NM1/10: (11/11/10) – participant(s) / grade(s)

This year I decided to have a smooth transition from the CA1 to the NM1 course, to allow students to complete their interactive videos and develop an accompanying website, which to my mind provides sufficient rationale to regard the project as *web technology*, also because XML, the authoring format for ximpel[1], is one of the web's key technologies.

Apart from the portfolio, which can be accessed via the partipants page above, students were required to produce a worst page, for which an election was held, see creativetechnology.eu/wordpress/?p=615

The election was itself was an extremely enjoyable event, and as the assignment itself, highly appreciated by the students.

A course such as web technology is difficult, not in the least because of the great diversity in skills and interests. As I was absent for two weeks, some were happy with the freedom and took the time to explore the technology, but others had a problem to get themselves to work, and would have liked more direct and guided tuition. A somewhat disturbing factor is that suddenly the notion of *portfolio* became somewhat obscure, because of the introduction of the mevolution 'portfolio' as a progress monitoring tool for tutoring. Fortunately, these issues have been clarified and most students do sufficiently see the relevance of a personal portfolio for their future career and there work done for the creative technology study.

No doubt partly due to the work for the group project(s), no student this year did any of the optional assigments, ranging over the exploration of jquery, processingjs, the HTML5 canvas or advanced CSS, despite expressing a regret that such topics were not dealt with in the course.

Apart from a lack of time, this also indicates a problem with the attitude of this years' students, which is overall a bit passive. Students are, in general, not inclined to follow up on additional references, and explore the material.

All in all, I am not dissatisfied with the results, as expressed in the grade assessment(s), and despite the possible confusion that may arise when spreading the efforts for the interactive video project over two courses, I strongly recommend to continue this approach in the following years, not in the least because of the impressive results: creativetechnology.eu/wordpress/?p=622

Interestingly, whereas previous attempts to involve them in (micro) social networks were met by students with, at best, reluctance, after in a thoughtless moment opening a *creative technology* facebook group[2], within an hour more than half of the first year students (over 20) and as well as a number of second year students were member and (ongoingly) active, with activity concerning past, ongoing and future courses.

---

[1]/sites.google.com/site/ximpelinteractivevideo.html
[2]www.facebook.com/home.php?sk=group_165568023466897