

Emneevaluering / course evaluation ISV

Navn / name

Øyvind Stiansen

Emnekode / course code

STV2020

Semester

Spring 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

Course Evaluation Report

Course Code: STV2020

Course Title: Social Science Data Analysis and Programming

Language: English

Course Convenor's Evaluation of the Course:

- Overall, the course worked quite well. In general, the students seemed happy with the course and the home assignments and term papers indicate that most students learned a lot!
- The mix of lecturing and hands-on exercises during the lectures in which students can try the code themselves seemed to work well for making students engage with the materials.
- For the seminars, we had a mix between individual feedback on the term paper projects and working on exercises applying the skills from the lectures. Our impression was that the latter format worked better than the former.
- Compared to the 2022 version of the course, the 2023 version emphasized basic data wrangling

skills and visualization more (at the expense of more advance topics, e.g. on remote sensing). Our impression is that this worked well and helped raise the general R skills of students completing the course.

- Philipp Broniecki did a heroic job in reading and providing feedback on all the home assignments three times! It would have been difficult to get all the students through without Philipp having the time, flexibility, and patience for this part of the teaching.
- The deadline for approving students' mandatory activities was set just days after the final submission (leaving us with very little time to read and approve the submission) and in Easter week. It would be useful to adjust such deadlines to the actual activities in the course.

Summary of Feedback from Student Contact Point:

- The lectures were fast-paced, leading to some students feeling overwhelmed and falling behind. Moreover, there were significant differences in the students' competence levels within the class. These differences made it challenging for the lecturers to find the right pace and right difficulty level for the covered materials. However, there is a general consensus among the students that the course is appropriately challenging.
- Students who did not have prior experience with the course prerequisite (1020) faced challenges. It might be useful to stress the need for prerequisite knowledge even more.
- The first lecture included a review of prerequisite knowledge, which was very useful.
- There was too little time between Felix's lectures and the final hand-in, leaving little time for students working on GIS in their homework to receive feedback.
- The topics of webscraping and text-as-data were covered at a fast pace (compared to data wrangling and visualization), causing some difficulties for the students.
- Coding exercising in the seminars work well and it would have been useful with even more exercises. Similarly, the inclusion of shorter exercises during the lectures helped slow down the pace and reinforce learning.
- Occasionally, it was unclear whether students were expected to code during the lectures or simply follow along.
- Both the github pages and the lecture slides were very useful for reviewing and clarifying concepts.
- Relying on a single family of packages (tidyverse) was appreciated.
- It is unfortunate that the machine learning course cannot be included as part of a political science 80-group (since the course is organized by Sociology).
- The seminar groups should not be larger. It is important to have opportunities for individual feedback.
- The term paper is very relevant for the future work on the BA thesis. This was mentioned in the first lecture, but maybe the connection could have been made even more explicit?

Suggestions for improvements:

- It would be useful to indicate a suggested progression for the 40-group in data science. Ideally,

students should take STV2020 before progressing to the other more specialized/advanced courses. STV2020 should be a course that builds the foundations, e.g. for STV2022, but if some students have already taken STV2022 they are likely to already have taught themselves much of the materials covered in STV2020. If adapting too much to these students, the course would be too challenging for students who only worked with R in STV1020. This suggested progression probably shouldn't be mandatory (we don't want to turn anyone away) but indicating the ideal progression to the students would probably make things work a bit better.

- There should be even more hands-on exercises during the lectures and seminars in future iterations of the course.
- The html. format presented some challenges for many students due to the way Quarto handles embedded content. It might be easier to suggest PDF output and the tinytex package in the future.