

RAPPORT

MUF101 / Musikk, kultur og samfunn

Undersøkelsen ble utført med avkryssingsmuligheter på tildels mange alternativ for å måle utvikling av motivasjon gjennom året, undervisningens og vurderingsformens relevans for læringsutbytte, pensums omfang og grad av kompleksitet, arbeidsmengde og mer generelle inntrykk fra emnet.

Sammendraget her gjengir et hovedinntrykk fra de ulike kategoriene.

20 respondenter.

Motivasjonen for emnet virker å synke fra middels/høy på begynnelsen av året til lav på slutten av året.

Undervisningen vurderes til kun delvis å oppnå læringsutbyttene, og den anbefales av de fleste å være diskusjonspreget med kortere forelesningsdeler/introduksjoner.

Pensum er av 9 resp. vurdert til for omfattende, mens 11 mener det er passelig.

De fleste svarer at pensum knyttet til de tre fagområdene er generelt greie å forstå, mens svarene spriker mer i vurderingen av hvordan de to bøkene (Small og Cook) bidrar til faglig utbytte.

De fleste resp. svarer at arbeidsmengden er passe.

De fleste (9 resp.) mener vurderingsformen passer dårlig for å måle om læringsutbyttene er nådd, resten fordeler seg på "passer bra" (5 resp.) og "fungerer dårlig" (6 resp.).

Emnet gis dårlig tilbakemelding når det gjelder relevans for faglig praksis, og de fleste ville ikke valgt emnet om det var et valgemne.

Over halvparten (12 resp.) holder fram tverrfaglig undervisning som noe positivt. Færre respondenter enn halvparten svarte positivt på de mer kvalitative utsagnene blant svaralternativene som berører emnet generelt.

EMNERAPPORT, 2018 Spring

EMNEKODE: MUG105 Music in World Cultures

FAGLÆRER: Thomas Solomon

FAGLÆRERS VURDERING AV GJENNOMFØRING

Praktisk gjennomføring

The course consisted of a total of 15 meetings: 11 regular lectures and 4 seminars in which the students orally presented their semester projects (a field work project). The exam consisted of an assignment portfolio with two assignments. The 11 regular lectures were all based on PowerPoint presentations with audio and video examples, and sometimes demonstrations in class by the teacher of different musical instruments.

Studentenes profil, karakterfordeling, strykprosent og frafall

Of the 26 students registered in the course at the beginning of the semester, 19 students completed the exam in the class and received a grade. The class is taught in English and is open to students from other departments, including exchange students. About 3/5 of the students were Norwegian and 2/5 were exchange students. This course is required for 1st-year students in the bachelor program in musicology.

Final grade distribution:

A	2
B	9
C	4
D	4
E	0
F	0

Studieinformasjon og dokumentasjon

A copy of the study plan for the class plus the full description/schedule for the course (lecture topics, assigned reading for each lecture, written assignment descriptions and due dates) was passed out at the beginning of the semester. The study plan and course description/schedule were also available on the university's learning platform *Mitt UiB*. Lecture materials (PowerPoint slides, handouts) were made available on *Mitt UiB* after most of the lectures.

Tilgang til relevant litteratur

The required textbooks were available at the campus book store *Akademika*, and copies of the textbooks were also available at the Grieg Academy Library. Selected articles were available either for free online (via the university library's subscription) or, for a small fee, via download from the online compendium (*Litteraturkiosken*).

FAGLÆRERS VURDERING AV RAMMEVILKÅRENE

Lokaler/undervisningsutstyr: The class was taught in a room in Sydneshaugen skole. The data projector and sound system worked OK.

FAGLÆRERS KOMMENTAR TIL STUDENTEVALUERING

Metode – gjennomføring - spørreskjema.

An anonymous online survey was created on *Skjemaker*, and a link to the survey was sent to the students from *Mitt UiB* near the end of the semester, with two reminders. Despite the reminders, only 4 responses were received. See below for a summary of the results.

Online survey results

1 How motivated were you in this course? (1 is the lowest rating, 5 is the highest.)

- 3: 3
- 4: 1

2 Are you satisfied with your own development in the course? (1 is least satisfied, 5 is most.)

- 3: 2
- 4: 1
- 5: 1

3 How relevant was the course for your program of study? (1 is least relevant, 5 is most.)

- 3: 3
- 4: 1

4 Was the level of the readings appropriate for level of the course? (1 is least appropriate, 5 is most appropriate.)

- 2: 1
- 3: 3

5 Was the level of the lectures appropriate for level of the course? (1 is least appropriate, 5 is most appropriate.)

- 2: 1
- 3: 1
- 4: 2

6 Were the teaching methods and types of assignments appropriate for this course? (1 is least appropriate, 5 is most appropriate.)

- 4: 4

7 How does the amount of work required for this course compare with others you have taken/are taking at this level? (1 is much less in this course than other courses, 5 is much more in this course than other courses)

- 1: 1
- 3: 2
- 4: 1

8 How well did the readings for the course help you to understand the selected musical cultures they covered? (1 is helped very little, 5 is helped very much.)

- 3: 4

9 Were the teachers prepared for the lectures? (1 is little prepared, 5 is very prepared.)

- 5: 4

10 Were the lectures presented in a clear and understandable manner? (1 is not clear and understandable, 5 is very clear and understandable.)

- 4: 1
- 5: 3

11 Did the teachers and lectures increase your interest in the subject? (1 is least, 5 is most.)

- 3: 2
- 4: 1
- 5: 1

12 Was the structure and organization of the course clear to you? (1 is not clear, 5 is very clear.)

- 4: 4

13 Did the teachers make the assignment requirements clear? (1 is least clear, 5 is most clear.)

- 4: 1
- 5: 3

14 Are you satisfied with the room and equipment? (1 is least satisfied, 5 is most satisfied.)

- 1: 1
- 3: 1
- 4: 2

15 Did you get enough helpful feedback about your work in this course? (1 is least, 5 is most.)

- 3: 4

16 Did the teachers respond clearly and quickly to your e-mails and other questions outside of class? (1 is least quickly, 5 is most quickly.)

- 4: 2
- 5: 2

17 How much of the reading list have you read?

- less than 25%: 2
- 25-50%: 2
- 50-75%: 0
- 75-100%: 0

18 How many hours did you work for this course during a week (not including class time)?

- less than 5 hours: 2
- 5-10 hours: 2
- more than 10 hours: 0

19 How much do you feel you learned in this course? (1 is very little, 5 is very much.)

- 3: 2
- 4: 2

20 Overall evaluation of the course. (1 is poor, 5 is excellent.)

- 3: 2
- 4: 2

21 Please comment in your own words on what you liked and didn't like about the course, and what you would suggest be changed or improved the next time the course is taught. You may write in Norwegian or English.

Summary of the students' responses to question 21 (free text comments):

Only 3 responses were received to question 21. Issues the students mentioned included a (perceived) lack of connection between the assigned reading and the content of the lectures (on the one hand), and the exam form in the course (on the other). Otherwise, the same students commented that they did like the assignments, and learned a lot through doing them.

(Complete student responses are kept on file by the course-responsible person.)

Teachers' comments on the results:

The scores on the quantitative questions were somewhat lower this year than in previous years, which had shown a gradual upward trend. But since only 4 responses were received to the evaluation survey (despite 2 reminders being sent), and of these only 3 answered question 21 (the free text comment question), one should be cautious in generalizing from them.

EMNERAPPORT, 2018 Spring

EMNEKODE: MVK101 Musikkproduksjon

FAGLÆRER: Thomas Solomon

FAGLÆRERS VURDERING AV GJENNOMFØRING

Praktisk gjennomføring

The course consisted of a total of 10 meetings, including workshops on working with sound equipment and concert production, guest lectures on various aspects of music production and the music industry in Norway, and 2 meetings with students' progress reports and final presentations. The students also worked in small groups to practice with sound equipment and do sound for music therapy house concerts, as well as all together in one large group to produce the exam concert at the end of the semester. Parts of the teaching were shared with the music therapy course *MUTP105 Samspel i musikkterapigrupper*. The students in these two courses cooperated on house concerts: the music therapy students performed in different small groups while the musicology students did concert production, including especially working with the sound equipment. The exam consisted of an assignment portfolio with four assignments including practical projects (production of house concerts and an exam concert), written work (application for project support), and oral presentations, all graded pass/fail (*bestått/ikke bestått*).

Follow-up from previous evaluation

In response to comments and suggestions from the students who took the previous edition of the course in Spring 2017, the following changes were made this year:

- in order to improve communication between the musicology students and the music therapy students, a musicology student from the course was appointed to represent musicology in the music therapy students' "house concert committee"
- the funds the students had available to use for expenses related to the exam concert were increased to 4000 NOK
- a staff member from the faculty came to one course meeting and gave an orientation into the faculty's economy procedures (purchase orders, vendor agreements, etc.), which the students were to follow when using their funds for the exam concert

Studentenes profil, karakterfordeling, strykprosent og frafall

This course is required for 1st-year students in the bachelor program in musicology, and is only open to them. Of the 15 students registered in the course at the beginning of the semester, 12 students completed the exam in the class and received a grade.

Final grade distribution:

bestått	12
ikke bestått	0

Studieinformasjon og dokumentasjon

A copy of the study plan for the class plus the full description/schedule for the course (lecture topics, assigned reading, assignment descriptions and due dates) was passed out at the beginning of the semester. The study plan and course description/schedule were also available on the university's learning platform *Mitt UiB*. Lecture materials (PowerPoint slides, handouts) were made available on *Mitt UiB* after the lectures.

Tilgang til relevant litteratur

As this course is more practically oriented than theoretical, it does not have a long reading list. The short reading list was published on *Mitt UiB*, and a few relevant open-access articles were also posted on *Mitt UiB* for the students to access.

FAGLÆRERS VURDERING AV RAMMEVILKÅRENE

Lokaler/undervisningsutstyr: Practically oriented workshops in the course were held in the Grieg Academy's Gunnar Sævig's sal, while lectures were held in Stein Rokkans hus, Auditorium 1080. The data projector and sound system in both these rooms worked OK.

FAGLÆRERS KOMMENTAR TIL STUDENTEVALUERING

Metode – gjennomføring – spørreskjema.

An anonymous online survey was created on *Skjemaker*, and a link to the survey was sent to the students from *Mitt UiB* near the end of the semester, with two reminders. Despite the reminders, only one response was received. While one response cannot be representative of the students in the course as a whole, it does represent one student's point of view, so it is summarized here.

Online survey results (one respondent)

1 Hvor motivert var du for emnet? (1 = svært lite motivert, 5 = veldig motivert)

- 4: 1

2 Er du fornøyd med din egen utvikling i emnet? (1 = ikke fornøyd, 5 = veldig fornøyd)

- 4: 1

3 Hvor relevant var emnet for studiet ditt? (1 = ikke relevant i det hele tatt, 5 = svært relevant)

- 5: 1

4 Er du fornøyd med kursets innhold? (1 = ikke fornøyd, 5 = veldig fornøyd)

- 4: 1

5 Var kurset godt strukturert og organisert? (1 = lite eller ingen struktur, 5 = veldig godt strukturert)

- 3: 1

6 Er du fornøyd med undervisningen i emnet? (1 = ikke fornøyd, 5 = veldig fornøyd)

- 4: 1

7 Var forelesningene lagt på riktig nivå? (1 er minst passende, 5 er mest passende)

- 4: 1

8 Var foreleserne godt forberedte? (1 = ikke forberedte, 5 = veldig godt forberedte)

- 4: 1

9 Var forelesningene godt strukturerte og presentert på en klar og forståelig måte? (1 er dårligst, 5 er best)

- 4: 1

10 Bidro foreleserne og undervisningen til å øke din interesse for faget? (1 = ikke i det hele tatt, 5 = i veldig stor grad)

- 5: 5

11 Hvor fornøyd er du med samarbeidet med musikkterapi-emnet MUTP105? (1 er minst fornøyd, 5 er mest fornøyd)

- 2: 1

12 Var kursets oppgaver i tråd med kursets mål? (1 = i liten eller ingen grad, 5 = veldig godt tilpassede oppgaver)

- 4: 1

13 Var kravene og forventningene til oppgavene fremstilt og presentert på en klar måte? (1 = veldig uklart, 5 = veldig bra)

- 4: 1

14 Dette kurset gir 15 studiepoeng. Var det samsvar mellom arbeidsmengde, kursets nivå og antall studiepoeng? (1= ikke samsvar, 5 = godt samsvar)

- 4: 1

15 Er du fornøyd med rom og utstyr? (1 er minst fornøyd, 5 er mest fornøyd)

- 3: 1

16 Fikk du i løpet av kurset tilstrekkelig hjelp og tilbakemelding? (1 = I liten grad, 5 = i stor grad)

- 3: 1

17 Fikk du rask respons på mail eller andre spørsmål stilt utenom selve forelesningene? (1 = i liten grad, 5 = veldig rask respons)

- 4: 4

18 Hvor mye mener du at du har lært i dette emnet? (1 = veldig lite, 5 = veldig mye)

- 4: 1

19 Din samlede vurdering av emnet. (1 = veldig dårlig, 5 = veldig godt)

- 4: 1

20 Her kan du skrive med egne ord hva du likte og ikke likte med kurset, og gi oss tilbakemelding på hva du tenker kunne vært endret til neste gang det blir undervist i dette emnet.

Summary of the students' responses to question 20 (free text comments):

There was only 1 response to this question, but since it thoughtfully addressed substantive issues, it is reproduced here in full:

“Synes undervisningen som foregikk i Stein Rokkans hus var svært god og forelesningene var interessant og godt presentert. Her lærte jeg mye. Samarbeidet med studentene på musikkterapi kunne vært bedre. Undervisningen med dem startet gjerne med at vi kunne rigge til med instrumenter, lyd og lignende, men etter dette var «oppgaven vår» over, og vi ble gjerne sittende i over en time og bare se på, uten noe særlig nytte for studentene i musikkvitenskap. Undervisningen med musikkterapi kunne gjerne vært bedre strukturert så vi kunne få mer nytte og lære av samarbeidet med dem.”

Teachers' comments on the results:

This is the third time this still course has been offered. Some of the suggestions made by students the previous year have been implemented this year, to good effect, though communication between the musicology students and the music therapy students continues to be a challenge. Overall the students seemed satisfied with the course (though there is not an empirical basis to support that assertion, since only 1 student participated in the evaluation survey). The one student who participated in the survey gave high marks (4 or 5 out of 5) to nearly all the questions, a notable exception being the question regarding the cooperation with music therapy (mark of 2 out of 5).