

Emneevaluering / course evaluation ISV

Navn / name

Olav Schram Stokke

Emnekode / course code

STV2250

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

This course includes 10 lectures and 5 seminars for each student. Whereas the last time given (2021) as many as 5 lecturers were involved, this time the course leader gave all lectures – implying greater consistency in structure. I plan to continue this format.

The midterm evaluation with the course contacts revealed general satisfaction with course but also a sense that the syllabus was a bit overwhelming. I therefore expanded the use of mentimeter-based repetition in the second half, a move that was given thumbs-up both in the end-of-term evaluation meeting with the course contacts and in the nettskjema-based student evaluation I conducted after the exam. Yet, the final assessment communicated by the course contact and in the student evaluation was that the syllabus was too ambitious in amount and in level of difficulty.

As regards amount, the number of pages was around 1000, which is standard for a 2000-level course. Given that the exam also includes a term paper, I will consider reducing it somewhat.

The student evaluation of the lectures was generally positive, including thumbs up for pre-lecture syllabus notes, mentimeter-based repetition and student discussion in small groups (summeminutter). Some felt that slides should contain more text and that the lectures should be structured more as a syllabus review – but I did make it clear at the first lecture that lectures would focus on certain parts of the syllabus, with a focus on drawing connections among contributions,

rather than going through the syllabus. I do not plan to change that policy.

The term papers from the seminars formed part of the exam, counting 40%. The student evaluation of the seminar leaders – Kaja, Leonor and Marina – were enthusiastic; all of them were praised for the constructive and well-prepared guidance they had provided.

The course is given every second spring semester. I will make some revision of the syllabus and change somewhat the order of the lectures so as to streamline it better with the new textbook used this year – which I and also the students found very good, clearly better than that used last time.