



UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN
Institutt for geografi

Emnerapport høsten 2014:

GEO310 Skrivekurs og prosjektskisse

Innhold:

1. Informasjon om emnet
2. Statistikk
3. Egenevaluering
4. Studentevaluering
5. Oppfølging

Emnerapporten er gjennomgått i
Undervisningsutvalget ved Institutt for geografi

Dato: 27.01.2015

1. Informasjon om emnet	
Emne	GEO310 Skrivekurs og prosjektskisse
Undervisningssemester	Høst
Emneansvarlig	Arnt Fløysand
Vurderingsform	Skriftleg eksamen 5 timer.
Undervisningsform	Prosjektskildring på 10-12 sider som er ei gjennomarbeidd skildring av tema, formål/fagleg grunngeving for prosjektet, problemstilling, ei kort utgreiing av forskingsdesign, metode og plan for gjennomføring.
Obligatoriske arbeidskrav	To innleveringar: I løpet av første fase av kurset i august skal det leverast inn eit 'tankepapir' (1-2 sider; første veke) som har til mål å utvikle tema, vinkling og argument, og ei prosjektskisse (4-6 sider; andre veke) som vidareutviklar desse til ei problemstilling og gir viktige referansar. Seminarinnlegg/munnleg presentasjon av prosjektskisse med opponert á ca 30 minutt.
2. Statistikk	
Eksamensmeldt	27
Bestått	24
Stryk	
Avbrutt	
Ikke møtt	1
Manglende oblig	2
Legeattest	
Trekk før ekamen	
Gjennomsnittskaraktar	
Karakterfordeling	

3. Egneevaluering

Vurdering av undervisningsopplegget i forhold til mål og resultater (emneansvarlig)

The objectives and content of the course is to get the student to start early with his/her master thesis through writing training and practical insight in the research process. The course aims at offering students more insight in the writing process behind a successful master thesis by working with a project proposal for the future master thesis.

Having completed the course the student should be able to: choose relevant knowledge in geographic research related to his/her specialization within geography; choose a topic for a Master's thesis, develop and narrow it down to a clear researchable question that can be investigated within the given time and resource limits; carry out an independent project with the support of a supervisor; argue scientifically, structure a Master's thesis and follow good scientific use of references; and carry out a systematic search in the library, in scientific and other data bases, and interpret and evaluate data and literature critically.

The main tool for fulfilling this is active students and their work with individual project proposal for their future master degrees. The project proposals are developed stepwise via three compulsory papers in the form of thought paper, project draft and project proposal.

The course is also very dependent on smooth facilitation of student – supervisor relations since the project proposal will form the basis for the master thesis and the allocation of a supervisor. In order to facilitate for this the teaching program of the course is threefold.

The course starts at the autumn semester beginning in mid-August. Part one runs over a period of 12 days with the following lectures(L)/seminars (S)/Assignments (A):

Day 1: Introduction to the course (L)/Writing a Master Thesis (L)/Kick-off-practice linked to thought paper (S)

Day 2: Presentation of staff and research themes for the new master students (S)

Day 3: Master Thesis: Structure, References, Quotations and Content (L)

Day 4: Evaluating sources: what is a credible source? (L)

Day 5: Assignment of thought paper (A)

Day 6: Feedback on thought paper (S)

Day 7: Introduction to library resources and search tools (L)

Day 8: Introduction to Endnote (L)

Day 9: Students develop their project drafts

Day 10: Good working habits. Referencing. Plagiarism. Ethics (S) /Assignment of project draft (A)

Part two of the course program is running from September to end of November. In this period the students are tuning their projects under supervision conducted by available staff members. The student-supervisor relations have been allocated on the basis of the content and disciplinary profile exposed in the project drafts. The second part of the course ends with the assignment of the project proposal.

In part three of the course, it comes to an end when the students present their projects in an oral

seminar á 30 minutes for each student. The seminars and project proposals are assessed by the supervisor and an opponent grading them pass/fail.

Accordingly, the course has three compulsory assignments (not two as stated in the course description!).

- The first assignment is the 'thought paper' (1-2 pages: first week of the course) with the aim to elaborate on theme, perspective and argument.
- The second assignment is the 'project draft' (4-6 pages: second week) which seeks to develop the project towards a scientific problem, including important references.
- The third assignment is the 'project proposal' (10-12 pages: end of November) containing an elaborate description of theme, aim/justification of the project, scientific problem, and a brief outline of research design, methodology and planned schedule.
- In addition, the course includes a compulsory oral seminar presentation (30 minutes: in mid-December).

The 2014-course has been successful in terms of output. Of a total of 27 enrolled students 24 passed; two failed (did not submit 'thought paper' and/or 'project draft' in time); while one student did not attend the course.

An overall evaluation of aim-result relations of the course is not conceivable since it partly depends on how the students are carrying out in their future work with their Master`s thesis. However, the assessment routines of proposal and seminars approved by the involved supervisors and opponents are controlling for the aim-results correspondence of a Master`s thesis work at the stage of the first semester. In 2014, 14 staff members (in the roles of supervisor/opponent) were involved in the assessment of the 24 project proposals and related oral seminars.

4. Studentevaluering:

Det har kome inn 6 svar.

#1 I study this course as part of: (choice)

- Masterprogram i geografi: 3
- Master's programme in Development geography: 3

#2 To what extent have you participated in lectures and seminars? (choice)

- 80-100%: 5
- 60-79%: 1

#3 How do you assess the academic content of the course? (choice)

- Average: 1
- Good: 2
- Very good: 3

#4 How do you assess the pedagogical quality of the lectures? (choice)

- Good: 2
- Very good: 4

#5 How do you evaluate your learning outcomes from the lectures? (choice)

- Avarage: 1

- Very Good: 5

#6 Please add information if you have any supplement comments to the lectures: (text)

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

#7 How where the project seminar of benefit to you? (choice)

- Average: 1
- Good: 4
- Very good: 1

#8 Additional comments/suggestions for the project seminar: (text)

#9 How where the mandatory assignments of benefit to you? (choice)

- Good: 3
- Very good: 3

#10 Please add information if you have any supplement comments about the mandatory assignments: (text)

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

#11 How do you rate the correspondence between what you have learned and the text about learning outcomes (<http://www.uib.no/en/course/GEO310>)? (choice)

- Good: 6

#12 Communication and administration of the course: how do you evaluate the contact with the department? (choice)

- Average: 1
- Good: 4
- Very good: 1

#13 Do you think the information published on "my space" is sufficient to keep you updated according to the course? (choice)

- Yes: 5
- No: 1

#14 Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the course? (text)

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

#15 What is your joint evaluation of the course? (text)

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

5. Oppfølging

Oppfølging av/kommentarer til tidligere evalueringer. Hvordan rapporten følges opp, evt. tiltak eller endringer som er gjort/planlegges gjennomført på bakgrunn av emnerapporten

The feedbacks from the students taking part in the evaluation are very encouraging:

The evaluation results are mostly good or very good

Most comments are positive
The suggestions for improvements interesting
No “alarming” conditions are reported.

Unfortunately, only six students have answered. This is too few to let the answers and comments become representative and turn the evaluation into a guiding tool for making or not making changes in the course.

Nevertheless, it might be worth considering:

Assignments marks of the final grade (as suggested under **#10**)? The pass/fail grading conducted by internal sensors (supervisor + opponent) could be for example be substituted by marks A,B,C,D,E,F and external sensors.

Improvements of the overall course coordination (as suggested under **#14**)?

What needs to be changed are:

the text-paragraph in the course description under the heading “Compulsory Assignments ...”. Here it is stated that the course has two compulsory assignments. This is not correct. It should be three in terms of thought paper; project draft and project proposal.

the use of the concept “project description” as a fourth term in the course description. I believe we should stick to the term project proposal, also under the heading “Forms of Assessment”.

the share of students’ participation in the next evaluation of the course. It is indeed a necessity to increase it!