

Emneevaluering / course evaluation ISV

Navn / name

Tobias Bach

Emnekode / course code

STV4422

Semester

Vår 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

(1) Self-evaluation by the course convener

This was the first time this course was given. Overall, our impression is that the course worked very well. We were very pleased with the format of inviting guest lectures which were giving short lectures (45 minutes) with one of the course conveners giving the first half of the lecture. Also, having some of these guest lectures present online while students being in class worked very well (but requires equipment to be present in the classroom).

In terms of topics covered, we also believe those are connected to ongoing debates, interesting for students, and at the same time provide possibilities for students to write empirical term papers with a limited amount of data collection.

We also think that the evaluation format works well (response papers and term paper). However, some students started writing response papers late, which we advised them against, but then they seemingly had problems finding enough time for the term paper.

We also experienced that only few students attended class, relative to the overall number of enrolled students, which we experienced as demotivating. That said, when we had discussions with students, the small group context worked well.

(2) Summary of student evaluation

The student evaluation (and the mid-course meeting with the student contact) brought up several good points for improvement, but also provided generally a very positive feedback about the course content (a good mix of theory and empirics), the feedback provided on response papers, the requirement to add an empirical example to response papers, and about information provided about the course (videos on CANVAS). The main comments on improvement were related to a more interactive style of teaching, possibly bringing in the response papers to a larger degree. This comment was already made during the mid-course evaluation and the second half of the course was more interactive (from our perspective). The student representative also mentioned that lecturers should communicate more clearly what they expect from students in terms of preparation for the lectures and in terms of expectations from response papers.

(3) Suggestions for improvements

We see the need to make some adjustments, but no major changes. We hope that we will be able to keep the guest lecturer format (Circle U. cooperation) and we will strive for more interactive teaching.

In terms of formal changes, we suggest the following:

- Reducing the number of response papers (mandatory activities) from three to two;
- Having a seminar session (thus 9 lectures and 1 seminar session) to give students the opportunity to present and discuss (with lecturers and peers) their term paper ideas. This would also correspond to the department policy of having an oral element when students' grades are otherwise based on written assignments).