AQH-Ci9-1 ANNUAL REPORT FORM FOR MODULES
Version 2.0 September 2009

*This form should be sent to the Chair of the relevant Module Studies Board or (if your Faculty does not use Module Studies Boards) the relevant Programme Studies Board **by 30 June** for undergraduate modules and **30 October** for postgraduate modules.*

*If you wish to be considered for the **Innovation Challenge** (see below) you should **also** send it to the AD Student Experience for your Faculty (or nominee) by **31 October**.*

Module title and code …CIF302 Advanced Database Concepts……………..

Host Programme Board or Module Board…Computing Level 3…………………

Name of module leader …Dr David Nelson……………………….

Academic year reviewed…2008/09……………..

Append, or summarise below:

- Achievement and progression data for the module

  Achievement on the module was excellent. From a cohort of 29 students, all students gained a pass mark in the portfolio with an average mark of 62.4%. 24 students passed the exam, and there was one non-attendance. Three students who attended but did not pass the exam passed the module with an exam mark of 35% or over. The average mark for the examination was 54% with an average module mark of 57%. The two students who were subsequently referred in the examination did not attempt the referral.

- Summary of student feedback for the module

  Students provided module feedback using the 'nominal feedback' technique, where they were asked in groups to list their positive and negative points about the module, discuss the feedback from all groups and then rank them in order of importance. The tables summarising the student feedback are given below, in order with the most important point first in each list.

  As can be seen from these tables the comments about the module were mostly positive. Students were very positive about the assessment and the practical sessions in the module. The assessment was by an individualised portfolio and the

students most positive experience regarding the module was the incorporation of review sessions which meant that they gained valuable feedback on their progress during the module, and ensured that their work was spread out during the entire module. The main problems commented on were very minor and mainly with regard to the equipment and the practical applicability of the module. Students found the machines on the terraces poor from an ergonomic perspective as the monitors are fixed to the desks and therefore not fully adjustable. The comment relating to 'no talk from industry' was due to the organised speaker being unable to attend due to sickness. The module was updated this year to include more practical sessions and tutorial exercises but the students did comment that more practical content would have been beneficial.

Positive Points (most positive first)

	Rank
Review sessions spreads out work	1
Practical sessions	2
Practical assignment	3
Wide range of topics in detail	4
Lectures relevant	5
Portfolio assessment weighting	6
Individualised portfolio	7
Learning/practical work balance	8

Negative Points (most negative aspect first)

	Rank
Exam (probably)	1
Equipment problems on terraces (relates to eyesight)	2
Need more practical content (less theory)	3
No talk from industry	4

- Other evidence if applicable (eg comments by external examiners, PSRB issues)

None.

Evaluation by module leader

Strengths

1. Nature of assessment where students produce an individualised portfolio which is monitored with review sessions during the module.
2. The module is co-taught by two staff with differing interests and experiences in databases which promotes discussion during the module.

Areas for Development

- Actions which can be taken immediately and do not require further approval (say by whom actions will be taken and give target dates)

1. Look at incorporating more practical content in the module.
2. Ensure that an industrial speaker is invited that is able to attend in future instances.

- Actions which can be taken by the module leader but require further approval (say by whom actions will be taken and give target dates)

  None

- Issues which require wider discussion within the Programme Board and suggested courses of action

  None.

Innovation Challenge

If you wish any of these developments to be considered for the **Innovation Challenge**, identify it here and indicate how the improvement can be evaluated in a year's time.

Proposed development under the Innovation Challenge …………..
……………………………………

Why / in what way do you think this would be innovative? …………………
………………………………………………

Evidence of the positive impact of the development will be …………..
…………………………………………………………..

For details of the Innovation Challenge contact Dr Judith Kuit, Head of Academic Development