**Periodic evaluation form of courses IPED**

Please fill out the form and send it to the administrative coordinator of the course.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course  | Kompetanse, arbeidsliv og innovasjon PED2801H **20 studiepoeng** |
| Semester  | 2022 høst |
| Lecturer/responsible for the course  | RP Mervi Hasu, several lecturers, including two guest lecturers |
| Time for mid evaluation (short evaluation midway through the course) | - |
| How did you carry out the periodic evaluation?  | Websurvey (11 questions) after the last lecture (oppsummering og informasjon om eksam) |
| How many students took part in this evaluation?  | 20 out of 32This year there were a few students 4-6 who told that they have not studied English during their school years (or did that very little) and that they have difficulties to read and understand both written and spoken language  |
| **The students’ experiences of the following points:**  |
| \*Study informationIncluding: Basic course information (semester/emneside), information/ advice/’learning aids’ during the course, use of Canvas | **Note: Course language Norwegian, English** (introduction and two other lecture in English, seminar partly Norwegian, partly English) Overall, the students were content with the course information, and the responsible person (RP) received a very few clarifying questions by email after the course start. Detailed information on course assignments, various learning aids etc. during the course were provided in Canvas and in the lectures/seminars. **Summary**: information and communicating the information about the course seemed overall good. In written comments, one student expressed that the information/content of the first introductory lecture and the first seminar could be combined, so that the seminar work would start sooner and more effectively. |
| \*Teaching start and implementation of the course Including: Course structure, elements, assignments, and implementation of the course | Mostly, students were content with the organized teaching, assignments, and overall implementation of the course. 13/20 65% valued the forms of teaching “passe”. In open answers, approx. 2 students wrote positive comments about the course (focuses, assignments, learning aids, lecturers, organizing of seminars), but criticized school exam. Two critical comments concerned lectures given in English, which they thought were too difficult or too slow in pace.Contribution to group work and seminar work. All students with one exception seemed to contribute well to group work. In one group, the RP needed to make the decision to give one student an individual task. This was unfortunate, but the views about the situation in the group differentiated remarkably and there was no success in negotiating to resolve the matter. This caused extra work for RP. **Summary**: Seminars had good and engaging athmosphare, and participation to seminars was in high level. All groups delivered good or relatively good level assignments in time (oral presentation+written report). A few groups produced very good quality reports. |
| \*Lessons/teaching, teaching plan and learning environment  | 15 students from 20 were content or fairly content with the forms of teaching and learning activities, whereas 7/20 assessed these as relatively poor. Divided views concerned also the usefulness of the course to professional development (faglige utvikling): 14/20 thought the course improved their professional development (nokså mye or svart mye) and 7/20 that it improved only a bit (nokså lite).This year the participation in lectures was good, regularly approximately 2/3 participated. Guest lecturers was valued highly a few times in open answers. Participation in the seminars was better than in lectures. This is probably because the seminar work is organized in the form of student group contributions. If individual student was not present, he/she “let the group down” (group pressure). The obligatory group assignments, which were instructed and discussed in the seminars, were highly valued. 19/20 thought that these improved their professional development (9 svart mye, 11 nokså mye). This is clearly a good sign in students’ quality of learning. However, this year only 8 students from 32 participated in the special workshop of HRM and design. Workshop is laborious to organize and intensive to lead so it is a question if it is worthwhile to arrange for only so few students are participating. This was the trend also previous year. Overall, 19 students from 20 reported that they became very (6) or somewhat (13) inspired on the course themes and interested in to deepen their knowledge in these themes during their further studies. **Summary**: The atmosphere especially in the seminars among the students, and between the teachers and students, was positive, active and engaged. Obligatory group assignments that were worked on in the seminars, were highly valued. This course element requires active learning. However, heterogeneity of students have increased remarkably, which makes it difficult to set the level of teaching in the course. Advanced students seem to expect more. Also students without English language skills may be disappointed. A great deal of literature is in English.   |
| \*The content of the course (level and relevance in connection to the course aims)Including the syllabus | There were no substantial complaints about the overall course structure and content or the relevance. See above.Majority of students valued the syllabus either “svært bra (6) or nokså bra (14)”. In open answers, a few students found the syllabus too difficult and/or too large/too variegated. There are texts in Norwegian, but mostly the syllabus is in English. There were students who were not able to read (understand) texts well enough in English.This year, as also the previous year, the heterogeneity of students was very clear; level of students’ capability and motivation varied a lot. The more advanced students felt that there was too much repetition of basic things, while some students needed a lot of explaining and support. This year 28/32 students passed the course: one F, one E, 5 D’s, 12 C’s, 7 B’s, 3 A’s). 3 student did not had the first or the second (extra) exam.**Summary**: In 20 study points course the amount of pages (with many new concepts) is challenging for many students. The seminar/group work assignments forces the students to start reading at least part of the syllabus already in the beginning of the course. This helps many. Individual, active reading is still required. This comes as a surprise for some, and this shows in the exam results. Some changes to syllabus may be needed, although there were already changes this year. There is also the question of the type of exam: this year the school exam was terrifying for many and it was questioned before the exam and criticized also in open answer’s feedback. |
| \*Assessment  | Students gave mostly positive feedback, but there were also critical voices this year. Heterogeneity of students has increased remarkably. Feedback is useful in improving the course. Unfortunately, we miss a great deal of answers. **Summary**: Course assessment could have needed more student answers, but provided some useful information. Polarization of students is a problem. |
| \*The students´ individual effort  | Most respondents reported that their contribution in the course was very good or fairly good. This was quite well in line on how they assessed their preparation and contribution in the lectures. Preparation for seminars was assessed more positive: 19 students from 20 reported being “nokså godt or svært bra” prepared for seminars. Oral presentations and written reports in groups showed mainly good or very good effort. It can be that in groups the more advanced students help the group to succeed. **Summary**: Participation and contribution was highest in seminars in which there was a necessity to present group progress. Students’ effort in seminars was good or very good.  |
| **Conclusion** |
| \*Suggestions for changes (the students and the teachers)  | The course was run for the fifth time, after some literature changes, and it still succeeded to capture students’ interest and motivation in most parts. Seminars with oblig. assignments function well and motivates students. This year there were particularly many advanced students, and feedback for improving the course was received. Course was perhaps too demanding for students without English language skills. 29/32 took the exam and 28/32 passed the course (one E, 5 Ds). Polarization of students is a problem that is difficult to resolve. Large syllabus (approx. 1400 pages) is a challenge for some students, especially for those without English language skills. Adding more lectures (explaining the syllabus in detail) is not the solution. Some changes to syllabus and role of lectures and their division/connection to seminars may be needed. However, if students without proper English skills will be accepted to the course/bachelor program, syllabus may need to be changed radically, and lectures in English need to be excluded. This will need consideration with the study leadership. Suggested changes that are possible to implement next fall or near future: 1. Special workshop (not obligatory element) does not attract students the same way at it did before the Pandemic. It is suggested to put it into break for the next 1-2 years, and during this time it’s continuation will be reconsidered.
2. The exam form may need consideration in the future. School exam was criticized. It is however suggested to keep the school exam next fall, in order to see if the students are after pandemic adapted to the situation with a school exam. It is also good to have variation in exams. Easy access to artificial intelligence applications also affects exam forms in the future, so school exam may has its place.
 |
| \*Reasons for not doing changes that students have suggested  | It is difficult to increase texts in Norwegian language, because most research relevant for the course is in English. It is good to try to increase texts in Norwegian. Adding more lectures (explaining the syllabus in detail) is not a possible solution with approximately 1400 pages of syllabus.School exam will not be changed, although it was criticized. It is good to have variation in exams. Easy access to artificial intelligence applications also affects exam forms in the future, so school exam may has its place.  |
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