

## Midway Evaluation, ANTH4150, spring 2022

The course was evaluated using an online form where students were asked to rank the course on several indicators, on a scale from 1 to 7. Students also had the option of offering general comments to the course in plain text. Few students availed of this latter option. In all, seven out of 23 active students filled in the form, that is, approximately 30%.

The evaluation is overwhelmingly positive, and oftentimes very positive. This can be seen below where we list the average score on each indicator, as well as the number of maximum scores (seven) per indicator:

How useful have you found the curriculum?

5.43 (three sevens)

Although the curriculum has been referred to and lectured on in class, it has largely functioned as background readings. How well do you think this has worked?

6 (two sevens)

How useful have you found the two workshops?

6.14 (two sevens)

How useful have you found the guest lectures?

6 (two sevens)

How useful have you found the course convener's two recorded lectures?

6.14 (four sevens)

How useful have you found the group-based discussions of draft reflection papers?

6.29 (five sevens)

How useful have you found the course convener's feedback to draft reflection papers?

7 (seven sevens)

The course convener has delivered some in-class and recorded lectures, but has otherwise played a slightly more withdrawn role, in order to give space to guest lectures from outside academia. How well do you think this has functioned?

6.57 (four sevens)

How would you rank your own level of preparation and active participation?

5.29 (one seven)

How would you rank your fellow students' level of preparation and active participation?

5.43 (two sevens)

How would you rank the course convener's level of preparation and engagement?

6.71 (five sevens)

To what extent has the course lived up to your expectations?

6.29 (four sevens)

To what extent has the course addressed the learning outcome of the course?

6.57 (five sevens)

How satisfied are you overall with the course?

6.29 (five sevens)

On most indicators, the score is above six, indicating a high level of satisfaction. The score is somewhat lower on student engagement and preparation, and on the curriculum. The latter is in line with the course convenor's own impression this year, namely that there was perhaps too much overlap between two of the assigned books, and that one of them may be replaced next time the course is offered. That said, there of seven respondents gave the curriculum the maximum score of seven, indicating overall satisfaction and that major changes are not required.

The comparably lower (but still relatively high) scores on student engagement and preparation indicates that pedagogical innovations may be in order, so that more space is created for active student engagement. However, this year the midway evaluation (as well as the analysis of data) was unfortunately carried out with some delay due to a prolonged period of corona virus infections in the course convener's family. This means that few corrective measures were implemented this year. Instead, the important input on the curriculum and student engagement will be taken into consideration when planning the course for 2023.