UiBs kvalitetssystem for utdanning

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	ARK 214
År	2020
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Daniela Hofmann / Ramona Harrison
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Overall, this has worked very well taking into account that it was the first time this course was taught by a new lecturer/teacher, and especially considering that the entire course had to be moved to online tuition at very short notice. This entailed choosing a different software (a freeware version, as opposed to that available in UiB computer rooms), splitting the sessions into more, but shorter classes (as three hour sessions online are difficult to follow) and providing extra material so that the students were able to carry out step-by-step practical exercises away from the virtual classroom, as opposed to in the lab and with direct supervision, as originally planned. Question and answer sessions were also scheduled to allow students to address specific issues they experienced in their individual projects. Less than two weeks were available to effect these changes.
Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	Students filled out a questionnaire in the last class – 6 of 14 responded. The first part of the questionnaire asked students to rank various parts of the course from 1 (not good) to 5 (very good). In general, scores achieved were 3.8 or higher. Students thought that the course was interesting and useful, with a good balance between lectures and practical classes, and very useful additional material uploaded online. Overall, the students also thought the remote teaching worked well (3.7 – a solid score considering the very limited time available to change the structure of the entire course to fit online delivery). Students were also asked whether they experienced technical problems (a minority – score of 1.7) and whether they found it harder to concentrate online (score of 3.3).

	Students also were in favour of recording the lectures (score of 4.7), and this is an option to explore for the future.
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?	Two problems did emerge. First, two students felt that the technical vocabulary was not explained well enough. These are also the same two students who said the literature list was not helpful. However, this list did contain a basic textbook with a glossary of technical terms. Perhaps in the future, the information on where to find the glossary could also be put on a PPT slide, rather than just delivered orally, to make sure everyone receives it. Secondly, although the students overall enjoyed the course, slightly lower scores were achieved for the confidence level of using GIS on one's own (2.8) and using it in own projects (3). To an extent, this is a predictable result of using a complex piece of software for the first time. However, this effect was likely compounded by remote teaching, as this does not allow the kind of one-on-one individual encouragement that is possible when walking around between students in the computer lab as they work. Indeed, the fact that the scores were still quite high shows that the guidelines put in place to help students work through the practical exercises in their own time were actually very good and detailed. Still, in the future, it would be desirable to have at least part of the course face to face to give more individually tailored encouragement.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	