3-årig emneevaluering: GEOV 331

Emne: GEOV331

Semester og år for gjennomført emneevaluering: V24

Navn på emneansvarlig(e): Ulysses Ninnemann

Innhold:

1. **Beskriv og begrunn pedagogiske valg i emnet, reflektér over studentens læring som følge av disse valgene.**

   The course is a seminar discussion of scientific papers with rotating leadership of the discussion every week. The course theme, and pensum content is co-designed with the students, to suite their overlapping interests and skills—and progress is continuously (re)assessed as part of the class meetings. A goal is to develop the ability to critically evaluate research papers—which is practiced throughout the course. Likewise, students are forced to apply and develop their ability to interpret plots, figures, and data and draw logical inferences. Students are assessing different scientific hypotheses in the literature each week and the success of different experiments in testing/falsifying them. In order to evaluate their development and ability to formulate and test hypotheses, the final task in the course is to write a research proposal, give peer-peer feedback (as formative exercise), revise their ideaas and present it to each other. This exercise also tests to what extent the students have acquired knowledge of specific approaches for reconstructing past circulation and their utility and limitations.

   The students generate impressive proposals after 1 semester of reading and critically discussing and reflecting on the chosen topic.

Emneevalueringer skal også minst omfatte:

2. **Oppfølging av tidligere evalueringer**

   Following COVID, students had been eager to maintain some of the online (pre)discussion of papers and we carried that on for some years. We did this because we are co-designing the course and its approach and it was a useful bridge for students moving from fully digital to in person learning activities—it was also highlighted in the last evaluation that some of those digital pre-discussion fora were useful. However, we have gradually moved back to a pure in person discussion and this year was the most successful, enthusiastic, and engaged year in some time—confirmed based on the comments from the student evaluations.

3. **Studentevaluering og andre evalueringer som er relevante for emnet**

   Evaluering [her]

   Comments from last evaluation suggest students find identify the aimed for learning outcomes as a value for the course and that the activities align with these aims:

very good course, really interesting and since you read papers every week and discuss them you learn a lot - both knowledge on the various topics but also in general on how to read and be critical to a paper. All this in a very welcoming setting.

Very well-organized and informative course. It builds the essential skillset of reading and discussing scientific papers, critiquing, writing project proposals, pier reviewing, and proposal pitching.

The course is very good in general, and I didn't actually expect that at the beginning. I took another seminar-based course last semester and I am not a fan of this kind of course, simply because I expect to learn more from the teacher/textbook rather than from discussion/papers. But I found this course is better than I thought, probably because it's a smaller group, and the papers we chose were systematic and not totally random. However I still wish to have a bit more lecture time (like 2-4 more hours) by the teacher, so the students could have a stronger basic mindset on paleoceanography before going into the paper discussions. For the final assignment (proposal writing), I think I would enjoy it more if I were a Master student, but as a PhD student I felt a bit 'not real' and energy consuming. We learned a lot by finishing this proposal for sure, but for me it was like playing a game that we couldn't win. (I am not asking for more workload for future PhD students, and sorry I don't have solid advice for my feeling :))

Kjempebra oppsett og innhold. Veldig nyttig fag. 10/10

The course is based on group discussion and I think it was very interesting, however, I had to learn how to "do it". I have learned a lot about reading papers (critically) and I believe this is very useful further in my studies and now when I start writing my master thesis.

4. **Erfaringer fra andre som bidrar i undervisningen på emnet, både studenter og ansatte**

   No other teachers

5. **Strykprosenten på emnet**

   Strykprosent i perioden: Karaktersnitt i perioden:

   <div align="center">

   # 0.0%

   </div>

   ## Emnegjennomføring oversikt pr år

ARSTALL	Antall kandidater	Antall kandidater be..	Bestått kandidater	Antall kandidater st..	Strykprosent kandidater	Snittkarakter
2021	10.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	0.0%	
2022	7.00	7.00	7.00	0.00	0.0%	
2023	11.00	11.00	11.00	0.00	0.0%	

   Rapport i Tableau: https://rapport-dv.uhad.no/#/views/SVP3Emnegjennomfring_1/Emnegjennomfringslister?:iid=2

6. **Eventuell fagfellevurdering**

   Nei—although a peer has participated in the course as a learning activity themselves some years ago

7. **Vurdering av samsvar mellom emnets læringsutbyttebeskrivelse og undervisnings-, lærings- og vurderingsformer**

   Generally there is good alignment here. However, since the course is co-created every year, there can be some differences in the specific learning outcomes related to how much we dwell on the different specific methods and approaches for reconstructing past ocean change.

8. **Vurdering av om framdrift og opplegg for emnet er i samsvar med de fastsatte målene for emne og program**

There is consistent oral feedback from master and PhD students that this is one of the most valuable courses they take locally in terms of building both general competency toward their theses, critical reading skills, discussion and fact based argumentation skills, as well as topical expertise in the discipline.

9. **I de tilfellene det er tilknyttet praksis eller arbeidsrelevans i emnet, skal det evalueres om ordningen fungerer tilfredsstillende.**