

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: 100

Programnivå: BA

Emne/program	ARK 110
År	2023
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Daniela Hofmann
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Overall, the course worked well. It is always a challenge with large classes to ensure that people feel comfortable asking questions, and to get active participation in settings like materials classes, but this generally worked. The cooperation with the museum (especially concerning the Bronze Age materials classes, but this year also some lectures) was productive and the administration of the module relative smooth, apart from a technical/IT issue right at the end, which resulted in everyone being allowed to sit the examination.
Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	An online form was made available, to which 29 students responded (about 1/3). Satisfaction scores are given as averages, scoring out of 5 (highest). In general, people were happy with the lectures (4.4), the materials classes (4.1) and to a slightly lesser extent the exam preparation seminar (3.9). Mostly, they felt they learnt a lot (4.2) and enjoyed the course (4.3), which offered a good overview over the periods in question (3.8) and the models and interpretations (3.5). 25 students were happy with the literature list provided, three felt that the texts were too difficult and detailed (one gave no response). Points from the more discursive comments: A) General organisation: 6 students commented that the rooms at Sydneshaugen are now rather old and getting unfit for purpose – it was mentioned that the chairs are uncomfortable, there are few outlets for charging laptops; the rooms were also relatively full and felt stuffy, and given that the curtains had been removed it was difficult to see the presentations. Also, the room for the exam seminar was perceived as too small (3 respondents). One student worried about their coffee cup falling off the angled desk, we must assume that this means there were no important problems. One person found it difficult to deal with two teaching languages, Norwegian and English.

	<p>B) Online resources: two students mentioned they would have liked more online resources, of which one in particular asked for video recordings. Four would like additional digital homework or practice questions. Apparently, some of the online textbooks can only be read by 3 people at the same time, which makes it challenging to refer to them during exams.</p> <p>C) Content: only few suggestions regarding additional topics were made (ship-related rituals, grease in the Bronze Age, more on the Near East). One more detailed comment mentioned that they would have liked more detailed discussion of ethnicity and migration, although they “understood why it was avoided” and one wanted to know more about linguistics. Two mentioned that it was difficult to keep track of periods and dates.</p> <p>D) Course structure: one student would like more time between the end of the course and the exam, 2 wanted more materials classes and 3 mentioned that they would have liked more time to reflect and discuss in a seminar setting. One also suggested splitting the course into several smaller ones, while another thought there were actually few contact hours for 20 ECTS.</p> <p>E) The literature list was experienced as overwhelming by 4 people, with one stating that it was “difficult to figure out what to read and what not to waste our time on”, but one also stating that this was still a very interesting course with engaged teachers (who were also mentioned positively in 3 other comments). One also mentioned that it was difficult to connect to the VPN, and that this should be explained in the lecture.</p>
<p>Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet? Hvilke?</p>	<p>Comments about the rooms notwithstanding (section A), it seems clear that the majority are happy with the course. There is a minority who would prefer it to be more stretched out, and to include room for reflection (section D), but this would lead to clashes with the option modules – as would moving the exam. In terms of more materials classes, more seminars and so on – all these would be good, but ultimately there is a lack of staff resources for such intensive forms of teaching. In the meantime, it was discussed to help students to self-organise into colloquia-groups, and to make suggestions for topics. This could also answer the comments in section B, and we will try this next year. Video recordings will not be made, as they discourage students from asking questions. However, on request students can obtain permission from some lecturers for voice recordings.</p> <p>Several people seem to struggle with the literature list (section E), but it is important that people learn (bit by bit) how to identify relevant reading, rather than mechanically</p>

	<p>following orders. To facilitate this process, I have planned to write a “how to use the literature list” guide. This can also include a link to where students can find out about the VPN.</p> <p>Regarding content (section C), I was surprised that one student felt ethnicity as a subject was “avoided”. It already formed part of the very first lecture, is represented in the pensum, and migration (and the resulting relationships between populations) formed a large part of the Neolithic section at least. Linguistics was, admittedly, included to a lesser extent, as it takes a lot of time to explain this properly. Regarding periods and dates, it is always pointed out which of the PPT slides showing chronology tables the students should print out and refer to during their self-study periods.</p>
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	