

# Emneevaluering / course evaluation ISV

Updated: 10 June 2024 at 9:56

Submission ID: 32104250

Delivered: 10.06.24 09:13

## Navn / name \*

Navn til emneansvarlig  
Elin Lerum Boasson

## Velg kursnivå \*

Masterkurs

## Bare for Master: velg blokk

Blokk 1

## Emnekode / course code \*

STV4424

## Emnenavn / Course title

Climate, Energy and Environmental Governance

## Semester \*

Vår

## Emnerapport / course report \*

Evaluation STV4424 spring 2024

Evaluation written by Elin Lerum Boasson, based on discussions with Yves, feedback from the 15 students who evaluated the course during the last class and written feedback form one student.

The students got okay grades from this course, but unlike what tends to be the case we did not give any As. The lack of eager A-students probably also contributed to make the lectures less fun, as it was very hard to engage the students.

### Readings and lectures

Students are overall pleased with the readings, but underline that the content is challenging, especially for students who have little prior knowledge about climate governance. Students highlight that the first readings for the first lecture was too difficult, and we should probably consider to move some of the readings to later lectures.

The final term papers also indicate that many students struggle with getting a good overview of the course. Students call for more empirical examples. They also complain that it took too long before they understood what the course was all about, but this is maybe just a normal learning curve.

### Group work

We had changed the obligatory activity (writing a group report on the strategy of an actor in a real world case). In 2023, we had two external presenters talking in general terms about how to influence climate governance, and then the students choose a topic. Now, the students where all faced with the same case, and three external presentors talked about how they worked with this case. The student groups where assigned an organization, and then they developed a memo that explained the strategy of this actor and came up with suggestions for improvements. They where given a quite detailed memo on how to work with the case, with much more specified ground conditions than before.

Students suggest having a mingling with the presenters after the events, so that they can 'interview' them, focusing more specifically on 'their' organization. This is probably a good idea, as very few students asked the presenters questions.

Students highlight that they learned a lot during the group work. The group work reports where much better

Students highlight that they learned a lot during the group work. The group work reports were much better than in 2023, so the changes seemed to help the students. Still, we had some challenges. The guest lecture session on the case (light commercial vehicles) worked well, although the guests talked too little about how they worked and more about their positions. According to the students, they liked that the group was given an actor, and did not have to choose their own case and actor. Some students asked for the group work memo to be even more specific. We should try to see if it is possible to improve it, but probably that is not possible.

Some students ask us for approving the research question for the group work, and this is maybe a good idea, we need to consider whether we have the time to do this.

Summary of the group work reports:

- All groups answered a specific question
- But few developed a narrow, clear, interesting question
- All groups describe the role of 'your' organization
- But more weight given to its position than to its strategy
- All groups to some extent assessed the quality of some aspect of the organization
- Still, the students failed to specify whether they assessed the actors' position, strategy, actual work, and/or performance
- Students could have used the course readings more actively
- You failed to develop criteria that could be used to assess the positions, strategy and/or actual work of 'your' organization
- Most of you related shallowly to too much theory
- All groups suggested improvements
- But not 2 – 4 specific improvements, as was asked for in the memo.
- Most suggestions for improvement were unclear
- The language was not great – why not use ChatGPT?
- Few metaphors, figures and/or tables
- It was clear from most group reports that the groups had not collaborated very intimately when working with them, there were inconsistencies and overlaps in the text.

Examination: Term papers

Some students reports that the term paper seminar worked very well, but ask for an example of a term paper, example of good research question. From the teachers' point of view, at least one of the seminars where less vibrant than what they normally are. It was not easy to get these students talking! Another student suggests doing the seminars twice, with a brief discussion on the theme first and then a more thorough discussion later on. Doubt that we have the time for this.

Several students highlight that having the group work overlapping with the term paper was not good, they suggest having the group work a bit earlier, and rather have the students working very intensively on this. It is not clear that this is possible, we probably must have some overlap.

Some students underline that it was nice to have a lot of time to write the term paper after the lecture is done.

The term papers show that quite a lot of the students struggle with understanding what the memo on the term papers actually entails. Few actually do what this memo prescribe them to do. We maybe need to add more about academic writing to the lectures themselves. It is especially hard for students to understand differences between using theory to examine causal relationships, and to use them more descriptively.

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

1. Vurdering av emnet
  - Læringsutbytte i emnet
  - Undervisningsformer og organisering
  - Andre relevante temaer som læringsmiljø, studentenes arbeidsinnsats og eventuelt vurderingsformer
2. Studentens tilbakemelding
  - Oppsummering av studentenes viktigste tilbakemeldinger
3. Helhetlig vurdering og videreutvikling
  - En samlet vurdering av kvaliteten på emnet
  - Justeringer som er foretatt som følge av evalueringen.
  - Muligheter for videreutvikling av emnet

The course evaluation should include:

1. Assessment of the course
  - Learning outcomes in the course
  - Teaching methods and organization
  - Other relevant topics such as the learning environment, students' effort and possibly forms of assessment
2. Student's feedback
  - Summary of students' most important feedback
3. Overall assessment and further development
  - An overall assessment of the quality of the course
  - Adjustments made as a result of the evaluation.
  - Opportunities for further development of the course