



26 May 2016

**Report on course evaluations  
FACULTY OF THEOLOGY, ES 2015.**

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

*General observations about the evaluation process*

The compiled lecturers' reports 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. Some of them are submitted on forms with response rates, others look something like essays. The focus also ranges from the very general to the highly detailed and specific.

The study boards have discussed the potential problematic fact that the lecturers on the individual courses are also responsible for the whole evaluation process, including writing up the students' input. The question of the method of evaluation and the frameworks for them is being discussed by a special committee (joint committee for Theology and CAS), which will draw up proposals for improvements.

As part of the discussions in the study boards, it must again be noted that student response rates have again been relatively low this semester for several of the course evaluations and that this makes the work on developing courses more challenging. The committee's proposals for revising the method of evaluation are expected to improve the response rate.

*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.

DIRECT +4535323781  
MOBILE 61711890

csj@teol.ku.dk

REF: CSJ

The automatic registration system once again proves that there is a significant difference between the number of students who register for a course and the number who attend classes and take part. This, of course, has a knock-on effect on the response rate for the evaluations, which is relatively low.

As mentioned above, the study boards have set up a joint committee to review specific methods of evaluation, including the use of the standardised questionnaires, and are expected soon to be in a position to propose a new method of evaluation, the form and content of which is better suited to the needs of both lecturers and students.

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

As previously, the study boards decided to use the degree of alignment between students' and lecturers' mutual expectations as the benchmark for the evaluations:

Category A consists of courses with a high degree of alignment. The teaching works particularly well, and the 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 thereof – and expectations are particularly badly misaligned. These courses require special attention and a significant degree of adaptation to address the problems identified. Follow-up work includes offers of coaching in pedagogy and/or specific adaptations to the course objectives and learning objectives for the specific course in question.

#### *Conclusion*

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

Yours sincerely,

Associate Professor Carsten Selch Jensen PhD  
Associate Dean and Head of Studies