

## #62

<b>Emnekode</b>	203
<b>Emnetittel</b>	Comparative Arctic Indigenous Governance
<b>Semester</b>	Vår 2021
<b>Institutt</b>	Institutt for sammenliknende politikk
<b>Emneansvarlig</b>	Per Selle

### Emnets undervisnings- og vurderingsform

Course report

Course: SAMPOL 203

Period: Spring 2021

Lecturer: Aaron Spitzer

Oversight: Per Selle

#### Introduction:

In spring 2021, we for the fourth time taught SAMPOL 203, Comparative Arctic Indigenous Governance. The teaching portion of the course consisted of 12 lectures, each approximately 1.5 hours, all using PowerPoint, and (due to the pandemic) all delivered by Zoom. Average attendance per class was around 30 students. Some opportunity for interaction with the lecturer was provided during Zoom sessions but few questions or comments were put forwarded. Similarly, to compensate for the online nature of the course, five "office hour" sessions were available to students in the lead-up to the exam, where they were invited to contact the lecturer or drop by his office to ask questions or discuss course material. Only a handful of students took advantage of this opportunity. The reading portion of the course consisted of numerous, fairly advanced books and articles – an average of approximately 100 pages of reading per class. The test was a 10-hour at-home exam. For the first time, rather than asking a single, general, comprehensive essay question, students were instead presented with five essay questions and asked to answer three of them, each requiring a degree of critical thinking to address a specific sub-theme of the course.

#### Breakdown of marks:

Of the 62 students registered for this course, 53 took the exam. Of those, 50 passed the exam, while 3 failed.

#### The grade breakdown was:

A 10  
B 13  
C 17  
D 5  
E 5  
F 3

#### Student assessments:

Of the 62 students registered for this course, only 12 completed some portion of the student evaluation, and most portions of the evaluation were completed by even fewer students. This extremely low number of respondents thus makes it impossible to meaningfully generalize from their answers. That having been said:

Of the respondents, five reported that they attended all lectures; four attended 7-10 lectures; three attended 4-6 lectures; and none reported attending 0-3 lectures.

Twelve respondents reported that the lectures contributed to their learning an average of 4.1 on a scale of one to five.

Eight respondents reported that the curriculum contributed to their learning an average of 2.5 on a scale of one to five. Respondents stated they spent an average of 4.7 hours per week on the readings. Three commented on what

readings they found most useful, with one stating Rawls, another Kymlicka, and a third stating the historical readings about Canada. Three commented on what readings they found least useful, with all stating “none” or “I’m not sure.”

Six respondents reported they would characterize the appropriateness of the difficulty of this course as an average of 4.0 on a scale of one to five.

Six respondents reported they would characterize their academic gain from the course as an average of 3.7 on a scale of one to five.

Six respondents reported they would evaluate the knowledge and skills they gained as 3.8 on a scale of one to five.

Five of six respondents stated they would recommend the course to other students.

When asked if there was a part of the course they were especially satisfied with, three respondents mentioned the lectures and one mentioned “The introduction and the part on the Samis.”

When asked if there was a part of the course they were especially dissatisfied with, one mentioned that the lectures had not been recorded, one that the final lectures began to get repetitive, one that the pandemic had prevented face to face discussion, and one “That I did not do the reading.”

When asked what could have been improved, one respondent mentioned recording the lectures, one suggested engaging more overtly in Canada/Norway comparisons in the final lectures, one suggested excursions/field trips, and one suggested mandatory online Q and A sessions.

#### Teacher’s overall assessment

Overall we feel this course was relatively successful – though, due to the pandemic, not as successful as in previous years. The online lectures of course felt quite unidirectional, with less participation from the students than in previous years. We look forward to returning to in-person, interactive lectures next spring. Also, as we migrate this course from being purely lecture based to somewhat more applied, we look forward to potentially debuting more interactive elements, such as breakout groups and, perhaps, a few small sub-assignments throughout the semester.

We will also update lectures and reading lists to insure that the most recent relevant scholarship is represented.

Meanwhile, we found the new exam to be more successful than the previous, more general exam, but also somewhat harder to grade, leading overall to more marks at the center of the distribution and fewer at the outer extremes. It is my perception that the grades we awarded were somewhat higher than in previous years, due at least in part to the nature of the exam.

---

#### **Evaluering metode(er)**

Essay test

---

#### **Sammendrag av studentene sin evaluering**

Provided in the course report

---

#### **Emneansvarlig sin evaluering**

Provided in the course report

---

#### **Evt. kommentar til karakterfordeling**

Provided in the course report

---

#### **Mål for neste evalueringsperiode- Forbedringstiltak**

Provided in the course report

---