



Emnerapport H2019:

GEO308 Theory of Science and Research Design for Geographers

1. Informasjon om emnet


Emne	https://www.uib.no/en/course/GEO308
Undervisningssemester	Høst 2019
Emneansvarleg	Odd Inge Steen
Vurderingsform	Home exam, 5 days
Undervisningsform	Lectures and seminars
Obligatoriske arbeidskrav	Ingen

2. Statistikk

Eksamensmeldt	29
Bestått	24
Ikke møtt	
Stryk	1
Gjennomsnittskarakter	4

Karakterfordeling

Ordning	Antall studenter	A	B	C	D	E	F
H Hjemmeeksamen	29	7	7	8	2	0	1
	%	29	29	33	8	0	
	%	28	28	32	8	0	4



3. Egeenevaluering

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

Dette emnet har ikke vært lett å administrere/ organisere. Det har vært et enormt arbeid å få de mange foreleserne, tema, pensum og undervisning på plass. Med så mange dyktige forelesere inne så har det, imidlertid, vært faglig veldig spennende å være med på. Jeg har bevisst brukt professorer/ førsteamanuenser fra instituttet. Flere av de har sagt at de syntes det var spennende å være med på dette emnet– og at de gjerne stiller opp neste gang.

Studentenes evaluering er god – men kunne selvsagt vært bedre. Det kom hele 14 svar – noe som ikke er dårlig. Kun 1 student svarte «very poor» på et av de fire viktigste spørsmålene.


Det faglige opplegget har fungert veldig bra – synes jeg. Studentevalueringen er noe blandet. Det har vært en klar polarisering mellom de engelskspråklige og de norske studentene. Samlet sett så er evalueringene fra de norskspråklige mye bedre enn de fra de engelskspråklige. Dette kan skyldes fordi mange av utlendingene har hatt vitenskapsteori før- mens de norske har hatt lite eller ingenting. Men, det er ikke lenger polarisering mellom de som tar samfunnsgeografi og de som tar naturgeografi.

Eksamensresultatet var veldig bra. 7 av 24 fikk ADe 7 oppgavene holdt et meget høyt faglig nivå. Fordelingen mellom de øvrige karakterene var som normalt.


4. Studentevaluering:

14 svar.

#1 I study GEO308 as part of:



#2 How do you assess the different parts of the learning and assessment?



#4 Do you have comments about the lectures?

Kommentarer fjernet

#5 Do you have comments about the seminars?

Kommentarer fjernet

#6 Do you have comments about the course curriculum?

Kommentarer fjernet


#7 Did you find that the course reflected the learning outcomes described in the course description? <http://www.uib.no/en/course/GEO308>

- Very good: 1
- Good: 8
- Average: 2
- Poor: 0
- Very poor: 1
- I don't know: 2

#8 Did you find that the information at Mitt UiB, including announcements, was sufficient to keep you updated during the course?

- Yes: 12
- No: 2

#9 What is your overall evaluation of the course?



#10 Har du kommetarar din samlet vurdering av emnet?

Kommetarar fjernet

#11 Do you have suggestions on how we can improve the course?

Kommetarar fjernet

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

Jeg ser ingen grunn til å gjøre drastiske endringer på hverken innhold, tema eller forelesere. Det ble gjort et grundig arbeid med dette i inneværende år – noe som gjør at det skulle være lettere å bygge videre på årets opplegg og gjøre mindre justeringer til neste gang.

I studentevalueringen er det flere som vil ha mer seminarer, mens et par faktisk helst vil ha forelesninger og ikke mindre «diskusjon». Noen studenter etterlyser obligatoriske oppgaver- men det er jeg usikker på. Jeg vil foreslå en mindre endring. Fellesseminaret jeg hadde fungerte ikke, så jeg foreslår at vi tar vekk en fellesforelesning og erstatter det med et til seminar gruppevis. Det er forøvrig noen klare faktiske feil i evalueringen – men det er vel ikke så uvanlig.

Noen studenter har påpekt at det er noe overlapping i pensumet. Men- de to bøkene der det er klarest overlapping, er allikevel de to bøkene som er mest sitert av studentene. Jeg foreslår imidlertid å overføre Holt-Jensen boka til «anbefalt» litteratur. Noe overlapping både mht. pensum og undervisning synes jeg imidlertid vi skal beholde i et så komplekst emne.

Jeg mener også at vi bør fortsette å bruke egen stab, men prøve å få inn igjen Roar Strand fra Senter for vitenskapsteori i begynnelsen av undervisningen. Han er jo en meget dyktig foreleser/ forsker og en fargerik person.

Det har vært noe forvirring blant de som tar miljøgeografi. Skulle de følge naturgeografien eller samfunnsgeografien? Det resulterte i at det ble noe rot om hvilke av de to sensorene som skulle rette hvilke oppgaver. Jeg var gjennomgående sensor. Til neste gang må vi ha klart fra dag en – om hvilken av de to gruppene de enkelte studentene skal høre til i.

Hjemmeeksamen på 5000 ord (+/- 10%) er for omfattende. Jeg foreslår at vi endrer det til 4000 ord.



Emnerapport V2019:

GEO337 Discourses, Politics and People: Critical Perspectives on Environmental Governance

1. Informasjon om emnet

Emne	https://www.uib.no/emne/GEO337
Undervisningssemester	Vår 2019
Emneansvarleg	Siddharth Sareen
Vurderingsform	Portfolio with 3 essays (50% of the total grade) and one online home exam (50% of the total grade).
Undervisningsform	• 7 online written lectures (sessions) • 3 online assignments with supervision • Online discussions • Interactive classroom seminars with presentations
Obligatoriske arbeidskrav	Participation in online debates and online role play.


2. Statistikk

Eksamensmeldt	16
Bestått	15
Ikke møtt	0
Stryk	1
Gjennomsnittskarakter	B

Karakterfordeling

Gjennomføringsfakta - emne

Emne: GEO337 0



3. Egenevaluering

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

The overhauled version of GEO337 worked fairly well on the whole, given constraints such as the fact that it had to be taught largely online as a blended learning course, and that students had heavy workload in other parallel courses, which meant having to pace out assignments accordingly.

One thing that worked well is classroom presentations, where each student was challenged to take a deep dive into one of the course readings and deconstruct it for their peers. Individual ability to do justice to this task varied considerably. Another thing that worked well is unconventional assignments, pushing students to link theoretical learning with things going on around them, to apply concepts to specific issues, and to make links across readings and modules in line with their own argument. A final thing that worked well was the revamped curriculum, which most students clearly found engaging, with good coverage and variety, and a mix of accessible and difficult readings with wide thematic scope.

Some things worked less well, among them the limited amount of classroom contact and the lack of visually engaging blended learning material. For the next iteration, a strong preference would be to have more and shorter classroom sessions, and a reduced role for the online component. There could be six contact sessions of two hours each, spread across 4-6 weeks. Students who read the online content diligently clearly made better sense of course texts, and those who could not motivate themselves to read a short entry text into journal articles are unlikely to get deeper understanding from adding a smattering of pictures: they need to ask themselves why they signed up for a course if they are unwilling to put effort into reading talk notes and course texts. However, upon attending a 'transform to learn' pedagogy course at the University of Sussex, I discussed and reflected upon the role of more rich audio-visual content, and could envisage using more external links to such content. I did consult students throughout the course on their preferences, and in the next iteration will work to incorporate engagement techniques that work for less reading-oriented students, too.

The assignments and exam followed a learning curve where they sought more integrative and synthesising thinking and articulation from students as they worked their way through more modules. Those who did so diligently showed notable improvements in their later assignments, and it would have been preferable to return corrections earlier than turned out to be possible – something to improve upon next time.

To sum up: overall content good, student engagement generally high, classroom sessions more effective and preferable over the online component, scope to increase group work and peer collaboration, and need to have rolling updates to online talk notes to highlight real-world relevance. From student production, thematic learning and a deeper understanding of the curriculum is apparent. From oral presentations, ability to process and articulate course texts was challenged and improved – all students put in earnest effort and generally did well though with scope for considerable improvement if the exercise was iterated in different forms and with more articles. The revamp, both of the curriculum and the lead-in texts, generally worked, with room to build on it. In particular, the latter modules (with a more critical / theoretical orientation) could be expanded, but this must be balanced with the needs of the variety of students signed up for the course.


4. Studentevaluering:

5 svar.

#1 I study GEO337 as part of:

- Master's Programme in Geography at UiB: 4
- Exchange Programme: 1

#2 How do you assess the different parts of the learning and assessment?



#3 Do you have comments about the online lectures/sessions?

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

#4 Do you have comments about the classroom sessions?

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

#5 Do you have comments about the course curriculum??

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

#6 Do you have comments about the assignments?

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

#7 Did you find that the course reflected the learning outcomes described in the course description? <http://www.uib.no/en/course/GEO337>

- Very good: 1
- Good: 3

- Average: 1

#8 Did you find that the information at Mitt UiB, including announcements, was sufficient to keep you updated during the course?

- Yes: 4
- No: 1

#9 What is your overall evaluation of the course?

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

#10 Do you have comments on your overall evaluation of the course?

Åpne kommentarfelt er fjerna.

#11 Do you have suggestions on how we can improve the course?

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

In a future iteration, I would explore multiple formats for student presentations, as suggested in some student feedback – e.g., one individual presentation, a team presentation, a dual presentation (each student in a pair presents the same paper independently, then reflect/discuss together). This will be desirable and more feasible if the contact sessions are expanded during the course.

I have mixed feelings about making the online written content more appealing: the complete rewrite of online module notes was aimed to lead students into each module topic and hand-hold them into making sense of the assigned reading. Images, definitions and suchlike are readily available online, and post-graduate students should be capable of identifying such material by themselves, or requesting specific additional inputs during classroom sessions. Having more in-person sessions in the next iteration will, I expect, resolve this issue, as it will enable more reflexive interaction between course faculty and students and offer greater scope for adjustment of course delivery modalities.

Linking with current issues, adding some web links to such things and engaging with them during classroom sessions worked well and should be continuously updated in future iterations. An additional possibility could be to record audio lectures for online modules for multi-modal student engagement, but since all students are present in town and taking other courses during the semester anyway, it seems simpler to have more classroom sessions.

In terms of things that did not work well and could be changed, one of the exam questions seemed hard for many to interpret (also based upon in-person course feedback) and should be simplified.