

## CCG evaluations Fall 2013, Report.

### **CCG course evaluations, Fall 2013**

Of 63 respondents, all are 7<sup>th</sup> sem. students.

A majority declare themselves to know the learning objectives of the specific courses well. A fairly large share indicates to know the learning objectives to some degree and across the courses only a minority state that they do not know the learning objectives.

One course had almost half the students stating that they do not know the learning objectives and efforts will be taken by the CCG coordinator to tackle this problem.

Some courses (core courses) received many evaluations whereas stream specific courses received fewer evaluations. As these courses obviously have fewer attendants it is not as such a problem but provides challenges in concluding on the evaluations as some courses received a rather low number.

Nevertheless much, and general satisfaction registered with regard to the level and coverage of individual courses, and with the communication of objectives and requirements. In most courses between 75% and 100% of the students state that the level is appropriate. Only a few students state that the level was either too low or too high across the different courses. In one particular course the explanation seems to be a perception of being given too many and too complex texts. Course materials are considered to be supportive to the learning process, and teachers' communication of the content is positively reviewed.

There is also room for further improvement of course. 'Philosophy of Science and Methodology' receives some criticism. While the quantitative data shows that students are satisfied with the level and scope and shows that a majority (83%) believes that the course supports their process of learning the qualitative comments point to different forms of critique. The problem still seems to be that a number of students are already familiar with methodological issues due to holding specific BAs, whereas other students have little knowledge of philosophy of science and methodology. It is extremely hard to conclude a general trend from the qualitative comments however. There are lots of contradictions where a particular teacher is evaluated positively in one comment and negatively in another.

The majority, however, evaluated the course positively in most aspects. The course is going to be revised before the Fall 2014 and the different suggestions coming from the students will be considered and discussed.

The evaluation of the core course Managing Multiculturalism/PBL shows a similar tendency. Overall there are positive evaluations of the scope and level of the course when looking at the quantitative data. When looking at the qualitative comments the message is more confusing. In the qualitative comments the respondents mainly write about the PBL part and less on the Managing Multiculturalism part. The course receives many positive aspects about the group-work and workshops. The criticism related to the critique of the Philosophy of Science and Methodology course: that some students are already familiar with PBL and group-work. It is important that the students will benefit from the academic content of the course, i.e. Managing Multiculturalism. We will discuss the evaluations further and decide if revisions of the course are necessary to ensure that our students benefit from both the academic course specific content and the PBL part. This semester we offered an expanded version of the group formation sessions. This was to accommodate a request for more time to share ideas and create groups. There are few comments

directly addressing this aspect of the course. The intention was to get students to reflect about project ideas earlier on in the semester and prevent students from ending up writing on their own against their own will. From the actual composition of groups this goal seems to have been reached.

One core course had some respondents finding that it does not adequately serve the interests of all four streams. This is a recurrent critique also raised in the past years. The program continues to work with this issue and make sure that the core courses represent the overall CCG framework and not particular streams. That said, some students indicate that they would prefer only stream specific courses. This will not happen. The CCG program has to offer a coherent framework dealing with issues of culture, communication and globalization. The challenge is how to communicate to our students why this is necessary.

It is very satisfactory to see that the stream specific courses as well as the optional courses were positively evaluated. Among the qualitative comments we find suggestions for improvement but overall the courses have all been positively evaluated in relation to learning objectives, work-load and supporting learning processes.

### ***Project supervision***

Only 23 students filled out the CCG Supervisor evaluation. The evaluations obviously are personal evaluations and highly subjective. This makes it difficult to draw any conclusions. The same supervisor could by different groups be perceived as both offering the necessary support in terms of methods, theory and working process and not being able to do so. In general there is dominating positive perception of the supervisors' competences and ability to support the project writing. In the evaluation of the scope of supervision and accessibility to the supervisor there is a clear overweight of positive statements. However, the CCG coordinator will follow up on specific comments regarding particular supervisors being away from university during the period of project writing. As our teachers and supervisors are also researchers, periods of absence cannot be avoided and must even be expected but both the supervisor and the students should be aware of periods of absence and make the necessary arrangements for supervision.