**Fall 2023 Evaluation: PED 2501/4501 (15 stp)**

Palmyre Pierroux (Emneansvarlig)

Morgane Domanchin

**Total enrolled students: 32**

6 bachelor students PED 2501 (all international)

26 master sudents PED 4501 (2 international)

*Total students participated in evaluation: 26*

**Evaluation methods**

A final evaluation elicited student evaluations of activities from the entire course. Evaluation was conducted on final day of class, before the home exam was handed out.

We used Mentimeter (14 questions) in a whole class arrangement + group discussions of ‘positive’ and ‘could be improved’ feedback that was noted on ‘postits’ and then shared on the wall + individual postits that were also shared on the wall. Individual postit responses and group discussions were organised and analysed according to international master students; international bachelor students; and KDL master students.

**Feedback per evaluation topic**

1. *Study information*

Mentimeter: All of the students (26) were satisfied with the information they received and the administrative arrangement of the course – schedule, syllabus, and helpful staff assistance with questions (admin and teaching).

1. *Teaching start and implementation of the course, including lessons/teaching, teaching plan and learning environment*

Mentimeter:The students were in agreement that the course was well-organised and they understood what they were expected to do (20), and that the teaching methods and physical environment (rom 241) promoted active participation (26).The students were overwhelmingly positive about the social environment among students (26), and 23 students would recommend the course to other students.

‘Positive’ written comments:

*PED 2501 Bachelor*

* Engaging teaching, great discussions
* Readings were very well-structured

*PED 4501 Master*

* Liked teaching staff, teaching style and methods, and teacher-student relations, teachers helpful
* Learned alot, liked class discussions, easy to talk to staff
* Liked the ‘reflection paper’ tasks
* Fun with new ways of working with a subject, it promoted student active participation
* Liked the small group chapter discussions and choosing the chapters they presented
* Easy to ask professors questions, easy to participate in discussion
* This was the first time I got to talk to and know Norwegian students
* I felt included by the Master students and the Norwegian students
* Liked the room, technology and the resources, good sitting arrangements, freedom to arrange
* Course was well-organised

‘Could be improved’ written comments (summary):

* Some students felt that it was difficult to go into depth in class; there should be more practical examples of processes and interventions and more lecture time could be spent on difficult concepts.
* Perhaps reduce time used on student chapter presentations to allow more lectures?
* This was the first time with such a large class and although there was much good will, the groups (8 students per group) were too large to effectively collaborate at times. More support from teachers to facilitate group work was needed at times. In contrast to positive responses from previous semesters, almost half of the students in the evaluation ‘somewhat felt’ that there was not a good balance between individual work and group assignments.
1. *The content of the course (level and relevance in connection to the course aims)*

Mentimeter: The students were in agreement that the subject encouraged them to read and engage with the content (26), and they felt that the teaching covered topics from the syllabus well (22). They agreed that the teaching methods helped them understand difficult concepts (18). The ‘planning, leading and evaluation a creative process’ was most well-liked (15), and the ‘planning, leading and evaluating a study using DBR methods’ was next well liked (11).

‘Positive’ written comments:

* Liked the pensum
* Overall superb course, I learned a lot
* Interesting and relevant literature (Bachelor student)

‘Could be improved’ written comments (summary):

* An international student felt that some pensum literature needed updating – for ex, gaming.
* Connections between learning, creativity and innovation do not form a coherent ‘subject’ – rather, the course introduces topics that are expanded on in different subjects in the KDL program. This is made explicit during the course, showing how topics are related to other KDL courses that go more into depth. However, some students felt it was difficult to get a clear idea of the course ‘subject’ and how the lectures, tasks and exam were connected (this was before they saw the exam).
* There were many enthusiastic gamers in this class. A few students wanted more focus on gaming and gamification of learning, and one said that the gamification lecture seemed ‘misplaced’.
1. *The students´ individual effort*

Overall there was a high level of engagement in the class, a positive social environment with alot of student-teacher interactions, and a very low absence rate. Individual reflection papers were overall very good. There were 1-2 students who clearly made little effort based on the work and exam they submitted.

1. *Conclusion and suggestions for changes*

This is my last time teaching this course, so my comments may not be relevant for the changes the new teaching staff will surely introduce. Particulalry since it will no longer be offered to international bachelor and master students.

* The large class size led to larger group sizes, which created challenges for students’ collaboration. Group size should not exceed 5 students.
* In terms of content, the gaming topic is included but is not well incorporated. Currently there is a lecture that includes an in-class group task, and I think for this minimum approach that the current literature also works fine. So it could either be exanded upon or perhaps eliminated, - keeping in mind that the topic also serves as a useful intro to work with gamification in PED 4505.
* In terms of coherence, I think as an intro/overview course to KDL that the topics ‘learning, creativity and innovation’ are well-covered and related as clearly as is possible – both to each other and to the KDL master program. Teaching the DBR method does important work in this regard, and the students grasp this very well.
* I think the biggest challenge is finding a good balance between the active learning approach, which clearly motivates and engages first semester students, and identifying those topics students struggle with and spending more time for lecture/discussion that can go into more depth. A suggestion here is to re-think the task of individual chapter presentations in small groups. This task takes alot of time relatively speaking, even though the students really enjoy selecting, preparing, presenting and discussing texts in this format.
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