

Course Evaluation Summary – HIS115 (Time)

The course evaluation for HIS115 is based on a very limited number of responses (namely, 3, out of 19 who ultimately submitted the final exam). This low response rate means, inevitably, that the results must be interpreted with caution, as individual responses have a disproportionate impact on the overall picture. They can only express personal preferences of the individual students rather than anything general about the character and quality of the course itself. Nevertheless, the feedback provides some useful indications regarding students' experiences of the course, and these might be enhanced by bringing to bear informal feedback I conducted for the same course in its initial manifestation in 2024.

Overall, students express a generally positive assessment of the course. Most respondents report being *quite satisfied* with HIS115 as a whole, although one respondent expresses clear dissatisfaction (to every question, indeed; it is therefore difficult to know how much credence to give to this person's responses, especially as the qualitative responses, where suggestions for improvement could have been offered, remained unanswered). Given the small number of responses, again, this divergence should not be over-interpreted.

Students largely perceive the course as well structured, with reasonable coherence between different parts and an appropriate distribution of time. This suggests that the overall design of the course functions satisfactorily.

Attendance among these respondents was high, with most students reporting attendance at the majority of lectures. The lectures were generally perceived as engaging, and most respondents felt involved in the teaching. This is consistent with the informal feedback gathered in 2024, which was overwhelmingly positive on this front. Learning outcomes from lectures were assessed as moderate to high by most students, though the one respondent discussed above reported limited learning benefit.

Student feedback on the syllabus and readings is mixed. This is of particular interest to the course coordinator, as the amount of reading was the major point of criticism in the informal feedback gathered in 2024. While some respondents report learning a great deal or quite a lot from the readings, the same respondent reports learning very little. The amount of reading is generally perceived as appropriate for the scope of the course, although this respondent found it less appropriate (whether too much, too little, too complex or too simple, is not outlined).

Students express a neutral assessment of group work – a critical component of the course and one instituted for specific pedagogical purposes. This suggests that group activities neither significantly enhanced nor detracted from the learning experience, and that their pedagogical impact may be limited in their current form. By contrast, this was often stressed as a positive in the 2024 feedback (though not universally).

Assignments are described as reasonable and appropriate in difficulty, being neither too demanding nor too simple. Overall, students regard them as acceptable and fair. Given that the course coordinator had instituted a substantial change to the content of the 1500 written assignment, this must be viewed as a positive development.

In terms of course content, respondents have highlighted particular interest in themes such as:

- Different conceptions of time
- Scientific approaches to time
- Time and critique

Most students report that there were no topics they particularly disliked. By contrast, the 2024 feedback revealed a mix of favoured and less-liked topics (leading the Course Coordinator to continue with the same twelve themes).

Some constructive suggestions were provided:

- A desire for more non-European perspectives on time, including perspectives not directly linked to colonial or pre-colonial contexts (However, this was actually a consequence of changes to the syllabus made after the 2024 feedback, in which it became clear that the global reach of the course was making too many intellectual demands of the students; hence, in 2025 the course was more explicitly focused to European history, including its colonial dimensions).
- Increased plenary or whole-group discussions, although students also note that low participation levels made this challenging in practice (this accords closely with the course coordinator's experience, in which in-class participation was considerably more difficult to generate than in 2024, when most participants in the informal feedback ground reported positively to this aspect of the course).

Based on the feedback, the following measures may be considered:

- Reviewing the syllabus to assess whether broader global perspectives can be more clearly integrated (one option might be to dedicate a class specifically to non-European perspectives, as opposed to the current focus on time and European colonialism, which by definition retains a thematic link to European history)
- Reflecting on how group work and discussion formats might be adjusted to encourage greater student participation (keeping in mind the stark divergence between the experience and feedback of the 2024 and 2025 cohorts)
- Continuing to monitor the balance and scope of readings to ensure clarity regarding expectations and learning outcomes (a particular challenge given the heavily thematic – and occasionally abstract – focus of the course)

Despite the low response rate, the evaluation indicates that the HIS115 course on Time is generally perceived as a well-structured and engaging course with relevant and interesting content. It suggests that the principal pedagogic purposes of the course are being realised, even notwithstanding the relatively challenging conceptual and theoretical dimensions of the topic. Further development should focus on strengthening global perspectives and enhancing student participation, while future evaluations would benefit from a higher response rate to ensure a more representative basis for assessment.

HIS115 tema Mikropsykiatrihistorie Evaluering høsten 2025

Emnet ble evaluert med et evalueringsskjema som ble delt ut på siste ordinære forelesning. 16 studenter fylte ut evalueringsskjema. Frammøtet på forelesningene har vært ganske stabilt, mellom 18 og 22. 33 studenter har levert begge de to obligatoriske oppgavene og forventes å ta eksamen (av ca 40 oppmeldte). Dessverre var det dårlig frammøte den dagen jeg distribuerte evalueringsskjema.

Av resultatet av evalueringen: Av de 16 mente 12 at de hadde lært 'mye' av å ta kurset, mot 4 som hadde lært «litt» (ingen krysset av på hverken-eller, lite eller ingenting. Alle mente at nivået på forelesningene var 'passe', 3 studenter mente at nivået på pensum var for avansert, resten mente det var 'passe'. Studentene oppgir i snitt å ha arbeidet med emnet 11,3 timer i uka, inkludert forelesninger (dette tror jeg ikke er så pålitelig tall, jeg tror flere ikke har inkludert undervisningen). 3 studenter mener at omfanget av pensum er for stort, resten mente det var 'passe'. 11 har 10 dager før eksamensstart lest mer enn halvparten av pensum, 3 har lest mindre enn halvparten og 2 oppgir å ha lest alt. Nesten alle oppgir å ha hatt stort utbytte av å skrive de to obligatoriske oppgaven, et par har hatt 'middels' utbytte av dette. Ingen oppgir å ikke hatt utbytte av dette .5 studenter syns det er for lite undervisning, resten syns det har vært passe.

I tillegg hadde jeg noen spørsmål knyttet til hvilke deler av pensum studentene hadde mest utbytte av. Svarene her varierer ganske mye, noe som viser at det ikke er noen bestemte deler av pensum som byr på vanskeligheter. Et par studenter ønsker seg at jeg legger ut power point presentasjoner fra forelesninger, noe jeg har som politikk å ikke gjøre.

Alt i alt gir evalueringsskjema at i alle fall de mest aktive studentene (de som følger undervisningen) er godt fornøyd med læringsutbyttet av emnet.