

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	ARK 216
År	2023
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Daniela Hofmann
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	This is an option module that ran for the second time this year. Overall, this course worked well. Students were told in the orienteringsmøter that there would be a lot of teamwork, and so those that registered really were primed for this and generally worked very well together. All of the 16 students were highly engaged and all but one (who had technical problems) submitted the exam.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	<p>An online form was made available, to which 14 of the 16 students responded.</p> <p>In general, students were happy with the course. The lectures were rated as 4.7 (out of a possible 5), the practical sessions scored 4.6, and the literature list an obligatory tasks a 4.3. Overall, the students who responded felt they learnt a lot and enjoyed the course (both 4.6), they understand on-site recording (4) and post-excavation work (4.6). They also felt that the classes prepared them well for the assessment (4.6) and for taking part in excavations (4.2). Overall, the scores are therefore very similar to last year's.</p> <p>Discursive comments were also generally positive, with people particularly enjoying the practical tasks. One student mentioned it would be good to get more handouts, which is certainly possible, or whether it would be possible to make the handouts available beforehand. This I am less inclined to do generally, as the tasks often build on lectures and are not easily understandable by themselves, but I would consider doing so on request.</p> <p>One student asked for more information about field schools particularly in Norway, but to be fair there aren't many. Others just wanted more of everything: more surveying, more about bones, about chronology or in general more practical exercises and more drawing time. It was mentioned that there should be at least two more sessions,</p>

	<p>as the course was highly relevant to future working life. This is flattering, but unfortunately not really possible in the time we have. Perhaps one more seminar on chronology could be squeezed in, but the autumn term is short and it is also important for students to have enough time for the exam. I'll think about it.</p> <p>One student also asked for a concordance list of English and Norwegian excavation terminology. I will try to make one for next time.</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>In general, this course seems nicely honed now, with no immediate need for adjustment.</p>
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	