CCG course evaluations, S2014

47 respondents filled in the semester evaluation form, all 8th semester students. This is still a very low response-rate and the matter has been discussed at a Teachers Meeting how to improve the response-rate. Likewise will the Study Board have focus on this challenge. Another problem in making a general conclusion on the evaluation is that many courses have been evaluated by very few students (between two and six respondents) although the attendance has been higher.

Across the courses a majority of students spend 4-6 hours or more on classes and preparing for classes. In a few courses a majority spend less than 4 hours. As these specific courses only had very few students filling out the evaluation forms (three to five students) it is difficult to conclude if this is a general problem for these specific courses.

In most courses a majority declare themselves to know the learning objectives of the specific courses well. Only in a few courses did a minority declare that they were unaware of the learning objectives. This has especially been a concern for one course and the coordinator will deal with this issue to make sure that the teacher of this course communicates the necessary information (learning objectives and exam) to the students of that particular class.

Much, and general satisfaction is also registered with regard to the level and coverage of individual courses, and with the communication of objectives and requirements. Course materials are considered to be supportive to the learning process, and teachers’ communication of the content is positively reviewed. Individual comments show that there in a one course, Academic Written Communication, was some confusion about exam requirements. However, in general most respondents were very satisfied.

The ‘Applied methodology’ courses offered by the four streams individually are in general very well received. Most respondents declare to have gained new competences from following these courses. One of the courses led to some complaints from a few students, however, in the evaluation the same critiques were not raised so it is difficult to conclude anything from these complaints. It will be considered if the Study Board should do a general evaluation of the Applied Methodology Courses. Individual comments from respondents offer suggestions for further improvements but it is difficult to generalize these.

The core courses are generally well received, although some respondents find that the course on Media Consumption does not adequately serve the interests of all four streams. These reservations come from students from IRGO and IMER students who think that the course speaks more to CMC and OL students. The year before the opposite situation was the case. Despite these comments the particular two courses are still evaluated with a majority being positive about the coverage and scope.