

## Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	ARK 100
År	2023
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Daniela Hofmann
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p>This course is students' first exposure to university teaching and to archaeology. It is team-taught, with each member of our permanent staff (and some PhD students) giving lectures on their period specialism.</p> <p>Overall, this course worked well. The additional student-led seminars were extremely useful in terms of building up a bit of camaraderie between the students and in providing a low-barrier setting for asking questions. IN general, the students in class seemed engaged and interested and asked a lot of questions.</p>
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der?  Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrappporter sist år.	<p>An online form was made available, to which 9 students (out of 52 who attempted the exam) responded. This is not a very high number, and we will aim to use one of the student seminars to give dedicated time for the form.</p> <p>In general, average satisfaction scores for lectures, student-led seminars and the Bergen byvandring were slightly higher than last year, falling between 3.3 and 4.2 (out of 5). Scores of a similar range were achieved for whether students felt they got a good overview of all periods, for the usefulness of the literature list and whether they now felt they understood the basics of archaeological thinking and methodology and therefore felt prepared for the exam. Higher scores were achieved for whether it was good to meet all the lecturers (4.6), and whether the course was enjoyable (4.4). The one questions that scored lower than last year is whether people felt the course was well structured. Tis may be because one lecture had to be re-arranged last minute, something several students comment on negatively.</p> <p>There was also the opportunity to give more discursive feedback. Alongside mentioning the cancelled lecture. Two students mentioned audio-problems with the microphone in the room, which remains hard to handle. Perhaps some</p>

	<p>clip-on microphones could be bought. One student thought there should be more than one lecture a week, and one would like more of a focus on methods.</p> <p>In contrast to last year, nobody wanted a more “high school approach” to teaching. It seems that the handout and the optional seminars, which were mentioned positively a couple of times, really worked there. A little more information could perhaps be given on how lectures and the pensum (where more of the methods are explained) hang together. Under the circumstances, it is strange that the exams contained more fail grades than in previous years, largely because of very superficial exams. It is hard to assess whether these were particularly people who did not come to the (not obligatory) prep seminars, but if this trend persist then perhaps an obligatory one will need to be added.</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>I have not yet gotten around to including the transferable skills in the handout, as promised last year, but I did spend more time talking about these in the first class.</p>
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	