

Emneevaluering / course evaluation ISV

Navn / name

Marina Povitkina

Emnekode / course code

STV1300

Semester

Vår

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

Course convener's evaluation of the course:

Overall, the course worked well. 317 students finished the exam out of 385 students who were signed up to the course at the time of the exam. About 150 students attended the lectures regularly.

There was a miscommunication regarding the exam language. The course page indicated that it was only possible to write exam answers in English, which caused discontent among students. We solved the issue mid-way through the course but by that time several students dropped out because of no possibility to submit exams answers in Norwegian. We therefore need to ensure that from now on the course webpage states that the exam can be written in English or any of the Scandinavian languages.

The course contains 12 lectures on diverse topics, which seemed to be confusing to students who were struggling to grasp the essence of comparative politics. I got this impression from course evaluations and questions during the lectures. Due to the high demand, I recorded an additional summary lecture, where I explained the red threads of the course.

The course involved study groups and study mentors who facilitated discussions in study groups. We are currently conducting an evaluation survey from students and study mentors to assess how it worked, but from our perspective and discussions with course representatives, this setup worked very well.

The course had a teaching assistant who helped with recordings, communication with students and arrangement of study groups and their help was necessary for a smooth running of the course. I recommend keeping the teaching assistant for the future iterations of the course, if resources permit.

This year we tried a new lecture solution to increase engagement – mentimeter Q&A slide available for students during the lectures, so that students can type their questions throughout the duration of the lecture. This worked well and I recommend keeping it for the future iterations of the course.

Summary of student evaluation:

Overall, we got positive evaluations about the course from the student representatives. They, however, reported that many students were overwhelmed by the amount of reading and that it was difficult to navigate the reading in terms of what is relevant for the exam. During the mid-term evaluations we received some requests from student representatives, such as providing previous years' exam answers with various grades, indicating which pages are more relevant to read in the chapters than others, investigating the possibility to write exam in Norwegian, etc. and we fulfilled most of them.

Most students also perceived that there was too much information during the lectures and that the lectures should focus on the most important parts of the course. I consider restructuring lectures next year to accommodate this concern.

Suggestions for improvements:

As the overall setup for the course worked well, major changes are not necessary. I, however, propose some minor changes. I suggest reducing technical content in the lectures to help students focus on the bigger picture. This will result in fewer lectures, but I suggest adding a lecture on state capacity that is currently missing from the course, to compensate. I also suggest removing some of the articles from the syllabus and replacing very technical reading at the start of the course (chapter 3 of CGG using game theory to explain politics) with less technical reading for a smoother start of the course, for example:

McCormick, John, Rod Hague, and Martin Harrop (2022). *Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction*. Bloomsbury Publishing. Chapters 1, 2, and 3.

Given a high demand this year, I also propose adding a summary lecture instead of the lecture on welfare state, parts of which will be covered in the new lecture on state capacity. The lecturer for the welfare state lecture will not be able to give the lecture next time the course is given, so it is a good time to test the addition.