

# SKEMA TIL AFRAPPORTERING PÅ UNDERVISNINGSEVALUERING – STUDIEÅRET 2018/19

## Del 1. Offentliggøres på science.ku.dk (må ikke indeholde personfølsomme oplysninger, herunder konkrete kursustitler, navne etc.)

1.0 GRUNDOPLYSNINGER	
Institut	Institut for Geovidenskab og Naturforvaltning
Periode	Studieåret 2018/19

1.1 EVALUERINGER GENNEMFØRT I PERIODEN	
Antal kurser	205
Antal projekter og specialer	Bachelorprojekter: 8 Specialer: 29 Masterprojekter: 0 Projekt udenfor kursusregi: 0 Virksomhedsprojekter: 6

1.2 REFLEKSION OVER SVARPROCENT (både kurser og projekter/specialer)
Angiv svarprocenten og kommentér denne
<p>Response percentages for courses are variable and in many cases relatively low. In those cases where the response percentage is low (below 6 in total and less than 20% of the students enrolled in a course), we choose to not discuss the evaluations in the UVU as they are unlikely to be statistically representative, however we expect all teaching staff to read the course evaluations. In the study year 2018/19 this equated to 80 out of a total of 205 courses (11/50 courses in Block 1, 17/60 in Block 2, 24/40 in Block 3, 26/48 in Block 4 and 2/7 in Block 5). We see a general trend of decreasing responses with level in the course evaluations, and from Block 1 through 4, and we suspect that this reflects a general satisfaction with teaching at IGN and that if they are satisfied with a course they see little need to make an evaluation (and that those with less than satisfying experiences are more likely to respond). From the more negative side, it could also reflect that students potentially do not see that their comments and evaluations have a marked result. The latter concept is not surprising as the students do not return to follow courses again so do not experience the adjustments made as a result of course evaluations. In general, the teaching staff at IGN are extremely aware of the results of course evaluations and are continually making adjustments to their courses in response to them. Continual efforts are made to increase the responses to</p>

course evaluations and our experience in UVU is that the best results come from setting time aside in the final week of teaching for a face-to-face discussion with the students. The results of the latter are most constructive and are not represented in the on-line evaluations. Evaluations of various reports are low – conversations with students suggest this is due to a) them moving on to new challenges (jobs) and b) a lack of clarity about who actually reads these evaluations (in the case of Bachelor and Master thesis evaluations, anonymity is virtually impossible). We need to clarify to the students that these evaluations are only read by VILU and administrative staff (referral of these evaluations to the UVU occurs on a case by case basis).

### 1.3 KURSERS FORDELING I KATEGORIER

Kategori	Definition	Antal	Refleksion over fordelingen af kurser i kategorier
<b>A</b>	<i>Kurser, hvor undervisningen har fungeret særligt godt og kan være til inspiration for andre.</i>		21 courses classified as A in 2018-19, compared to 22 in 2017-18.
<b>B</b>	<i>Kurser, hvor undervisningen har fungeret tilfredsstillende. Evalueringen giver anledning til ingen eller mindre justeringer af kurset.</i>		50 courses classified as B in 2018-19, compared to 53 in 2017-18. During discussion of courses in the IGN UVU we do not distinguish between A and B courses at IGN, and only discuss C-courses. We would like to have more time to highlight and reward those courses and teaching staff that consistently receive positive evaluations, however time and manpower constraints do not allow this at this point.
<b>C</b>	<i>Kurser, hvor evalueringen giver anledning til justering og udvikling af kurset og/eller undervisningens form og/eller indhold.</i>		<p>Twenty-four courses classified as C in 2018-19, compared with 16 in 2017-18. We are satisfied with the number of courses that end with a C-classification, despite this increase. We do not interpret this to represent a decrease in the quality of teaching at IGN, but instead reflects an increased focus on the course evaluations.</p> <p>Many of these courses end with a C-categorization due to small technical issues or specific, one-off circumstances during a course (e.g. disruption to teaching due to sickness, organizational/inventory issues) which can be easily addressed.</p> <p>The course evaluation process is effective at identifying the very few courses and teaching staff where there are more serious pedagogic/administrative issues that need to be addressed by administration/the leadership team.</p>

<b>1.4 ANALYSE AF KURSERNES KATEGORIER</b>	
Hvilke elementer fra evalueringer og positive erfaringer med kurserne i kategori A kan fremhæves?	In general, the responses to most courses at IGN show that the students are satisfied with the organization and academic level of the teaching they receive. In particular, they provide many positive comments on the enthusiasm, dedication, expertise and drive of the teaching staff involved. In these cases, we trust and expect all teaching staff to read and assess the evaluations and use the student comments to continually make small improvements and clarifications to their teaching – or to take positive affirmation from the responses.
Hvilke elementer fra kurserne i kategori B kan fremhæves?	There is often little difference in the written text comments between the A and B courses. At times in the B courses, the signals sent by individual students are often mixed and difficult to interpret (too much reading vs not enough reading) and are purely based on an individual student's experiences and preferences. The written comments in B courses tend to include many positive and constructive suggestions for improvement of successful courses.
Hvilke opmærksomhedspunkter peger kurserne i kategori C på?	In many cases, the quantitative classification of courses as C-kurser is based on relatively small logistical issues that suggest some improvements can be made, but do not highlight major pedagogic issues in general. A common theme in several evaluations of C-courses at IGN are issues caused by a lack of coordination between various members of teaching staff, logistical details such as space availability and timetabling, and accessibility to teaching materials. Several courses also note a relatively high workload. In the relatively rare and more serious instances of C-kurser, students note a lack of enthusiasm, engagement, or academic level of individual staff members.
Hvilke justeringer og opfølgingsinitiativer vil blive foretaget for kurserne i C-kategorien?	For all courses classified as C, we have asked for a specific written response to the course evaluations highlighting any modifications the teaching staff will make to modify the course. In as many cases as possible, a meeting has also been held with the course responsible to discuss the progress of the course. The written responses and written summaries of these meetings are available if requested and will be used to track the progress of the course in the next academic year. In all cases, the relevant Head of Studies has been cc'ed on all correspondence and/or attended the meetings.

#### **1.5 STATUS PÅ SIDSTE PERIODES OPFØLGINGSINITIATIVER FOR C-KURSER**

*Sammenfatning af pkt. 2.1. Angiv i overordnede termer og ikke på kursusniveau.*

In most cases, the courses classified as C last year have shown a marked improvement in their evaluations. However, there are also several courses that continue to fall into the C category (although there is typically an improvement in the general evaluations – indicating that adjusting course contents is a process that takes time. The VILU and UVU continue to have a focus on these courses. Several courses have had major changes in the teaching staff involved, and it is therefore difficult to compare course evaluations from previous years. In several cases, so few students evaluated the courses that the evaluations cannot be considered

representative – in these cases the course responsible has been contacted to get their impression of how the course ran in 18/19 and to encourage them to ensure that students complete course evaluations.

### **1.6 REFLEKSION OVER EVALUERINGER AF PROJEKTER OG SPECIALER**

Tegner evalueringsresultaterne et billede af fælles træk i vejledningen? Vedr. forhold som f.eks. udarbejdelse af kontrakt, antal af vejledningstimer, opfølgning, faglige match?

The percentage of students who complete an evaluation of their thesis and/or project work is low – making assessment of this area difficult. We plan to emphasize to students that these evaluations are anonymous to help improve reply rates (students are likely unwilling to provide critical comments on supervision if they remain reliant to the supervisor for support when finding employment). At IGN, we are placing increased focus on all aspects of the planning of thesis work, including deadlines for handing in contracts, identifying potential projects and supervisors, and time management during the period of the study.

### **1.7 GENERELLE UDVIKLINGSPROJEKTER PÅ INSTITUTTET I RELATION TIL UNDERVISNING**

Er der planlagt generelle udviklingsprojekter på instituttet i relation til instituttets undervisning (pædagogisk kompetenceudvikling, pædagogiske udviklingsprojekter etc.)?

Several sections at IGN have had specific workshops and collaboration with the IT-learning Centre in 18/19. These workshops have focused on better use of Absalon and have resulted in a general template for setting up course homepages in Absalon, which we recommend that all staff to use to ensure continuity between different courses. This is a response to specific wishes from students. There have also been workshops on the more advanced features of PPT that can be used during teaching such as incorporation of videos, quizzes, use of Shakespeak etc.