

Rapport fra «Student Evaluation of SVF-8054 Theory of Science Autumn 2018»

Innhentede svar pr. 11. januar 2019 10:26

- Leverte svar: **12**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **23**

Med fritekstsvar

The result of this evaluation will be used to improve over studies.

Questions concerning the common lectures given in week 37

Svar fordelt på antall

	Bad	Average	Good	Very good	Excellent
How were the lectures structured? *	4	5	3	0	0
Did the lectures reflect the course readings? *	4	0	7	1	0
How would you rate the lecturer-student communication? *	4	2	5	1	0
Did you find the course readings interesting and relevant? *	4	4	2	2	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	Bad	Average	Good	Very good	Excellent
How were the lectures structured? *	33,3 %	41,7 %	25 %	0 %	0 %
Did the lectures reflect the course readings? *	33,3 %	0 %	58,3 %	8,3 %	0 %
How would you rate the lecturer-student communication? *	33,3 %	16,7 %	41,7 %	8,3 %	0 %
Did you find the course readings interesting and relevant? *	33,3 %	33,3 %	16,7 %	16,7 %	0 %

Questions concerning the seminars:

Svar fordelt på antall

	Bad	Average	Good	Very good	Excellent
How were the lectures structured? *	0	3	7	1	1
Did the lectures reflect the course readings? *	2	3	4	2	1
How would you rate the lecturer-student communication? *	0	1	5	4	3
Did you find the course readings interesting and relevant? *	2	4	2	3	1

Svar fordelt på prosent

	Bad	Average	Good	Very good	Excellent
How were the lectures structured? *	0 %	25 %	58,3 %	8,3 %	8,3 %
Did the lectures reflect the course readings? *	16,7 %	25 %	33,3 %	16,7 %	8,3 %
How would you rate the lecturer-student communication? *	0 %	8,3 %	41,7 %	33,3 %	25 %
Did you find the course readings interesting and relevant? *	16,7 %	33,3 %	16,7 %	25 %	8,3 %

Did the content of the course meet your expectations?

- No
- Parts of it
- No
- Nope
- No
- yes
- Yes, it did.
- Yes
- No, I was suprised over the amount of lectures that was given and I missed discussions/participatory reflections during the first session
- no
- Not really, since we didn't get to know central theorists and their theories.
- Yes

Did you find the course relevant for your your work on your PhD thesis?

- Very little

- I found some parts relevant and interesting, but I missed a more explicit focus on different epistemologies and methodologies.
- No
- Yes, in one way or another
- Not much
- yes
- Yes, I did.
- Yes, but for the paper we were advised not to write with our thesis in mind.
- Yes
- not really
- sadly, no. I really had higher expectations about both the syllabus and the seminars.
- Yes

Please state the three most important things that you have learned as a result of participating in this course:

- (1) Some of Gadamer's theory, (2) some phenomenology, (3) Some history of science
- The value of reflecting on my own scientific position. The link between science and philosophy. To be more curious about learning outcome
- Fluency in ontology/epistemology terms.
- philosophy
- Understanding my own field better.
- John Searle's theory on language, tips for theorizing, working on terminology
- to question the methodological, epistemological and ontological assumptions that plays out in my research
- sorry, no
- While reading the course literature I have learned what some philosophical phenomena which I occasionally stumble upon in literature mean.

Which parts of this course (if any), did you enjoy the most? Please specify.

- The last specialization part
- The specialization part.
- Partly the specialization seminar in social science
- Seminar discussions.
- Seminar
- The seminars.
- Giving and receiving feedback on the paper was rewarding.
- The last session with student presentations, gave insight to the different ways on how to use the theory
- the session when we gave feedback to each other.
- Nothing in particular.

Which parts of this course (if any) did you enjoy the least? Please specify.

- The general part. Because I was already familiar with most of the stuff that was taken up
- The common lectures and the specialization lecture the 18. of october
- Writing paper draft. It was like being forced to write poetry in an unknown language
- Day two the first week
- The pre-course assignment, which we were told that most of us had misunderstood, in retrospect seemed like a waste of everyone's time.
- The first session, it was interesting but very compact and unstructured lectures
- more structural: the irrelevant reading list and the non-existing link between the syllabus and the lectures
- Common part very dry, quite difficult to follow for someone without previous knowledge.

Do you have other suggestions for improving the course?

- Changing the teaching language to the teachers native language
- The specialization part should be expanded, and the general part should be shortened. The general part is just too general to be that useful to most people
- Være mer tydelig på læringsutbytte i de ulike delene av kurset. Mer sammenheng mellom de ulike delene av kurset. Vurdere å tenke nytt om fellesdelen. Eksempelvis vurdere nettbaserte løsninger for å presentere viktige klassikere innen filosofi, presentert av flere innledere. Vurdere å dele kurset inn i en engelsk del og en norskspråklig del. Det sistnevnte handler om å forbedre læringsutbytte.
- There was a mismatch between course teachers' expectations for the paper (it should be completely elevated above our projects), and paper seminar discussants (advised us to start out with descriptions of our projects) . And, information online about requirements for paper, required reading/hand in of reading list
- Make sure the readingslists are available for the students and for all students before the course starts
- Make the pre-course assignment impossible to misunderstand and secure it's relevance to the course.
- I missed a reflection/discussion on the course readings, for me it was challenging to make use of the syllabus in the paper. Maybe a discussion on an article/chapter/book can be used as a starting point for discussing the theory of science and make it clearer to the student how to take a stand on the different issues that are related to the objectives of the course?
- 1) Stop saying "real sciences" alongside "social sciences" - social sciences ARE real sciences. 2) [REDACTED] Furthermore, the emphasis he places on reductionism and neuroscience as the true answer to social sciences is an incomplete portrayal of social scientific theories and demotivating to social science students. 3) If the content doesn't extend to fit the time allotted, don't throw out bullshit questions like "Does free will exist?" just to make us stay the entire time. Let us go early and get to work on our readings/papers. 4) There are a multitude more readings that are relevant to ontologies/epistemologies/axiologies/methodologies in social sciences than were listed on the reading list. Please enlarge the list of acceptable readings. 5) If the purpose of the general sessions is to deal with the overarching themes, then point those out!
- do a total transformation and re-think the course as a whole. More well known theorists and give us help to both understand and use them.
- No

Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema (v534_0rc1)