discussion should only have one syllabus, in light of exactly the concern you have raised. So this should no longer be an issue. I hope. I am happy to discuss this at the meeting tomorrow.   While I understand that the current logistics do not allow this, I hope to find a way to do this in the long term because I really do believe that it is the best way to strike a compromise between a 10 point and a 20 point course while maintaining enrolment (numbers).