

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: 100

Programnivå: BA

Emne/program	ARK 110
År	2025
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Daniela Hofmann
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Overall, the course worked well. Students enjoyed materials classes, but also felt comfortable asking questions and participating in lectures. As in previous years, the cooperation with the museum (especially concerning the Bronze Age materials classes) was productive. We continued the optional kollokviegrupper this year, although given last year's mixed success we reduced the number of groups. Next year, for funding reasons, this offer will no longer be available.
Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	<p>34 students responded to the online questionnaire. This is only marginally lower than the number of regular attendees (on average 36). The sample is therefore representative. Satisfaction scores are given as averages, scoring out of 5 (highest).</p> <p>In general, people were happy with the lectures (4.1), the materials classes (4.6) and the exam preparation seminar (4.1). The lecture and seminar scores are slightly lower than last year, but remain stable in a long-term trend. Mostly, students felt they learnt a lot (4.3) and enjoyed the course (4.2), which offered a good overview over the periods in question (3.9) and the models and interpretations (3.6). These numbers remained unchanged from 2024.</p> <p>In terms of the kollokviegrupper, 11 students reported not having attended at all, 11 attended one or two, and 12 three or all four of the offered seminars. This rate is similar to last year. This year, however, it was possible to pick a kollokviegruppe, so that students would not end up with people they did not like (which was an issue last year). Of the 11 people who did not attend, six provided a reason: work commitments, lack of time, preference for working alone (2x), personal reasons, and issues with working Studentweb. Of the people who did attend, several commented on the good tips and tricks they got, on the fact that it gave different perspectives on the reading and that it was easier to ask questions than in the full lecture theatre. People also enjoyed the more activating discussions, and</p>

several of those who attended one or two sessions said they would like to come to more, but were unable. Only one commented that they did not get anything useful out of attending. In sum, then, the sessions that have been developed over the last few years seem to work well now and to address most students' needs.

There has again been a slight increase in people who felt that the literature list was too difficult (11, up from 8 last year). This is surprising mainly because this year's literature list was substantially shortened due to new guidelines, but it continues a long-running trend. There is a slight tendency for those who struggled to also not have attended kollokviegrupper, but this is not a very tight correlation. Hopefully, having a subject-oriented LES100 course from 2026 will help us manage expectations more clearly, and also introduce more science-heavy texts (which I am guessing are the problem here - although this would need to be confirmed) earlier. At the end of the day, students will need to get used to reading long texts, and difficult texts, and you can only get better at that by actually doing it.

From the organisational side, in response to last year's feedback we moved the oppgaveseminar earlier in the course structure, so students would get an initial idea of what an exam asks them to do (which is then reinforced again in the kollokviegruppe). This appears to have worked well. Two students wanted better information (e.g. individual emails) about class changes, but this is not possible – they are told at the start of the year that Timeplan is the most up to date place to check for courses, and that they are responsible for forwarding any Mitt.uib announcements to their own addresses themselves. Other comments appeared only once, so do not point to systemic problems.

Points from the other more discursive comments sections were few this year:

- A) Activities: two students mentioned they would like more quizzes or questions in class. One would like a larger hands-on component (more materials classes).
- B) Content: one person wanted more on ritual, as this is "barely covered". This seems strange, as especially burials and hoarding practices take up quite a bit of time. In any case, a new course (fellesemne) on ritual practices is being developed.
- C) Lectures: one person wanted less detail in the Stone Age sections, another wanted handouts before class for the Bronze Age. One person requested a summary lecture.

In sum, there are no comments here that warrant immediate action, as they are largely isolated. Most people were happy (with quite a few expressing thanks for a good semester), or at least satisfied enough to not ask for improvements. There is little we can do in terms of

	providing more lectures or materials classes, as we are being asked to cut down our teaching.
<p>Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok?</p> <p>Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet?</p> <p>Hvilke?</p>	<p>This course has generally worked well over the years, with a lot of small adjustments made as required. This is however the last year it will run in this format, as from next year the materials class will be split off. Hopefully, students (who are generally keen on practical aspects) will have the patience to wait and first undertake the new, more theoretical (but less packed) course. Splitting the course should, however, give time for additional things, like more online quizzes.</p>
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	