



13 January 2017

**Report on course evaluations in the  
Faculty of Theology, FS 2016.**

On the whole, the evaluation reports also in this semester reflect satisfaction among both lecturers and students with the courses in the bachelor programme in Theology, as well as the master's programmes in Theology, African Studies (CAS) and the Religious Roots of Europe (RRE).

DIRECT +4535323781  
MOBILE 61711890

*General observations about the evaluation process*

The compiled reports by the lecturers contain a whole range of useful and thought-provoking observations on the individual courses, specific proposals for improvements and comments on elements of the courses that work well. However, as has been the case previously, the method of evaluation varies greatly. Thus there are big differences in terms of how extensive the lecturers' own descriptions are, as well as which forms they use, and whether they have attached the forms. Although this has been stated before, the study boards wish to highlight to the lecturers the general and specific aims of the semester evaluations,

csj@teol.ku.dk

REF: CSJ

and in particular to clarify the background and intention behind evaluation categories A, B and C.

The committee set up by the study boards to revise the evaluation forms had proposed some alternative forms that some of the lecturers used in the spring semester of 2016 (though only to a limited extent).

Once again, it must be said that the students' response rates, with a few exceptions, should be significantly higher. It is still necessary to clarify the importance of their participation in the course evaluations in connection

with the ongoing quality assurance of the Faculty's courses and study programmes.

#### *General observations about the evaluations*

Once again this semester, students and lecturers expressed general satisfaction with the courses on the bachelor programme and the three master's programmes.

In cases where the evaluations appeared to point to specific problems with certain courses and classes, the study boards have taken measures to further uncover and identify any problems in relation to these specific courses and remedy the issues that have been raised in the evaluations and the study boards' subsequent work.

It should be noted that the students' relatively low response rate needs to be taken into account when trying to identify and solve the problems.

#### *Categories A, B and C*

The study boards have again decided to assess the evaluated courses in terms of how the students' and lecturers' expectations have matched up with regard to the courses' general learning outcomes, the relationship between the expected amount of work and the forms and outcomes of the teaching, as well as the relationship between the students' work and the assessment criteria.

**Category A** consists of courses with a high degree of alignment between the students' and lecturers' expectations. The teaching works particularly well, and these courses could serve as a source of inspiration for other lecturers and students.

**Category B** consists of courses where expectations align, and the teaching is satisfactory.

**Category C** consists of courses where both lecturers and students express substantial dissatisfaction with the course – or parts of it. These courses require special attention and a significant degree of adaptation to address the problems identified in the evaluations. Follow-up work includes offers of coaching in pedagogy and/or specific adaptations of the course objectives and learning objectives for the specific course in question.

In summary, it can be concluded that by far the majority of the evaluated courses fall into category B.

The courses that have been placed in category C have been discussed by the study boards with a view to following up on the problems. For this semester, one course has been placed in category C. The Faculty of Theology's study board has asked the relevant department for a description of the planning of the course and an account of whether the relationship between the academic objectives, the teaching and the exam could be made clearer to the students. The report was subsequently discussed at a study board meeting and the study board found no reason to take any further action.

### *Conclusion*

In summary, the course evaluations paint a picture of general satisfaction among lecturers and students. Also this semester, the evaluation work bears witness to serious preparation, pedagogic commitment and persistent efforts to improve courses and teaching methods so that they support the students' academic development.

In the semester since the last evaluation (ES15), the Faculty has continued its pedagogical development activities through specially planned pedagogical meetings.

Best regards,

Carsten Selch Jensen

Associate Dean and Head of Studies, associate professor, PhD