

# COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

## Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

<b>Course LADOK code:</b> ES260L	<b>Scope (hp):</b> 30
<b>Course title:</b> European Studies II: European Studies Research Areas and Methodology and Minor Thesis	
<b>Course coordinator:</b> Dino Knudsen	<b>Number of registered students:</b> 36
<b>Semester in which the course is conducted:</b> HT24	
<b>Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name.</b> HGPSK semester 3 programme course and independent course	

## Forms of evaluation and feedback (To be completed by the course coordinator)

<b>Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional)</b>	<b>Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):</b>
<b>Summative course evaluation (obligatory)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Only via Canvas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Canvas and other form <input type="checkbox"/> Only other form (written and/or oral)	<b>Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation:</b> 36

## Student's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

<b>Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students response to the course is mainly positive, 75 % responding in the higher end when it comes to satisfaction. The same pattern is visible for students responses to examination forms (question 3) and whether the course has met their expectations (question 4). When it comes to taking responsibility for their own learning, students agrees that this is a strong feature in the course, but a few students would prefer more teaching/tutoring etc.</li> <li>• When it comes to how well the course's working methods sustains the learning activities (question 2), students are less positive, although only 5 % answers "to a very small extent". This issue has to do with the join GPS methods course, which works as module 2 in our course (see below under "Teacher's perspective").</li> <li>• The students have included many comments on how to improve minor aspects of the course (question 7).</li> </ul>
---

## Teacher's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

<b>Summary of the teacher's views:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the fall-semester 2024, ES260L ran for the first time as part of our European Studies Program.</li> <li>• The experience was mainly positive. The advantage of the course design is that it equips the students, step-by-step in a very methodological and streamlined way, to write their minor thesis during/at the end of the course (something acknowledged by several students in their feedback). Students are alerted early in the semester to thinking and</li> </ul>
--

planning their minor thesis, including writing drafts for parts of it as the semester progresses, which then is developed and finished at the end of the semester.

- The disadvantage is that due to the compact nature of this course, students falling behind with assignments as the semester progress, can find it difficult to catch up, and that the logic of the sequence of assignments are broken when students end up re-submitting assignments. However, for the big majority of the students this is not a problem.
- The main challenge, however, in improving the course, is module 2, which is the GPS's joint methods course. The joint method course has a great potential, including saving program resources and having a more diverse group of teachers complement each other with their particular expertise. However, the present format is not fully exploring the latter aspect. And most importantly a more "hands-on" approach is needed in the seminars, not only introducing students to methods, but also giving them a practical introduction to them, including exercises. As I'm writing this, steps are being taken to make rearrangements and adjustments, including moving this module (2) to the beginning of our course. This will reshape the whole course, and subsequent changes will have to be made to module 1.
- Apart from this, improving the existing course will focus on:
- 1. Feedback in time: Examiners do not always have the time (15 working days) to grade the assignments, which fall close because of the compact nature of the course, and providing the students with feedback before the students move on to developing the same text, or part of it, in the next assignment. In other words, the work-in-progress aspect is not fully exploited.
- 2. Alternating teachers: ideally, we need to have the same number of teachers involved in all three modules during the course.

### **Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)**

The underlying analysis and the action plan should be based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from teachers in the course and the knowledge development in the research field. If identified problems are left without action, this should be motivated.

#### **The following changes are planned in the short and long term:**

WHAT should be done, WHO should do it and WHEN should it be done?

- Steps to redesign the GPS joint methods course has been taken, including a meeting in February and a meeting in March. The result is still pending.
- After the redesigning of GPS joint method course, we will adjust module 1 accordingly, including the points mentioned above.

Remember to orally feedback the results of the course evaluation to

- the students who have completed the course evaluation
- the students of the next course round, i.e. the next time the course is given