UiBs kvalitetssystem for utdanning

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	ARK 113
År	2025
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Daniela Hofmann
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	This was the first time the course was taught entirely by me, as Hein Bjerck's bistilling could not be renewed. The sessions were therefore changed around a little, and a new more theoretical class was also introduced. Compared to last time, when there were generally 30-35 students present in any one class, this year's group was smaller – 15 students overall, with about 12 to 13 present at any one time. This actually made it easier to handle the practical activities.
Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	An online form was made available, to which 11 students responded. Satisfaction scores are given as averages, scoring out of 5 (highest). In general, people were happy with the lectures (4.5), the essay writing seminar (4.3), the reading (4.0) and the resources made available on Mitt (4.1). Group discussions were a little less popular (3.9), but this is an aspect where scores also vary more widely between respondents than for the other items – some really loved it, and others really not. These scores are almost identical to those from last time the course ran (2023). As previously, what was highlighted positively is that the course uses a lot of interactive techniques and hands-on examples where students must themselves try to get to grips with archaeological data. Most of the respondents explicitly commented positively on this, and said it helped their concentration. The smaller group size this year also helped to facilitate this aspect. Only one student commented that they would rather like activity-based classes every other time, not every time. Of the people who took part in the survey, most enjoyed the course (4.6) and felt more aware about interpretation issues (4.6), about how to dissect news reports in the media (4.2) and about how archaeology influences migration debates in the present (4.7). Understanding of

	methods (4.3), of how to read a scientific text (4.1) and of how to combine archaeological and scientific perspectives (3.9) also scored slightly higher than last time, and in general people feel comfortable with tackling the exam (3.9).
	Among the narrative student comments, one person mentioned they would like more guidance on how to interpret graphs, and this is certainly something that can be incorporated in the future. One student felt there was too much detail/too fast a pace, while another wanted more detail in lectures. I am therefore thinking it's more or less right as it is now.
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?	I felt this course worked well. I was worried about the additional theory class, as most students are put off by theory, but it was not commented on negatively, so it seems I got away with it.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	