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1 Semester in General

The semester was in general heavy in courses that, in addition, ended late and left little time for project work. The handling of the SAD course at the previous semester was better w.r.t. the projects. It was noted that the choice of the PE course was too early w.r.t. the courses that had barely started (only one lecture for PSS) and it was difficult to choose the right PE course.

The students are not happy at all about basis. The programming courses at basis are of too low level for what is expected in later semesters. In particular, the C programming course was poor and useless. In general, the quantity and level of courses at basis are by far too low and the student even suggest to remove the semester completely if the level is not improved because it is just a waste as it is now.

2 Projects

One group had a problem of uneven involvement due to heterogeneity of the group (members and ambition) and some communication problem. In addition, their supervisor was not much available and even signaled late in the semester that there was no time left for supervision. That group had a hard time with support.

SPO as PE course was good and was very relevant for the projects.

3 Courses

The students found that DNA, MIP, and PSS overlapped.

MVP The exam form in MVP was a good idea, which meant fewer exams at the end, which was appreciated given the amount of other courses. Everyone appreciated this sooner or later in the course. The content of the course was good. One group complained about the pre-requisite in the C language that was an obstacle. In addition, the help they received for the exercises (part of the exam) was different than usual (and thus unexpected). The first exercises took longer than expected to get accustomed to programming. This group also complained that the content of the exercises was far from the lectures. The material was of high level and some topics that were technical could have received more examples. The notes on the slides during the lectures worked well, i.e., using a pen on a tablet PC.
DNA  The students found the first part of the course better than the second part. The quality of the second part could be improved both for the lectures and the book because the network book contains a lot of irrelevant text.

SS  The lectures with the board worked well. The exercises were good but having them in the auditorium was not so good because it hindered group cooperation. The quiz was welcome.

PSS  The lectures were good but some exercises could be shortened to have time to focus on the most important parts. The course was spread and finished too late for the projects. In fact the mini project even ended after the project. The book differs from the lectures.

SPO  The course was difficult to follow because the lecturer went quickly over some topics that the students were supposed to have understood. The course was in general heavy and the students would prefer to have a more concise book. The lecturer stuck to the book and gave rarely other examples to explain the theory. The lecturer was involved and helped for the projects as well. However, his language was confusing because he used words that did not exist (often in English) to explain some concepts. The part on programming in Java was not as good as the part on Triangle.
Semester Evaluation for Dat4/MI2/DE2/SSE2 F2010

Simonas Šaltenis and Ulla Öland

October, 2010

This evaluation of the Dat4 F06 semester is mainly based on the minutes from the steering group meetings, semester coordinator’s own observations, and semester evaluation forms of two groups of students (one international master student and four Dat4 students—five in total). Comments from such a small number of students should be taken with a grain of salt, but some of the comments mirror the concerns expressed during the steering group meetings and a couple of students’ e-mails received by the coordinator after the group formation.

Semester in general

The main problem this year, as for many years on this semester, was the group formation process, which was particularly painful this year (most difficult in coordinator’s memory). In our opinion (and in the opinion of a number of students) the difficulty this year was mainly due to very varying “quality of the project proposals and presentation of these among the three groups,” as the students put it in their semester evaluation. The DES unit had most proposals and most effort was put in their presentation, a lot of potential supervisors doing the presentations. The DPT and IS had much fewer proposals and only two supervisors from each of these two units. The result was that nobody wanted to do the SOE proposals (and in the end, nobody did).

Here is a citation from an e-mail from one of the students:

...after sitting for nearly two times two hours, just staring at a black board with no one willing to write a project in the area of SOE, I don’t find it particularly valid or fair to force some students to write a project in SOE.

For me, the Dat4 semester is quite important. In my opinion the bachelor project, which this is, is a big deal. I would really like to write this project in the area that sparks my interests. Therefore it is even more frustrating that this rule forces some students into writing an project in an unwanted area. I doubt that this will get the desired effect as the project drive goes from being enthusiasm and interest to being all about passing the semester and moving on to a new project.

Other (more positive) comments:

• To have two days of group formation before closing the groups, has been useful according to the students.

• There was a good flow of information at the beginning of the semester. The students liked the introduction of all courses and project proposals.

• The students found it nice that the courses were finished fairly early in the semester which left a lot of time to finish the project.
• PDK was placed perfectly with regards to the project.

Courses

SV:
Students were very positive about this course. Both teachers were very good and took time to make sure that all the students understood the material. The exercise sessions were great and the teachers were very proactive in helping students by asking if they understood the exercises. The idea of being in the lecture room during exercises is good for a course like this.

SOE:
Some students used the word “superficial” to describe the course. The same figure representing the structure of the course was explained “for 10-15 minutes” almost each course session which seemed to some students as a waste of time. Some good techniques, tools, and methods were presented and the guest lecturers were also good.

Coordination between SOE and SWI can be better.

Some students find it strange that agile development methods are introduced first, before the traditional methods.

SWI:
The students felt that there was too little course material to cover the 15 course sessions which made the teachers stretch the material with a lot of redundant information.

An international student finds this course very useful for his future career. He learned a lot in the IEC course.

PDK:
A very good course, and it could be useful to have it in the first week of the semester, might even be better to move it to DAT1-2. The lecturer was well prepared for the course. He was an inspiring lecturer.

The peer review session gave some great feedback for the project paper.

DBS:
Some students observed that the teacher almost read the lectures off his slides. They felt that the course would be greatly improved if the lecturer was not so bound by his slides.

The international student was happy that the teacher and the assistant teacher helped him a lot during the course.
DAT6, INF8, SW10, CIS4 og DE4-MI4-SSE4 semesterevalueringerne fra foråret 2010.

Følgende giver et overblik over antallet af (ikke-tomme) besvarelser - antal grupper og antallet af studerende i disse grupper:

Dat6: 3 grupper med i alt 6 studerende.
Inf8: 0 grupper, ingen studerende.
SW10: 1 gruppe med 1 studerende.
DE4-MI4-SSE4: 1 gruppe med 1 studerende.
CIS4: 1 gruppe med i alt 3 studerende

Ovennævnte semestre er det andet - og afsluttende - semester på specialeåret af de datalogiske uddannelser.
For alle semestre gælder det at arbejdet på det andet specialesemester udgør en naturlig forlængelse af efterårsemestret i 2009.
Der er ikke styregruppenmøder på semestret. Der har ikke været afholdt kurser på semestrerne.

Der er kun ganske få bemærkninger i den fremsendte evalueringer.
Disse giver udtryk for et positivt samarbejde med vejlederne, og et godt udbytte af det sidste semester på specialeåret.
Der er desværre ikke grundlag for at foretage yderligere - og dybere - evalueringer.

Kurt Nørmark
Koordinator for specialeåret på de datalogiske uddannelser.
Semester evaluation spring 2010 dat 8
This report is compiled from student evaluations, semester meeting minutes and informal contacts with students and staff throughout the semester.

Courses

DWML
The students found this an interesting course at a high level with good combination of theory and practice, but with too heavy a load in the mini-project.

TOV
The students were less satisfied with this course. In particular there is a structural problem in that the course is given for a mixed semester group audience, and the experienced 10th semester students report that the level is too low for them. There were also some problems with the delivery of the course which are detailed in the minutes of the 14.04.10 semester meeting. The semester co-coordinator discussed the problems with the lecturer concerned and the students noticed some improvement – though some problems remained.

Projects
Projects ran relatively smoothly, though largely divorced from the taught courses. Several students decide to change topic from the previous semester, and in general there is more of a tendency for students to move away from their special topics, which gives a conflict with the pedagogical design of the semester. However four semesters is sometimes too long a period to work on the same topic without considerable development, and the coordinator will work at defining options for students with non-special related topics.

Semester in general
The students were irritated by some of the IT provision, in particular the change of email server (see 14.04.10 minutes). They also would welcome more freedom in choosing appropriate courses for their projects. A third issue is a lack of motivation for some students which is possibly caused by a relatively low level of engagement with taught courses and teaching staff.

However the semester ran smoothly, largely due to the capacity of these experienced students to set their own agendas and solve their own problems.

Jeremy Rose
Semester Coordinator
SW4 Semesterevaluering – Forår 2010

Denne SW4 semesterevaluering er på styregruppereferaterne og semesterevaluering fra en enkelt gruppe (7 grupper på semesteret). Derudover er der i semesterets løb kommet kommentarer fra 2 af underviserne, inddraget i koordinators kommentarer.

De studerendes kommentarer

SE kurset Datamat- og netværksarkitekturkurset (DNA) har været ok, men forelæsningerne har været svære at forstå rent sprogligt. SE-kurset Principper for samtidighed og styresystemer (PSS) har også været ok, men startede meget fra bunden af. Alle kurserne har givet et godt udbytte.

Semesterkoordinators kommentar

Koordineringen af SW4 har været uden de store problemer. Enkelte problemer nævnt til styringsgruppemøderne er blevet håndteret undervejs med kontakt til kursusholdere.

Flere af kursusholdere bemærker, at nogle grupper har haft et meget lavt aktivitetsniveau i øvelsesessionerne. Det gælder både for PE og SE kurser. I nogle tilfælde har kursusholders tilstedeværelse til opgaveregning ligefrem været uønsket, tydeliggjort ved en låst dør til grupperummene (2 grupper). Dette er aldeles uacceptabel opførsel!
Kursusholderen i DNA påpeger, at dumpeprocenten i kurset var relativ høj (godt 20%), og der kunne jo være en sammenhæng mellem manglende aktivitet og manglende viden.

Lone Leth Thomsen, Semesterkoordinator SW4, September 2010
SW6 Semesterevaluering – Forår 2010

I år var der 7 grupper på SW6.

Semester-temaet var “application development” og projektet blev udført som et multi-projekt hvor flere grupper arbejdede sammen om at udvikle ét stort kørende system.

Som på tidligere semestre var den første måned reserveret til at de studerende skulle nå frem til en overordnet arkitektur der ville gøre de individuelle (del)grupper i stand til at udvikle deres del af systemet. Tre uger før afleveringsfrist blev der givet en deadline hvor grupperne skulle foretage en integrationstest af de komponenter de hver især havde udviklet.

Baseret på tidligere års erfaringer (samarbejdsansvigeligheder når mange grupper skal træffe fælles beslutning, og problemer med at integrere kode fra mange delgrupper) blev grupperne opdelt i 2 multiprojekter bestående af hhv 3 og 4 grupper. Den ene multiprojekt-gruppe udviklede et Ebay-lignende website, mens den anden multiprojektgruppe udviklede et Facebook-lignende website. Disse 2 projektforslag (lav en Ebay/Facebook aplikation med en bestemt funktionalitet) blev givet på forhånd. Baggrunden for at have prædefinerede projektforslag var ligeledes baseret på erfaringer fra tidligere semestre, hvor de studerende brugte lang tid på at nå frem til konsensus omkring hvad de skulle udvikle. Dette resulterede i at de havde problemer med at nå at få defineret en overordnet arkitektur hvilket efterfølgende gav problemer når grupperne skulle til at udvikle parallelt.

Sammenskrivningen er baseret på evalueringen fra de 4 grupper der har svaret. De 4 grupper fordeler sig ligeligt på de to multiprojekter.

Semestret som helhed
Alle fire grupper svarer at SOE burde have været et PE-kursus i stedet for TOV, da det har langt større relevans udviklingen for udviklingen af et multiprojekt end TOV. Et andet gennemgående tema er, at de studerende savnede muligheden for at have større indflydelse på temaet for deres bachelor-projekt.

PDK kurset får ros, men det bemærkes at kurset er lidt malplaceret, da projektet ikke involverer at skrive en artikel.

Nogle af emnerne i PSS var allerede gennemgået i TSW fra SW5, men de studerende angiver at det var rart at få genopfrisket emnerne.

En gruppe bemærker at de godt kunne tænke sig variation, da udviklingen for deres vedkommende har været web-baseret på både 4., 5. og nu 6. semester.

Projektarbejdet
I denne del af skemaet gentages problematikken omkring at de studerende ikke havde haft OOAD på et tidligere semester, ligesom de anser SOE for at være mere relevant som PE-kursus end TOV. De studerende syntes at projektforslaget var ok, men at det kunne have været mere spændende med en konkret kunde i den anden ende.

Projektarbejdet har involveret en del kommunikation grupperne imellem, men qua de mindre multi-projekstørrelser har grupperne haft bedre ide om hvad de andre grupper lavede, og hvor de skulle henvende sig angående interface ændringer eller funktionalits-problemer.

TOV
Den anvendte bog får kritik for at indeholde en del fejl. Derudover mener de studerende at pensum var for stort og indeholdt for meget materiale der ikke var en del af eksamenspensum. Det var meget givtigt med praktiske øvelser.

MPL
Kurset var godt, men for kort – set i lyset af at de studerende ikke tidligere havde haft OOAD. Det bemærkes at kurset præsenterede nogle gode værktojier i forhold til at administrere og organisere et multi-projekt, og placeringen af kursusgangene passede fint. Kursusholderen får desuden ros for aktivt at deltage i multiprojekt-møder, og for at komme med konstruktive forslag til projekterne.

SOE
Det bemærkes igen at SOE burde have været PE kursus. Miniprojektet var spændende, og brugen af gæsteforelæsere blev overordentligt godt modtaget.

PSS
Kurset, og i sædeleshed kursusholderen får ros fra samtlige 4 grupper. De bemærker at forelæsningerne er spændende og velstrukturerede, og slides er meget brugbare. Kursusholderen får ros for at være engageret og god til at motiverer de studerende.
PDK
Det bemærkes at kurset placering er mere relevant for datalogerne hvor projektet netop involvere at skrive en artikel. Forelæseren får ros for at være engageret og gøre stoffet spændende.

Semesterkoordinators kommentar
Semesteret er forløbet planmæssigt og uden de store problemer. Multiprojektet blev som concept godt modtaget – de studerende mente at det var en god oplevelse at prøve at skulle samarbejde på tværs af grupperne. Man kunne overveje om det var muligt at finde en passende kunde til næste udgave af SW6. Den samlede braintrust (>20 studerende) ville gøre det muligt at udvikle nogle spændende applikationer, og det ville samtidig have en gavnlig effekt på de studerendes motivation.

Et projektforslag der kom fra en af de SW6 studerende efter semestret, omhandler at lave et skemasystem til erstatning for skema.cs.aau.dk, da det tilsyneladende er en kilde til frustration hos flere studerende.

I indeværende semester stod det de studerende frit for at vælge udviklingsmetode. Såfremt SOE var PE kursus, bemærkede censor desuden at det kunne være interessant at foretage udviklingen som et Scrum projekt (a scrum of scrums).
Evaluation of SW8 Semester in F10, Peter Dolog (Semester Coordinator)

Semester
In general, students find the semester good. They found the semester start and given information at the start also good. The semester start was not so relevant for elite students as the course have not been introduced and projects for elite students have been assigned. One group rated the balance between courses and projects as average as the students felt that they did not hear in courses what they have used in the projects. Students find the distribution of activities fine even though they felt that SWI exercises were a bit pressed. Load was especially high during the period of SWI exercises, Essence period in SWI and during specialization selection. One group reported that there was an overlap of testing between TOV and earlier semester. One group also reported big problems to understand Asian teachers.

Projects
Students found projects interesting and found especially the option to shape own project very interesting. They find a good idea that a company is involved in two proposals. However students commented that there was not so much relevant material to projects from PE courses such as MST and TOV.

Courses

SWI: Students find the course in general good but very different from what they have been used to. The course was evaluated by them in detail in a separate survey organized by the teachers of the course. One group expressed a difficulty to engage in a new form of teaching in the course which required them to be more active. There was also too much of the Essence related topics in the course.

MST: Students in general liked the course. However they would like to have the course more advanced for the 8. semester of their study. They reported difficulty to understand Asian teachers. They find the workshops about mobile innovation good, motivational, good to learn about, and fun. In general, students however missed more topics relevant to their projects.

TOV: Students in general found the course good. One student group reported that there was too much uupaaal and the course was too theoretical. Students would appreciate more applications relevant to their projects. Also they reported about too many cancelations.
Semesterevaluering rapport BAIT/INF4, F10

Semesteropstart
Overall, the semester start went well. There were some minor problems with the group formation as one student had to be assigned to a group, but this did not lead to further problems. Two foreign exchange students missed the semester introduction, and initially lacked some background information, but their group got them updated.

Kurser
For most courses, there were only minor comments during the semester (as noted below). For the DNA course, however, the students reported problems with the level of the course compared to their prerequisites.

ISB:
The students liked this course.

DB:
The students feel that this course, especially exercises, works well since it is adapted to their project (unlike those courses that are followed by students from several different study courses).

IUK:
There were some misunderstandings regarding the way the course exam was organized that were resolved. Some students did not feel that the use of “twitter” during lectures was helpful. Also, there was a question why the number of credit points for students taking this course is not the same for different study courses.

SOE:
Initially, there were some minor technical issues with the microphone and the course organization. Later, the students showed excitement about the course and the fact that guest lecturers were included.

DNA:
The students felt that this course was not at the level of their prerequisites, probably due to the fact that students from other studies (computer science, software engineering) represent the majority of the participants. Specifically, the students requested a crash course in C programming and other prerequisites.
Projekter
In general, the projects worked out well. One group experienced difficulties in self-organization. Another group had some problems understanding the supervisor due to accent.

Semesteret generelt
Unfortunately, there were no comments in the semester evaluation. This limits the evaluation of the semester overall, but might also indicate that there were no major unresolved problems. The semester evaluation should be encouraged in order to obtain more reliable feedback. The students remarked at the beginning of the semester that answering semester evaluation questionnaires can be problematic when the deadline for answering is close to the project report deadline. Also, they were reassured that teachers and supervisors do not see the evaluation results before the exam.

Also, students expressed that they would like to have a calendar system that provides email/sms-notifications and that they can export in ical-files.

Ira Assent, 30.09.10 ira@cs.aau.dk
The semester was started with the introductory semester meeting on 1st February, students were briefed about the courses and other details including project theme etc. The students were also told that there will be 3 semester meeting scheduled during this semester: 1st March, 13th April and 3rd May, where students can give feedback and their reflection on the semester.

All meeting were held and the general feedback from the semester was ok, but they have one general comment that they would have preferred more lectures for all the courses and in particular for Information Retrieval and Computer Supported Cooperative Work. As the low payment of hours and very few number of students most lectures were not like the normal 2 sessions of 45 minute each. The coordinator explained to them the reason, the coordinator has the feeling that as most foreign students are not familiar with our model of teaching so some time they found it difficult to adopt.

The general impression as a coordinator I feel that the semester went well and they did a very good job in making very good project together.

D. M. Akbar Hussain
Lektor
Coordinator CIS2
There were 3 CIS4 students at this semester:

Theme: Distributed systems  
Supervisor: Andrea Valente

Theme: CSCW  
Supervisor: David Hicks

Theme: Data Mining  
Supervisor: Daniel Ortiz-Arroyo

**Coordinator's report**  
There were no F10S students.

A semester group meeting was held by email in the beginning of May 2010.

From the meeting, I will mention:  
*one supervisor* reported that his student had some problems writing his final report (i.e. master thesis) and remarked:

- "A general note: this is not the first time that an Italian student has problems writing a report and is forced to postpone.

- I would like to propose that we give all international students a crash-course in technical writing, to avoid these problems in the future."

All three passed the passed their final exam for the cand.it in the summer 2010.

There were no student semester evaluation responses from the SurveyXact system.

The survey examination result statistic has been (or will be) sent separately by the department secretary.

**Comments from the supervisors:**
- "It's ok by me."
- "The report looks ok. Also, I agree with the comment about the technical writing course. I believe it would have helped the student that I was supervising as well."
- "I read the evaluation and it's OK don't have any comment."

Esbjerg, 7 October 2010  
Henrik Legind Larsen  
CIS4/ F10S Semester Coordinator
Semester Evaluation F6S-2010

Date: Wednesday, 15 September 2010

Co-ordinator: D. M. Akbar Hussain
Referee: D. M. Akbar Hussain
Minutes Taken during all the meetings: D. M. Akbar Hussain

The semester was started with the introductory semester meeting on 1st February, students were briefed about the courses and other details including project theme etc. The students were also told that there will be 3 semester meeting scheduled during this semester: 5th March, 12th April and 3rd May, where students can give feedback and their reflection on the semester. It is an exaggeration from a group of 2 students that literature list and semester courses were not available, which is simply incorrect as the F6S web page was updated before the start of the semester with most details about courses and other relevant information.

Most of the comment comes from one of the group and in-fact in the 1st meeting, the rest of the meetings have either no comment or little feedback however, general feedback for the semester from most students was ok. As most teaching is done in the earlier part of the semester so the overall feedback about the courses were satisfactory but particularly one group of students felt that some lectures of Syntax & Semantics were planned late, but it was explained to them that it was due to their study tour abroad.

However, there was one concern regarding the examination for the courses: Syntax and Semantics and Compiler Construction as these are PE courses but according to the study board these have to be evaluated separately as well for which they were told that there will be an oral examination for Compiler Construction and there will be evaluation through exercises it seems that there was little confusion between their understanding and how the teachers explained to them as how exam will be conducted, partly the students should be responsible as if there was something they did not understood they should have cleared up with the teacher, however, in the end it was ok and students agreed as well.

The coordinator’s observation as a supervisor of one group of students is that because they had problem from the very start as they took long time to decide for example what tools to use to build their project or if they can build their own tool. The concern was raised by supervisor many time to them, supervisor’s observation is that not all the members of that particular group were contributing equally towards the project which they did mentioned in their feedback. Also, my feeling as a supervisor is that it was their
first software project so they had difficulty in understanding how to handle different things in the project, although supervisor was all the time guiding them that they need to be more focused on things necessary for the project development, he gave them all the tips and even related links/literature which have similar solved examples in codes etc. The supervisor told them that he can guide them and facilitate them to solve any problem or difficulty but he cannot solve or write code for them which basically is the role of the supervisor.

The general impression as a coordinator I feel that the semester went well, although one group had difficulty at the earlier part of the semester but in the end they worked very hard and with the cooperation of their supervisor they were able to build a good project. The 2nd group was very good from the very start of the semester and they decided at the early stage what they are going do and they build an excellent project.

D. M. Akbar Hussain
Lektor
Coordinator F6S
SP2 - Semesterevaluering F2010

Overordnet er SP2 (F2010) forløbet mestendels tilfredsstillende, dog
var der været adskillige relevante kritikpunkter for dette semester.

Det skal bemærkes, at hele strukturen for spiluddannelsen er under
trafisk revision i forbindelse med lanceringen af det nye DADIU
semester (kaldet DADIU 2.0). Af samme grund vil jeg ikke foretage mig
underligere i forhold til de anførte kritikpunkter.

Semesterevalueringen og gennem uformelle samtaler med SP2'erne
gennem semesteret anføres følgende punkter der giver anledning til
kritik/re-evaluering:

1. Semesterplanlægning
2. TAP kurset.
3. AI kurset.
4. MUE kurset.

Ad. 1.
Semesterplanlægningen, især eksamensplanlægningen, var ikke
everensigsmæssig for SP2: for flere af de studerende var der fx meget
tort tid mellem afslutning af DADIU fællesproduktion (hvor alle er
samlet til evaluering i København) og eksamen. Tidspunktet for DADIU
produktionen kolliderede også med valg af speciale-emne og -vejleder
hvorfor adskillige studerende måtte ty til mail/telefon-møder i den
forbindelse.

Den uheldige planlægning skyldt bl.a. usikkerhed omkring datoerne
for DADIU fællesproduktionen (den såkaldte maj-produktion starter fx i
april) samt almindeligt besvær med at få en eksamensplan til at gå op
en højere enhed.

Med den nye DADIU struktur burde problemet være løst, dog bør
undervisere nok være mere opmærksomme på eventuelle spil-studerende i
forbindelse med skema- og eksamens-planlægning.

Ad. 2.
TAP var ramt af en del aflysninger/flytninger p.gr.a. sygdom hvilket,
kombineret med punkt 1 ovenfor, har affærd en del kritik. Derudover
har flere grupper vanskeligt ved at se, hvor teknikkerne der
underviser i på TAP kan anvendes i forbindelse med spiludvikling.

Mht. sygdom er det vanskeligt at gøre noget konstruktivt ved og
imidlertid at gøre sig imod.

De teknikker der undervises i på TAP er særdeles anvendelige i et
fremadudvalg af softwareudviklingsprojekter, herunder også (dele af)
spilludviklingsprojekter, men ikke nødvendigvis i et semesterprojekt.
Kritikken af AI kurset går på (for) lange forelæsninger samt at en del af pensum der er særligt relevante for spiludvikling først kommer sent i kurset.

Eft. lange forelæsninger bør de studerende tage det op enten direkte med underviseren eller på et styregruppermode.

Rækkefølgen af pensum i et PE kursus er et velkendt problem. Hvis AI kurset, som det er nu, bliver en del af den nye struktur på spiluddannelsen kan man evt. opfordre underviser på kurset til at overveje om der er mulighed for at ændre lidt på rækkefølgen, men det må naturligvis bero på en faglig vurdering.

Bemærk:

Baseret på de uformelle samtaler jeg har haft med SP2'ere i løbet af semesteret skyldes kritikken af MUE snarere tidspres end egentlige faglige indvendiger. Specielt var der bred enighed om, at det i princippet er en god ide at lave systematiske brugertests af et spil for at se om det rammer målgruppen etc. Det kræver dog at et spil er næsten færdigt, i det mindste som en spilbar prototype, hvilket ikke altid er tilfældet for SP2 projektet.

Under den nye struktur bør MUE, eller et tilsvarende kursus, placeres så de studerende kan afprøve teknikkerne på et næsten færdigt spil.