

Overall, the students felt that the course content was very good. They thought the lectures were good and well organized and appreciated having many different professors giving lectures, especially Maurice Mittelmark. The same satisfaction was not felt with the seminars as we felt some of the seminars were not needed and some could have been completed in a shorter amount of time. The students really enjoyed the interactive seminars, but dissatisfaction was expressed with the ethics seminar as it felt not as helpful. We enjoyed when Helga combined the lecture and the seminar.

Overall, students were pleased with the clarity of the assignments and somewhat pleased with the feedback. Students suggested that it might be helpful to make it clear how many sources you all want us to use and how many from the reading list. Some students suggested a faux grade so we can gauge where we are heading into the final exam. The feedback for WA1 was very inconsistent as in some cases certain things were wrong for one student, and they were forced to re-submit the assignment, but the same was okay for another student. We suggest that you all utilize a checklist of some sort so the pass/fail would be more consistent. Also, some expressed that it was not clear whether or not they needed to resubmit. Moving on to WA2, we believe the presentation should be included on the course page and the introduction lecture so we know ahead of time. Many of us really enjoyed receiving feedback with everyone in our individual groups, while some felt it wasn't as useful and took a lot of time. Some expressed confusion as they have received different feedback from different professors on their thesis topic. As WA2 was on an important and relevant topic, it would have been nice to receive more feedback on the paper itself, especially on the structure of our writing.

The students wish the literature list was more accessible. There was also a request to include literature on the digital literature list that professors use in their lectures so we can easily find these sources. We believe it was a lot to read, and felt as if it was much more reading than 301, which is a longer course. We recommend to make some things recommended as everything was required and it made it difficult to keep up with the readings. These comments on the reading list can be included in the topic of workload and duration. Students also felt that it would have been nice if the class had ended sooner in the semester. We do not have a very long holiday break, unlike most UiB students, and this makes it difficult for students, especially international students, to go home and spend time with family.

We continue to be unsatisfied with communication from admin. This is likely due to the issues we had during GLODE 301 with our final exam. We wish that the external examiner is required to understand the system, and we would like more transparency about how grading and the examiners worked.

Students believe we had a good overview and developed a good basis of knowledge from this class. There were no comments on competence from the students, but they felt their skills got sharper. We enjoy Victor's reaching style and lectures and we also thought the range of lecturers made it interesting and was a strong feature of this course. Again, we also really enjoyed Maurice.

Our suggestion on how to improve the course is to maybe have a book loaning system for the textbook like we had in GLODE 301. Other suggestions can be seen throughout this evaluation.

The students also expressed thoughts on topics not necessarily related to GLODE 302. Some feel the program/professors need to be clear about the specialization, especially when it comes to writing our thesis. We also think that maybe the strongest course (20 credits) shouldn't be the first course, and maybe it should be split up into two 10 credit courses. Having the biggest grade be our first grade does not sit well with many of us. Some also suggested using the PBL system more overall in the program, while others disagreed.