**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 PED2801 **20 studiepoeng** |
| Semester  | 2023 høst |
| Lecturer/responsible for the course  | RP Mervi Hasu, Isabel Brandenberger was teaching the seminars. 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 (summary and information about the exam) |
| How many students took part in this evaluation?  | 0 out of 40 by 18.12.2023 |
| **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 lectures in English, seminars partly Norwegian and 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.  |
| \*Teaching start and implementation of the course Including: Course structure, elements, assignments, and implementation of the course | Contribution to group work and seminar work: All students seemed to contribute well/ in an acceptable manner related to the group work. **Summary**: Seminars had a good and engaging atmosphere, and participation to the seminars was at 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  | Again, in this year the participation in lectures was good, as regularly nearly 2/3, sometimes a bit more, participated. Guest lecturers were praised. 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). **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 valued. This course element requires active learning. However, heterogeneity of students makes it difficult to set the level of teaching in the course. Advanced students seem to expect more. Also, students without proper English language skills suffer. 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.There are texts in Norwegian, but mostly the syllabus is in English. There may be 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 clear; level of students’ capability and motivation varied a lot. **Summary**: In 20 study points course the number of pages (with many new concepts) is challenging for many students. The seminar/group work assignments force 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. There is also the question of the type of exam. School exam is not favored.  |
| \*Assessment  | **Summary**: Course assessment could have needed more student answers but provided some useful information. Polarization of students is a problem. |
| \*The students´ individual effort  | **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 sixth time, and it still succeeded to capture students’ interest and motivation in most parts. Seminars with oblig. assignments function well and motivates students. Large syllabus (approx. 1400 pages) is a challenge for some students, especially for those without proper English language skills. Adding more lectures (explaining the syllabus in detail) is not the solution. School exam may not be favored, but it is suggested to keep the school exam at place. 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 have 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.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 have its place.  |
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