**Undergraduate Annual Module Review 2009/10**

*Annual module review should consider all modules offered by the School. Where relevant, please comment on placement learning / work-based learning / the year abroad.*

***In each section, please evaluate the statistical data or other relevant inputs as indicated below, and comment upon any significant issues or trends, indicating any action that has been / will be taken in response. All planned actions should be summarised in the action list.***

|  |
| --- |
| **Module (Banner) Code:** 04 19507 |
| **Module Title:** Object Oriented Software Design (EE2E) |
| **Name of Module Leader/Convenor:** Dr Mike Spann |
| **1. Student numbers:***How many students were registered on the module? (Please indicate if numbers have changed significantly since the previous year/s)*09/10: 26 EECE students at end of year08/09: 44 -- 07/08: 31 -- 06/07: 40 -- 05/06: 62 |
| **2. Analysis of module performance:***Please comment on the performance of students on the module, in comparison with the previous year/s and in comparison with the performance of other modules at the same level. (Refer to statistical data on module completion rates and the range of marks achieved.)* 09/10 module average: 43.16 -- students’ year average 49.50 -- failure rate 34.62%08/09 module average: 49.90 -- students’ year average 50.71 -- failure rate 18.00% (after scaling of +3)Performance in the exam part was very poor, with overall average of 32%. Coursework average was 54.4%. There is a suggestion that the learning outcomes are better addressed by the coursework element, and it is proposed to change the assessment to all coursework, retaining a small class test to assess basic factual knowledge of Java. |
| **3. Feedback from Students:***a) What methods have been used to gather student feedback and what proportion responded?*Standard questionnaires for EE2E1. Survey Monkey for EE2E2.*b) What key issues (both positive and negative) were raised in student feedback and what action has been / will be taken in response?*Generally positive about the content. Students felt the workload was high with four programming assignments. Two 3 hour sessions per lab are available. Students are warned to prepare beforehand, but few do. Lecture attendance was poor (9 am Friday start.)For 2E2, generally positive responses. Students find UML concepts difficult and unexciting, and they suggest more practical problem solving with example code incorporated into lectures and worked through in workshops.A change to all coursework should help with resolving these issues. |
| **4. Feedback from External Examiners (if applicable):***Were any issues raised by external examiners (in this year or the last) which were relevant or specific to this module? If so, what action has been / will be taken in response?*Good questions, testing understanding and ability in software engineering. Good paper. |
| **5. Educational Enhancement***a) Please summarise your overall reflections on the module’s performance and any planned changes or enhancements to the module.[[1]](#footnote-1)*May need some attention to lab workloads and scheduling of deadlines wrt robot project. For EE2E2, more weighting needs to be applied to assessment of the design logbook.*b)**Please identify any examples of good, or innovative, practice which could be disseminated more widely.*EE2E1 Programming assignments are all game based, which students seem to appreciate.EE2E2 design and programming assignments are also game based. |
| **I confirm that this annual module review has been conducted in accordance with the guidance notes on annual review.** |
| Signature of module leader: |
| Name: |
| Date:  |

Please submit the completed annual module review form to the relevant Programme Director/s by **16 July 2010**.

**Summary Action List**

|  |
| --- |
| *Please list all actions that have been identified as a result of this annual module review, as well as any ongoing actions.* |
| **Proposed Action** | **Deadline(s)** | **Person/Committee Responsible** |
| Consider changing the assessment to all coursework. Currently 50/50.2E1: Keep a class test (15%) to test a range of Java knowledge. Increase the size of the last assignment. 15% for each of the three assignments and 40% mini-project. 2E2: Change assessment to all coursework. Two assignments, 30% each, design logbook 30%, presentation 10%Will need a module change form. | August 2010 | MS/TNA/PG |
| Incorporate some workshop sessions where students work on assignments with PGTAs on hand to advise. | August 2010 | MS |
| Scheduling of deadlines wrt Robot project etc to be better coordinated. | Start of term | MS/TNA/BJC |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| *[Please add or delete rows as appropriate]* |  |  |

1. N.B. Any module amendments which need to take effect from the start of the next academic session, including any changes to assessments, must be approved at School-level via the Modification to Modules process by **17 September 2010** (see <http://www.as.bham.ac.uk/cdu/modules/modify.shtml>). In-session amendments to modules will not be approved. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)