

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	ARK 113
År	2023
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Daniela Hofmann (med Hein Bjerck)
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p>This was the first time the course was taught face to face (it was initially developed during Covid). The sessions were therefore extended again to 90 minutes, and the “homework” element dropped or turned into optional additional exercises. The main challenge was that the course has a lot of discussion and practical activities, which generally work best with a class of 20-25, but there were actually around 30-35 students present in any one class. Still, the majority were enthusiastic and really gave it a go, even if I could not be everywhere at once. So I would say the adaptation worked well.</p>
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrappporter sist år.	<p>An online form was made available, to which 23 students responded (so about two thirds; although some individual answers were scored by only 22 respondents). Satisfaction scores are given as averages, scoring out of 5 (highest). In general, people were happy with the lectures (4.3), the essay writing seminar (4.3), the reading (4.0) and the resources made available on Mitt (4.2). Group discussions were a little less popular (3.7), but it is noticeable that the scores given vary more widely between respondents than for the other items – some really loved it, and others really not.</p> <p>This was also taken up in some of the student comments, where five people responded how helpful the group discussions were, and two others that they sometimes took a while to get going and/or need improvement. Another mentioned that the exams preparation seminar was more useful, as the smaller group size made it easier to become active. Overall, this probably means that the discussions worked all right, but that class size probably should not increase much beyond 35, so I will consider a cap in the future.</p> <p>Three people responded that the reading list was too long, when it actually is shorter than for other 10ECTS courses.</p>

	<p>This most likely is a problem because there is a long “anbefalt”/optional reading section where students are supposed to just pick those titles that relate to their chosen essay topic. This was explained in class and the reading list itself starts with a PDF called README, which also explains this. Next time, I will try to add a reminder half-way through the course as well, as people evidently still forget this information. Still, one other student also commented that the entries on the list were really well chosen as entry points to own research.</p> <p>Of the people who took part in the survey, most enjoyed the course (4.3) and felt more aware about interpretation issues (4.1), about how to dissect news reports in the media (4.0) and about how archaeology influences migration debates in the present (4.1). Understanding of methods (3.9), of how to read a scientific text (4.0) and of how to combine archaeological and scientific perspectives (3.7) also scored high, and in general people feel comfortable with tackling the exam (3.9).</p> <p>Narrative student comments drew out that people liked the lectures, and the fact that both lecturers are research-active in the topics they were teaching, so that up-to-date interpretations and projects were presented. One criticism voiced by exchange students was that Hein Bjerck held his lectures in Norwegian, and also had not updated all his PowerPoint slides to be English. Even though he offered to take exchange students through the main points in a small group afterwards, they felt that this made the lectures themselves not useful for them, and I am inclined to agree. This was, however, the last semester that Hein will be teaching with us. Two students mentioned that they liked the practical aspects of the course and would like to see more such blended modules, and one even liked the Mentimeter quiz at the end, which was gratifying (it took ages to make).</p>
<p>Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet? Hvilke?</p>	<p>There were no major problems. Some of the rooms were a little small (this was mentioned in seven student comments), but it was important to be able to shift the furniture to enable group discussion, so this was a price worth paying. Some of the discussions also took a while to get going – even after previous work in smaller groups, addressing a class of 35 is more difficult for most students than a class of 15 or 20. To pool results, I therefore decided on a method whereby smaller groups wrote down their main results and “dropped them in the hat”, and I would then read out these comments anonymously. This generally got discussion going without anyone having to make the first move, and could perhaps be extended in the future.</p>
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	