

## Periodic evaluation form of courses IPED

Please fill out the form and send it to the administrative coordinator of the course.

Course	EDU4100
Semester	Autumn 2017
Lecturer/responsible for the course	Teklu Abate Bekele
Time for final evaluation	21 September 2017
How did you carry out the periodic evaluation?	Students preferred to write their feedback.
How many students took part in this evaluation?	21
<b>The students experience of the following points:</b>	
*Study information	They generally indicated with study information. Some suggested to have all the information well before semester start.
*Teaching start and implementation of the course	The course started with an introduction to the field of Comparative and International Education and associated theories/paradigms. That was followed by discussion of globalization and education, and social change and the role of education. As some students do have backgrounds in other disciplines, they seemed to have some trouble grasping the concepts quickly. The fact that teaching time was cut down to five days from seven contributed to the challenge: some felt overwhelmed by the amount of reading.
*Lessons/teaching, teaching plan and learning environment	Various methods such as lectures with discussions, individual reflections, group works and presentations, guest lectures and class exercises were used. PowerPoints that highlighted fundamental concepts were constantly posted in Fronter. To operationalize complex theories and perspectives, country examples were brought in. An environment was created so that everyone felt accommodated and was free to ask any question and/or to offer any feedback about course progression. Students were found to be satisfied with these arrangements. They in addition asked for more lecture hours, more guest lectures, and more small group discussions. They also suggested that the PowerPoints be more detailed.
*The content of the course (level and relevance in connection to the course aims)	They found the content interesting and challenging. Some struggled to demonstrate the learning outcomes specified, such as those

	related to critical/analytic thinking and writing.
*Assessment	The assessment was designed to evaluate students' understandings, skills and competencies. Generally, the home assignments indicated that they did well in relation to the first learning outcome: knowledge of theories and paradigms. Some however were challenged in relation to the other outcomes: skill of identifying areas that need study and demonstrate that in writing. Students also suggested to have the home exam at course start so that could think over it in good time. Some suggested to have a more traditional type of school exam that is too specific and focuses on content mastery.
*The students' individual effort	Students were generally engaged in various ways. They participated in class discussions, group works and presentations. Some students however were reserved and passive during discussions. The lecturer approached them and inquired them about their learning style and course pace. It was found that they were used to that kind of approach to their learning and hence it was not easy for them to come expressive and discussant in class. However, there were some students who were not ready for class: they did not read the literature and expected everything from the lectures.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
*Suggestions for changes (the students and the teachers)	Generally, being an introductory course, EDU4100 seemed to enable students to have a basic understanding of core issues that cut across education, society and development. The challenge was related to the pace of the course. As indicated above, the course was originally planned to have seven days, four hours each. Due to administrative requirements, teaching time was cut down to five days. That created a sense of rushness in students, as covering all the topics was found seminal for meaningfully attending the next course, EDU4110. As a consequence, the lecturer painfully cut short very interesting debates and discussions. In this sense, I agree with students, that a lot complex ideas were covered in a limited amount of time. A bit more lectures and small group

	<p>discussions could have been more satisfying.</p> <p>I also agree with students with regard to the need to announce exam questions at course start. That will give them adequate time to reflect and to ask for more clarifications and guidance from the lecturer. It may also motivate students to more systematically attend to lectures and group works- learning would be like a quest for getting solutions for the problems/questions posed.</p>
<p>*Reasons for not doing changes that students have suggested</p>	<p>It was not found to be realistic to invite more guest lecturers in a course that runs just for five days.</p> <p>The PowerPoints could not be any detailed, as the purpose is not to present in detail what is available in the readings but to highlight significant ideas that can stimulate class discussions. Students are supposed read the syllabus in their own and during their group works.</p> <p>The idea/suggestion of having a more traditional type of school exam that is too specific and which focuses on content mastery does not appear consonant with course objectives/learning outcomes. Rather, students need to be further supported to improve on their skills and competencies. As writing involves critical, reflective and analytic thinking, it is suggested to make the academic writing course mandatory for everybody. That way, it can be ensured that all students do attend to it seriously and have at least the basic competencies required.</p>

Signature (academic staff): .....  .....

