



Procedure for course evaluations

All the faculty's teaching activities are evaluated each semester, including academic internships, outsourced teaching, bachelor projects and master's theses. The results of the ongoing evaluations are reported back to lecturers, students, etc. as part of the quality-assurance process for the teaching.

The purpose of the evaluations is to ensure the quality of teaching and supervision. The quality of the faculty's courses and counselling is mainly developed in dialog between lecturers and students, and in order to promote this dialog, regular evaluations are conducted of courses, projects and theses.

The dean has overall responsibility for evaluations conducted in the faculty.

Head of department and Head of Studies has, in collaboration with the study board is responsible for conducting the actual evaluation, for drawing up course evaluation reports and for publishing reports on the study board website

Course evaluation reports are submitted to the study boards, heads of department and course directors.

The head of department follows up on the evaluations via the annual performance and development review (MUS), and recommends a skills-development programme for the individual member of staff, if relevant. The head of studies is responsible for following up on any points that are produced by the evaluation of courses taught by academic staff.

The study boards are responsible for following up on programme evaluations and course evaluations.

Procedure

Head of department and Head of Studies, in collaboration with the study board draws up an evaluation policy which must be publicly available.

The following should appear from the departmental evaluation policy:

Revised on 25 November 2016

[The Faculty of Humanities Quality Assurance Policy](#)

- Supplementary evaluation methods are used in addition to the minimal required
- Are there any special focus points for course evaluations
- Description of communication with students about the outcome of evaluations and the follow-up
- Description of communication with lecturers about the outcome of evaluations and the follow-up
- How academic internships, bachelor projects and master's theses are evaluated, and how this is integrated into the course evaluation.

During the planning process, the previous evaluation of assessments are reviewed with a view to assessing whether the methods were consistent with the purpose, whether the right questions were asked and whether a different method would have led to better results.

It must be ensured that the students are involved in the process, e.g. when designing the questionnaire used for the teaching evaluation or drafting the course evaluation.

Minimum requirements for evaluation

For all courses:

- All teaching activities are evaluated each time the course is run
- Final written evaluations are compulsory
- Oral mid-point evaluations are also compulsory, but the results are not reported to the study board – only that the evaluation has taken place.

For academic internships, outsourced courses, bachelor projects and master's theses:

- Final written evaluations are compulsory.
- Oral mid-point evaluations are compulsory, but the results are not reported to the study board

Other forms of course evaluation include ones in which two semesters or a full programme are evaluated to find out whether the teaching, academic objectives and exams are in alignment.

Course evaluation reports

The board of studies may set up an ad hoc subcommittees composed of Head of Studies or chair of the study and students) that draw up questions to the evaluation and/or evaluation report based on the final evaluations. The committee can bring in elements from other evaluations (if there have been any).

The study boards draw up an evaluation report for internal use. In the light of this, and the discussions in the study boards, course evaluation reports are prepared for publication. There shall not be published evaluation data that can be traced back to individual lecturers or students.

U&S will prepare a template to be used for the public part of the evaluation report.

Course evaluation reports divide the evaluation material into three categories (A, B and C) on the basis of the below description of the three categories.

- Category A consists of course evaluations that show, in general, that the teaching/subject element functions particularly well and serves as an inspiration to others.
- Category B consists of course evaluations that show, in general, that the teaching/subject element functions satisfactorily.
- Category C consists of evaluations that show, in general, that changes need to be made to the teaching/subject element.

Evaluations in the individual categories may well contain both positive and negative elements, but the categorisation is based on the overall evaluation of the teaching/subject element.

Course evaluation reports begin with the number of evaluations in each category and thoughts about the spread between them.

Each category is then discussed as follows:

- For category A, the focus is on particularly positive experiences during the period concerned
- Category B (the intermediate group, probably the largest of the three) is commented on only in brief.
- For category C discloses
 - What are the points of attention, the evaluations points
 - In continuation thereof, adjustments and other follow-up initiatives they have given or will give rise to.

The course evaluation reports for the next period include:

- Status of follow-up initiatives from the previous evaluation period, possibly on the basis of the complaints/appeals statistics or pass rates in prøvestatistik.
- Initiatives for skills development among teachers.

The report runs to a maximum of three pages.

Follow-up and publication

Teaching evaluations are conducted as part of the department's annual program report.

If serious problems are identified, the head of department and head of studies draw up a follow-up plan.