



## Møteinnkalling

Utvalg: **Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet**  
Møtested: SVHUM Møterom/styrerom A2021, Campus Tromsø  
Møtedato: 25.02.2020  
Tidspunkt: 09:15-11:30

Eventuelt forfall må meldes snarest på epost til Olav Skare ([olav.skare@uit.no](mailto:olav.skare@uit.no)) med kopi til Mayvi B. Johansen ([mayvi.johansen@uit.no](mailto:mayvi.johansen@uit.no)). Vararepresentanter møter etter nærmere beskjed.

**Saksliste**

<i>Saksnr</i>	<i>Tittel/beskrivelse</i>	<i>U.off.</i>	<i>Arkivref.</i>
<b>Orienteringssaker</b>			
OS 1/20	Referat og meldinger - Ph.d.-utvalgets møte 25. februar 2020	X	2020/967
<b>Ordinære saker</b>			
PHD-U 1/20	Etablering av nytt obligatorisk ph.d.-emne i forskningsformidling		2020/555
PHD-U 2/20	Innmelding av ph.d.-emner ved HSL-fakultetet høst 2020 og vår 2021		2020/555
PHD-U 3/20	Emneevaluering av emnet SVF-8054 Theory of Science høsten 2019		2019/727
PHD-U 4/20	Emneevaluering av emnet HIF-8100 Litteratur og medisin (ISK) høsten 2019		2019/727
	Eventuelt		

## **Orienteringssaker**

**OS 1/20 Referat og meldinger - Ph.d.-utvalgets møte 25. februar 2020  
2020/967**

## SAKSFRAMLEGG

---

Til:  
Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet

Møtedato:  
25.02.2020

Sak:  
1/20

---

### Etablering av nytt obligatorisk ph.d.-emne i forskningsformidling

#### Innstilling til vedtak:

Emnene SVH-8001 Research dissemination (5 stp.) og SVF-8002 Forskningsformidling (5 stp.) opprettes. Emnene overlapper hverandre og vil fra og med høsten 2020 tilbys hvert semester, med engelsk som undervisningsspråk på høsten (SVH-8001) og norsk som undervisningsspråk på våren (SVH-8002). De gamle emnene i formidling; SVF-8048 og SVF-8049 legges ned fra og med høsten 2020. AHR bli gitt det faglige ansvaret for emnet og fakultetet blir gitt det administrativt ansvaret. Det faglige ansvaret kan rullere mellom de største instituttene på fakultetet.

#### Bakgrunn:

I ph.d.-utvalgets møte 12. juni 2018 ble det vedtatt at fakultetets to obligatoriske emner i forskningskommunikasjon (SVF-8048 og SVF-8049) skal slås sammen til ett emne på 5 studiepoeng. Emnet skal tilbys hvert semester og alternere mellom å undervises på engelsk og norsk. I ph.d.-utvalgets møte 8. oktober 2019 ble det vedtatt at prodekan forskning skulle oppnevne en gruppe til å utvikle det nye emnet og gi gruppen et mandat.

Prodekan Ann Therese Lotherington oppnevnte i desember, 2019 følgende gruppe: Mariann Solberg (ILP) (leder), Sigrun Høgetveit Berg (AHR), Øystein Vangsnes (ISK), Gillian Ramchand (ISK), Elin Haugdal (ISK), Brynhild Granås (IRN), Torjer Olsen (SESAM) og Nina N. Anda.

#### Mandat

Gruppen ble gitt følgende mandat:

- *Utarbeide ny emnebeskrivelse som rommer både akademisk forskningskommunikasjon og populærvitenskapelig formidling.*
  - o *Emnet legges opp slik at stipendiatene vil forstå betydningen av å inkludere kunnskap om de ulike mottakerne når de skal kommunisere og formidle fra sitt forskningsarbeid.*
  - o *Emnet må tilpasses en ramme på 5 studiepoeng.*
  - o *Emnet skal ha en engelsk og en norsk versjon.*
- *Ta følgende i betraktning i utarbeidelsen av emnebeskrivelsen:*
  - o *Erfaringene fra gjennomføringen av de to emnene de siste to årene*

- *Om emnet HIF-8008 (5 stp) som i dag tas av lingvistikk-studentene kan erstattes av dette nye emnet.*
- *Om, og eventuelt på hvilken måte, High North Academys «Courses in Communicating Science» kan erstatte hele/deler av SVF 8048/9. Det dreier seg om:*
  - *FSK-8002 Scientific writing (3 ECTS) (emnet overlapper i dag med SVF-8049)*
  - *GEN-8007 Coping with media (1 ECTS)*
  - *GEN-8010 Visualizing your science (3 ECTS)*
- *Vurdere hvordan emnet mest hensiktsmessig bør organiseres.*
  - *Emnet skal tilbys alle stipendiater på HSL-fak., og en mulig modell kan være at ett institutt tar emneansvaret, inkludert koordinering av undervisningen, mens (dette og) andre institutter bidrar med undervisning. Det kan for eksempel opprettes et team som blir enige om en altemneringsordning som vil passe den aktuelle stipendiatmassen og de involverte fagmiljøene.*
- *Foreslå emneansvarlig institutt og fordeling av undervisningsoppgaver mellom andre deltakende institutt.*

### **Emnebeskrivelsen**

Gruppen har samarbeidet godt og stiller seg samlet bak den nye emnebeskrivelsen til SVH-8001 Forskningsformidling (5 stp.)/SVH-8002 Research dissemination (5 stp.). Det nye emnet overlapper 100 % med de to foregående emnene SVF-8048 Allmennrettet forskningsformidling (3 stp.) og SVF-8049 Vitenskapelig forskningskommunikasjon (2 stp.). Emnet overlapper også 100 % med HIF-8008 Professional Skills in Linguistics (5 stp.) som fortsatt vil bli tilbudt av ISK.

### **Undervisningen i emnet**

Undervisningen skal dekke både vitenskapelig og allmennrettet formidling, og det legges opp til ulike undervisningsformer som forelesninger, seminar, gruppearbeid og øvelser. Gruppen foreslår at man hovedsakelig baserer seg på at undervisningen gis av vitenskapelig ansatte i både samfunnsvitenskapelige og humanistiske fag ved UiT, med unntak av tema som krever særlig bakgrunn som journalist eller lignende. En bør tilstrebe at fakultetets ulike fagtradisjoner og vitenskapelige orienteringer er representert. Emnet er hovedsakelig praktisk rettet, og legger vekt på arbeid med formidling i mange ulike formater, som abstract, poster, miniforedrag etc. Studentene vil benytte egen forskning som utgangspunkt for arbeid med de ulike formatene.

### **Organisering av emnet**

Emnet skal tilbys hvert semester. Emnet vil bli tilbudt på engelsk i høstsemesteret og på norsk i vårsemesteret. Emnet vil bestå av to samlinger over to dager. I forkant av den første samlingen skal studentene levere et arbeidskrav og i mellom de to samlingene skal studentene jobbe med arbeidskrav.

Strukturen på undervisningen vil i stor grad bli farget av arbeidskravene som emnet inneholder. Emneansvarlig vil selv kunne få velge hvilke som det skal fokuseres på semester for semester, og kun et utvalg av arbeidskravene vil være obligatoriske. Tanken bak dette er at gruppen vil at den/de som skal undervise emnet i noen grad skal kunne velge selv hva de vil fokusere på. Dette vil gjøre det enklere for flere å kunne undervise et og samme emne.

Eksamensformen for emnet vil være en mappeevaluering der et utvalg av obligatoriske og valgfrie arbeidskrav skal leveres.

### **Bruk av generiske emner fra High North Academy**

Gruppen har diskutert om emner tilbudt av High North Academy kan erstatte deler av det nye emnet. Gruppen er enig i at obligatoriske emner i opplæringsdelen til studentene vanskelig kan erstattes av andre emner fra andre fakultet og enheter, og at de heller ikke kan erstattes av rent generiske emner. Dette fordi et emne i forskningsformidling på dette nivået bør ta utgangspunkt i de konkrete disiplinene og fagtradisjonene som studentene står i. Læringsmålene til ph.d.-programmet i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap samt Nasjonalt kvalifikasjonsrammeverk for livslang læring legger begrensninger på hvilket innhold og akademisk nivå emnene i opplæringsdelen til studentene skal ha. Videre har Ph.d.-utvalget ved flere anledninger uttalt at ph.d.-studenter ved HSL-fak ikke kan bruke generiske emner som del av opplæringsdelen sin. Det eneste unntaket til dette er i dag emnet GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey (2 stp.) som HSL-fak er administrativt ansvarlig for.

### **Emneansvar**

Det administrative ansvaret for emnet bør som før legges til fakultetet. Det faglige ansvaret bør legges til et av fakultets større institutt, og ansvaret bør kunne rullere med jevne mellomrom. Det er viktig at ingen får et privat eierskap til dette emnet slik at flere vil kunne være emneansvarlige og undervise i emnet. Gruppen foreslår også at det oppnevnes en referansegruppe av engasjerte vitenskapelig ansatte med en interesse for formidling.

Gruppen foreslår at AHR blir gitt ansvar for emnet de første årene.

Gruppen foreslår at det oppnevnes en referansegruppe som i utgangspunktet består av de medlemmene som har vært med på å utarbeide emnebeskrivelsen: Brynhild Granås, Torjer Olsen, Sigrun Høgetveit Berg, Mariann Solberg og Øystein Vangsnes. Referansegruppen vil også kunne spørres om å bidra inn i undervisningen.

Olav Skare  
seksjonsleder

Nina Norum Anda  
rådgiver

vedlegg:  
SVH-8001 Research dissemination  
SVH-8002 Forskningsformidling

*Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur*

HSL Faculty, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, 8.2.2017	<b>TEMPLATE FOR COURSE DESCRIPTIONS, THE HSL FACULTY</b> <b>Please see explanation to each point below.</b> The template is based on requirements for modules within the UiT quality system.
<b>Name</b>	Bokmål: Forskningsformidling Nynorsk: Forskningsformidling English: Research dissemination
<b>Course code and level</b>	SVH-8001
<b>Type of course</b>	The course may be taken as a single course.
<b>Scope of course</b>	5 credits
<b>Required / recommended previous knowledge</b>	<p>PhD students or holders of a Norwegian Master's Degree of five years or 3+ 2 years (or equivalent) may be admitted. PhD students must upload a document from their university stating that they are registered PhD students.</p> <p>Holders of a Master's Degree must upload a Master's Diploma with Diploma Supplement / English translation of the diploma. Applicants from listed countries must document proficiency in English. To find out if this applies to you see the following list:  <a href="http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Utenlandsk_utdannin_g/GSULista/2016/GSU_list_English_14112016.pdf">http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Utenlandsk_utdannin_g/GSULista/2016/GSU_list_English_14112016.pdf</a></p> <p>For more information on accepted English proficiency tests and scores, as well as exemptions from the English proficiency tests, please see the following document:  <a href="https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf">https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf</a></p> <p>Maximum total enrolment is 15. Admission to the course will be prioritized according to the following list:</p> <p>Category 1: Students admitted to the PhD program at UiT in the HSL Faculty</p> <p>Category 2: Participants in the Associate Professor Program who fulfil the educational requirements</p> <p>Category 3: PhD students from other universities.</p> <p>Category 4: Others who meet the minimum Masters degree requirement (or the equivalent) in a humanities or social sciences subject.</p> <p>If there are more than 15 PhD students from HSL who apply, students who are furthest along in their studies will be prioritized. Students who do not have Norwegian as their first language will be prioritized for admission to the English version of the course held in the autumn. Minimum total participants is 10.</p>
<b>Course contents</b>	<p>This course is designed to prepare students for engagement in competent and responsible research dissemination, directed towards the challenges for PhD students and researchers in the humanities and social sciences in particular. Hands-on practice based on the participant's own research will form the starting point for theoretical reflection.</p> <p>Communication of one's own research is an integral part of scientific endeavour and the dissemination of research results within one's field is a prerequisite for scientific progress. In addition, research is also part of the society it emerges from, and both the university and the individual researcher have a duty to make that research accessible to the general public.</p>

	<p>Research dissemination is a complex activity that takes place in a range of situation types, relationships and contexts, and can give rise to ethical challenges and questions of best practice. Mode of dissemination varies according to the particular audience, and encompasses many different formats and media. All kinds of dissemination, whether within one's own academic peer group or outwards to the general public, require a broad understanding of the distinct requirements of different genres and the expectations of one's audience. In addition, the priorities and implementational choices a researcher makes in the dissemination process is a major component of their own identity as a researcher.</p> <p>The course takes the above characteristics as a starting point, and develops them in the context of the different disciplinary strands within humanistic and social scientific research. It will form a foundational support for the individual's future development as a communicator of their own research.</p>
<b>Learning outcomes</b>	<p>The students have the following learning outcomes:</p> <p><b>Knowledge</b> The student has knowledge of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The university's and the researcher's social duties and responsibilities with regard to dissemination</li> <li>•The norms of academic honesty, factual argumentation, and scientific discussion</li> <li>•The different genres, formats and platforms for dissemination in both the scientific and general public domains.</li> <li>•The criteria for successful and responsible research dissemination in different genres and forums, and for different audiences.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills</b> The student is able to / can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate their research through written, spoken and visual modes of expression.</li> <li>• Take part in interviews and conversations about their own research</li> <li>• Adapt their research communication to different media and audiences</li> <li>• Take part as an academic expert in public debate.</li> <li>• Take part in academic debate within their field at the national and international levels</li> </ul> <p><b>Competence</b> The student is able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct and organize actual forms of dissemination for research projects.</li> <li>• Evaluate and reflect upon their own research communication and that of others.</li> <li>• Communicate research and development work with academic integrity, through established national and international channels.</li> <li>• Recognize and express the ways in which their research has an effect on, relevance for, and connection to society.</li> </ul>
<b>Relevance in the degree program</b>	The course satisfies the research dissemination requirement in the course component of the PhD program in the humanities and social sciences faculty at UiT
<b>Teaching and working methods</b> Teaching methods, scope and frequency should be described. Also provide information about the	<p>Teaching will consist of lectures, seminars, group work and practical exercises, directed towards issues in both discipline-specific and general public dissemination.</p> <p>The course will take place over a total of 4 whole days, divided between two separate sessions. The first of the required tasks for the course will be delivered before the first meeting. Other tasks will be completed in class, while yet others</p>

number of lectures / classes.	will be completed by the student in the time period in between the two class meetings.
<b>Practice</b>	
<b>Quality assurance of the course</b>	All courses will be evaluated once during the period of the study program. The board of the program will decide which courses will be evaluated by students and teacher each year.
<b>Coursework</b> The required coursework must be clear and feasible. Keep the scope of the course in mind.	<p>The following coursework requirements must be completed and approved in order to take the final exam:</p> <p>Obligatory Pre-Assignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft presentation of the student's own research, designed for a general audience, 1000 characters max. (about half a page), to be handed in before the first meeting.</li> </ul> <p>At least 3 of the following tasks must be completed and approved in order to qualify for final assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• draft abstract of an article (300 words)</li> <li>• draft of a scientific/academic poster</li> <li>• draft book review or peer review of an article.</li> <li>• draft newspaper article, blog article, or microblog series</li> <li>• short oral presentation (including the subsequent submission of written material—handout or slide show, notes etc), or recording of a podcast</li> <li>• participation in an interview.</li> </ul> <p>Tasks completed will undergo mutual evaluation in smaller groups based on given criteria, and under the guidance of an experienced researcher.</p>
<b>Assessment and exam</b>	<p>The exam will consist of a submitted portfolio containing a choice of 3 of the previously submitted tasks, together with a summary of in class peer evaluations and the student's own self- evaluation (reflection over the strengths and weaknesses of their own work, based on given recognized criteria).</p> <p>At least one of the submitted tasks should be directed towards a general audience, and one directed towards a discipline-specific audience.</p> <p>The exam will be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis.</p>
<b>Retake</b>	Retake is offered in the beginning of the following semester in cases of Fail. Deferred examination is offered at the beginning of the following semester if the student is unable to take the final exam due to illness or other exceptional circumstances. Registration deadline for retake is January 15 for autumn semester exams and August 15 for spring semester exams.
<b>Syllabus</b>	Roughly 400 pages. The course is has a strong practical orientation with less emphasis on readings. It contains extensive individual work in the form of exercises in practical communication, combined with written reflection on the communication process itself.
<b>Language of instruction and examination</b>	Teaching will take place in Norwegian in the Fall semester, and in English in the Spring semester. The language for the exam is Norwegian, another Scandinavian language, or English.

<b>Navn</b>	Bokmål: Forskningsformidling Nynorsk: Forskningsformidling English: Research dissemination
<b>Emnekode og emnenivå</b>	SVH-8002
<b>Emnetype</b>	Emnet kan tas som enkeltemne.
<b>Omfang</b>	5 studiepoeng
<b>Opptakskrav</b>	<p>Ph.d.-studenter og deltakere i førstelektorprogrammet ved UiT som har avlagt mastergrad kan søke opptak. Gyldig dokumentasjon er en bekreftelse fra din utdanningsinstitusjon på at du er aktiv ph.d.-student inneværende studieår. Deltakere i førstelektorprogrammet må dokumentere at de har avlagt mastergrad på fem år eller 3 +3 år (eller tilsvarende) for å være kvalifiserte søkere.</p> <p>Maksimum antall deltakere er 15. Opptak foretas etter følgende prioritering:  Kategori 1: Personer som er tatt opp på ph.d.-program ved UiT i humanistiske og samfunnsvitenskapelige fag  Kategori 2: Deltakere på førstelektorprogrammet som oppfyller utdanningskravet  Kategori 3: Doktorgradsstudenter fra andre universitet.  Kategori 4: Personer med minimum mastergrad (eller tilsvarende grad) i humanistiske eller samfunnsvitenskapelige fag.</p> <p>Dersom det er flere enn 15 ph.d.-studenter ved HSL-fak som søker opptak vil de som er kommet lengst i studieløpet prioriteres til disse plassene. Dersom noen står likt vil opptak avgjøres ved loddtrekning. Studenter som ikke har norsk som morsmål prioriteres ved opptak til høstens engelskspråklige emne. Minste antall deltakere er 10.</p>
<b>Faglig innhold</b>	<p>Emnet tematiserer forutsetninger for velfungerende og ansvarlig forskningsformidling. Det er innrettet mot de utfordringene doktorgradsstudenter og forskere i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap står overfor. Praktiske øvelser i formidling fra egen forskning vil være utgangspunktet for teoretisk refleksjon.</p> <p>Kommunikasjon av egen forskning er en integrert del av den vitenskapelige aktiviteten, og formidling av forskningens resultater mellom fagfeller er en forutsetning for vitenskapens utvikling. Forskingen er også en integrert del av samfunnet, og både universitetet og forskeren er pålagt å formidle forskning til allmennheten.</p> <p>Forskningsformidling er en kompleks aktivitet som foregår i en rekke ulike typer av situasjoner, relasjoner og kontekster. Det kan være etisk utfordrende og reiser ulike normative spørsmål. Forskningsformidling kan rette seg mot ulike typer av samtalepartnere og publikum, og dens former vil variere med ulike formater og medier. Både kommunikasjon med fagfeller internt i forskerfellesskapet og med den allmenne offentligheten forutsetter en bred forståelse av sjangerkrav og at man evner å rette seg inn mot mottakerens forutsetninger. Samtidig dannes egen forskeridentitet gjennom de valg man står overfor og de beslutninger man tar underveis.</p> <p>Emnet tar utgangspunkt i disse kjennetegnene og forholder seg til ulike disiplinære innretninger innen samfunnsvitenskapelig og humanistisk forskning. Det skal støtte opp under den enkeltes utvikling som forskningsformidler.</p>
<b>Læringsutbytte</b>	<p>Etter bestått emne skal studentene ha følgende læringsutbytte:</p> <p><b>Kunnskaper og forståelse</b>  Studenten har kunnskap om:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• universitetets og forskerens samfunnsoppdrag og ansvar for formidling</li> <li>• normer for akademisk redelighet, saklig argumentasjon og vitenskapelig diskusjon</li> <li>• ulike sjangre, formater og plattformer for vitenskapelig og allmennrettet forskningsformidling</li> <li>• kriterier for velfungerende og ansvarlig forskningsformidling i ulike sjangre, fora og for ulike målgrupper</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Ferdigheter</b> Studenten kan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>formidle forskning gjennom tekst, tale og visuelle uttrykk</li> <li>delta i intervju og samtaler om sin forskning</li> <li>tilpasse formidlingen til ulike målgrupper og medier</li> <li>delta som fagperson i offentlig debatt</li> <li>delta i debatter innenfor eget fagområde i nasjonale og internasjonale fora</li> </ul> <p><b>Kompetanse</b> Studenten kan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>tilpasse og gi form til formidling i forskningsprosjekter</li> <li>vurdere og reflektere over egen og andres forskningsformidling</li> <li>formidle forsknings- og utviklingsarbeid med akademisk integritet, gjennom anerkjente nasjonale og internasjonale kanaler</li> <li>kjenne igjen og uttrykke forskningens potensielle påvirkning på, relevans for og tilknytning til samfunnet</li> </ul>
<b>Relevans i studieprogram</b>	Emnet oppfyller kravet om formidling i opplæringsdelen til ph.d.-programmet i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap ved UiT.
<b>Undervisnings- og arbeidsform</b>	Undervisningen består av forelesninger, seminar, gruppearbeid og øvelser, og er innrettet mot både felles menneskevitenskapelige og disiplinspesifikke utfordringer. Emnet blir gjennomført som 4 hele dager fordelt på to samlinger. Et av arbeidskravene gjennomføres på forhånd, noen utføres i samling, noen som mellomperiodearbeid.
<b>Kvalitetssikring av emnet</b>	Alle emner evalueres én gang i løpet av programperioden. Programstyret avgjør hvilke emner som skal evalueres av studenter og emneansvarlige per år.
<b>Arbeidskrav</b>	<p>Obligatorisk forarbeid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>utkast til presentasjon av eget forskningsprosjekt for allmennheten, maks 1000 tegn (ca en halv side), leveres før undervisningsoppstart</li> </ul> <p>Minst 3 av følgende arbeidskrav må være gjennomført og godkjent før man kan fremstille seg til eksamen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>utkast til abstract for artikkel / paper (300 ord)</li> <li>utkast til vitenskapelig poster</li> <li>utkast til bokanmeldelse eller fagfelleevaluering av artikkel</li> <li>utkast til aviskronikk eller blogginnlegg eller serie av mikroblogginnlegg</li> <li>mundtlig fremføring av miniforedrag (med innlevering av skriftlig materiale – handout, presentasjon eller notat - i etterkant) eller innspilling av podcast</li> <li>deltakelse i intervju samtale</li> </ul> <p>Det gjennomføres hverandrevurdering i mindre grupper etter gitte kriterier under ledelse av en erfaren forsker.</p>
<b>Eksamen og vurdering</b>	Eksamen består av innlevering av en mappe med utvalgt materiale fra tre av de tidligere innleverte arbeidskravene, samt oppsummering av hverandrevurdering og egenvurdering (refleksjon over styrker og svakheter i eget arbeid ut fra anerkjente og på forhånd gitte kriterier). Minst en av innleveringene skal være allmennrettet og minst en skal være rettet mot fagfeller. Eksamen vurderes med “Bestått” / “Ikke bestått”.
<b>Kontinuasjoneksamen</b>	Ved karakter ikke bestått tilbys kontinuasjonseksamen i begynnelsen av påfølgende semester. Ved gyldig forfall tilbys utsatt eksamen i begynnelsen av påfølgende semester. Frist for oppmelding til kontinuasjonseksamen er 15. januar for eksamen i høstsemesteret og 15. august for eksamen i vårsemesteret.
<b>Pensum</b>	Om lag 400 sider. Emnet er praktisk rettet og har omfattende egenaktivitet i form av øvelser med påfølgende skriftlig refleksjon.
<b>Undervisnings- og eksamensspråk</b>	Undervisningen foregår på norsk i høstsemesteret og på engelsk i vårsemesteret. Eksamensspråk er norsk, andre skandinaviske språk eller engelsk.

---

## SAKSFRAMLEGG

---

Til:  
Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet

Møtedato:  
25.02.2020

Sak:  
2/20

---

### Innmelding av ph.d.-emner ved HSL-fakultetet høst 2020 og vår 2021

#### Innstilling til vedtak:

1. Ph.d.-utvalget ber administrasjonen tilrettelegge for at følgende emner revideres, opprettes og arrangeres **høsten 2020**:
  - HIF-8008 Professional Skills in Linguistics (5 stp)
  - HIF-8028 Cognitive Grammar: Basic course for PhD-students (10 stp)
  - HIF-8100 Litteratur og medisin (5 stp)
  - LIN-8004 Syntax I (5 stp)
  - LIN-8011 Statistics for Linguistics with R bootcamp (5 stp) (nytt)
  - SVH-8003 Feminist Theories, Methodologies and Epistemologies in Research Processes (5 stp) (nytt)
  - SVH-8004 Social Inequality in Health (5 stp) (nytt)
  - GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey (2 stp)
  - SVF-8054 Theory of Science (7 stp)
  - SVH-8001 Research Dissemination (5 stp) (nytt)
2. Ph.d.-utvalget ber administrasjonen tilrettelegge for at følgende emner revideres, opprettes og arrangeres **vår 2021**:
  - LIN-8001 Semantics (5 stp)
  - SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning (5 stp) (revideres)
  - GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey (2 stp)
  - SVF-8038 Research Ethics (3 stp)
  - SVH-8002 Forskningsformidling (5 stp) (nytt)
3. Følgende emner legges ned:
  - SVF-8048 Allmennretta forskningsformidling
  - SVF-8049 Vitenskapelig vitenskapskommunikasjon
  - Begge emner legges ned under forutsetning av at fakultetets nye emner i formidling SVH-8001/8002 opprettes.

#### Bakgrunn:

Utlysning om mulighet for å melde inn ph.d.-emner for studieåret 2020/2021 ble sendt på e-post til institutt-/senterlederne med kopi til kontorsjefene 8. oktober 2019, med påminnelse 18. november. Frist for innmelding var 15. januar 2020.

Instituttene/sentrene ble bedt om å fylle inn både mal for ph.d.-emner, og skjema for innmelding. I skjema for innmelding skal de opplyse om følgende:

1. Hvilket institutt/senter melder inn emnet?
2. Er emnet nytt? Ja/nei
3. Emnekode og emnenavn
4. Antall studiepoeng
5. Fagansvarlig
6. Studieadministrativt ansvarlig
7. Når skal emnet tilbys – høst 2020 eller vår 2021 (sett kryss)
8. Måned/dato for undervisning?
9. Søkerkode

For hvert nye emne og reviderte emne følger det en emnebeskrivelse vedlagt saken her. Det følger ikke emnebeskrivelse for emner som er godkjent og opprettet tidligere, og som det ikke er meldt inn vesentlige endringer til.

### Regler for oppretting og innmelding av ph.d.-emner

I fakultetets utfyllende regler til ph.d.-forskriften/ph.d.-programmet i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap, pkt. 15 Opplæringsdel (jf. forskriftens § 15), står det følgende om oppretting og innmelding av ph.d.-emner:

*«Eitt studiepoeng tilsvarar 25–30 arbeidstimar. For kvart emne må det gjerast ei vurdering av arbeidsmengda som ein går ut frå at studenten vil bruke på emnet sine ulike komponentar: Lesing av pensum, førebuing av plikter på kurset (som til dømes å planlegge innlevering av skisse eller liknande i forkant av kurset, planlegge presentasjonar, lesing av skriftlege innlegg frå medstudentar), oppmøte på emnet, etterarbeid og eksamen. Oppretting av mindre emneiningar enn 5 studiepoeng er ikkje tilrådd av omsyn til studentens samla arbeidsbyrde. Vidare bør det ikkje etablerast store emneiningar på 10 studiepoeng då det gir færre kombinasjonsmoglegheiter innan bolken 'fagspesifikk teori og metode/faglege tilnærmingar og posisjonar'.*

*Følgjande minimumskrav må innfriast for at eit ph.d.-emne skal godkjennast med eit omfang på 5 studiepoeng:*

- *Emnet blir arrangert over minimum to heile dagar.*
- *Undervisninga skal vere på minimum 15 timar. Det blir oppmoda til å aktivisere studentane, men omfattande studentarbeid under emnet bør kome i tillegg til ordinær undervisning.*
- *Eksamensforma bør gir studenten øving i sjangrar som ofte blir nytta innan forskning og formidling i faget. Døme kan vere vitenskapleg artikkel, review-artikkel, bokmelding, kronikk, blogg, refleksjonslogg. Det er viktig at eksamensforma er tilpassa sjanger og innhaldet i emnet.*
- *Lengda på eksamen vil variere avhengig av sjanger, men for paper skal det normalt vere ca.15 sider/6 000 ord.*
- *Litteraturomfanget kan variere, men bør minimum vere 700 sider. Eit ph.d.-emne med mindre litteraturomfang kan godkjennast dersom det er særskilt grunngitt.*

- *Fagleg ansvarleg skal minimum ha doktorgrad/førstestillingskompetanse.*

*Institutta/sentra blir ein gong årleg bedne om å melde inn ph.d.-emne til fakultetet som skal tilbydast kommande studieår (haust-/vårsemester).»*

## Oversikt innmeldte ph.d.-emner:

### SKK – Senter for kvinne- og kjønnsforskning

Høst 2020:

- SVH-8003 Feminist Theories, Methodologies and Epistemologies in Research Processes: (5 stp), faglig ansvarlig Kvinnforsk v/Katrin Losleben, studieadministrativt ansvarlig Siv Aina Hansen, AHR. Emnet overlapper 2 stp med emnet SVF-8055 Fornemmelse for kjønn.

### AHR – Institutt for arkeologi, historie og religionsvitenskap og teologi:

Studieadministrativt ansvarlig for alle ph.d.-emner: Isak Måseide.

Høst 2020:

- **SVH-8004 Social Inequality in Health** (5 stp): Hilde L. Sommerseth, i samarbeid med Handelshøyskolen i Tromsø v/Mikko Moilanen og ISV v/Marcus Buck.

### ISK – Institutt for språk og kultur:

Studieadministrativt ansvarlig for HIF-8028 er Torhild Skillingstad, for de 4 andre ph.d.-emnene: Kari Torill Guldahl. ISK ønsker å tilby et nytt emne i lingvistikk (LIN-8011) eksternt finansiert av LingPhil, og følgende, eksisterende ph.d.-emner, uten endringer:

Høst 2020:

- **LIN-8011 Statistics for Linguistics with R bootcamp** (5 stp) (nytt) fagansvarlig Jason Rothman
- **HIF-8008 Professional Skills:** (5 stp) fagansvarlig Gillian Ramchand
- **HIF-8028 Kognitiv grammatikk - Grunnkurs for PhD-studenter:** (10 stp) fagansvarlig Tore Nasset
- **HIF-8100 Litteratur og medisin:** (5 stp) fagansvarlig Henrik Johnsson
- **LIN-8004 Syntax I:** (5 stp) fagansvarlig Gillian Ramchand

Våren 2021:

- **LIN-8001 Semantics:** (5 stp) fagansvarlig Gillian Ramchand

### Faste ph.d.-emner i regi av fakultetet

I sak PHD-U 1/19 vedtok ph.d.utvalget at det skulle utarbeides et nytt obligatorisk emne i formidling på totalt 5 stp<sup>1</sup>. Emnet skal tilbys hvert semester, med norsk som undervisningsspråk det ene semesteret og engelsk som undervisningsspråk det andre semesteret. Det vises til forslag om nytt formidlingsemne i egen sak.<sup>2</sup>

Høst 2020:

<sup>1</sup> ePhorte 2019/601-1

<sup>2</sup> ePhorte 2020/555-2

- **GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey** – fagansvarlig Helene N. Andreassen, UB - universitetsbiblioteket, studieadm. ansvarlig Martin Arne Andersen (FUFHSL)
- **SVF-8054 Theory of Science** – fagansvarlig Attila Tanya (IFF), studieadm. ansvarlig Nina Norum Anda/etterfølger
- **SVH-8001 Research Dissemination** (engelsk versjon) fagansvarlig AHR, studieadm. ansvarlig Nina Norum Anda/etterfølger

Vår 2021:

- **SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning** – fagansvarlig Gry Paulgaard, ILP, emneansvarlig Anne Britt Flemmen, ISV, studieadm. ansvarlig Nina Norum Anda/etterfølger
- **GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey** – fagansvarlig Helene N. Andreassen, UB, studieadm. ansvarlig Martin-Arne Andersen
- **SVF-8038 Research Ethics** – fagansvarlig Kjersti Fjørtoft/ studieadm. ansvarlig Nina Norum Anda / etterfølger
- **SVH-8001 Forskningsformidling** (norsk versjon) fagansvarlig AHR/ studieadm. ansvarlig Norum Anda / etterfølger

### Revisjon av SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning (5 stp.)

Emnet *SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning* ble opprettet i 2008 og har de siste årene blitt tilbudt annet hvert år der ISV har hatt det faglige ansvaret ved førsteamanuensis Sissel H. Eriksen. Da Eriksen sa fra seg oppgaven vinteren 2019, oppnevnte prodekan forskning et team bestående av medlemmer fra ISV, SESAM, SKK og ILP som fikk i mandat å vurdere om emnet trengte en revisjon, se vedlegg. Arbeidsgruppen ble bedt om å ta stilling til følgende:

- Behovet for forkurs for kandidater med manglende metodeopplæring, og eventuelt utvikle forslag til emnebeskrivelse der dette tas inn.
- Vurdere om emnet også bør omhandle datahåndteringsplan. Sjekk eventuelt om *GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey* inneholder datahåndteringsplan og om det er et tilstrekkelig tilbud til våre ph.d.-kandidater.
- Drøfte om det er behov for at emnet tilbys årlig.
- Utarbeide forslag til plan for fordeling av undervisningsansvar mellom enhetene.

Arbeidsgruppens rapport er vedlagt denne saken. De mener at det er behov for et forkurs for de studentene som ikke har metodeopplæring fra mastergradsnivå. Forkurset kan opprettes som et rent nettbasert kurs og inngå som et arbeidskrav som må være gjennomført før emnet starter.

Gruppen har i sin rapport stilt spørsmål ved om HSL-fak bør be UB om å utvikle egne nettkurs spesielt knyttet til kvalitativ metode. Et slikt kurs kunne bli lagt ut i canvas og vært tilgjengelig for studentene. UB arrangerer i dag jevnlig nettkurs på Skype om datahåndteringsplaner både på norsk og engelsk.

Gruppen mener at det er tilstrekkelig å tilby emnet annet hvert år. Nord universitet tilbyr også et emne i kvalitativ metode annet hvert år, men de tilbyr emnet de samme årene som HSL-fak. Det har vært holdt møte med Nord universitet der det er spilt inn forslag om å koordinere hvilke år emnene tilbys ved henholdsvis Nord universitet og UiT. Man har ikke lyktes å få en avtale om dette enda.

Gruppen har videre blitt enig om en ansvarsfordeling på emnet. Fakultetet vil fortsatt sitte med det administrative ansvaret for emnet. Anne Britt Flemmen vil ha emneansvaret og koordinerer

arbeidet i gruppen våren 2020. Deretter foreslår gruppen følgende syklus for alternering av det faglig ansvaret:

- 2021: ILP og Gry Paulgaard har ansvar for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet
- 2023: CPS, SESAM og SKK ved nytilsatt i metodestilling har ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet
- 2025: ISV har ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet

### **Administrasjonens kommentarer til innmeldte ph.d.-emner for studieåret 2020/2021 og nedlegging av emner**

Administrasjonen har gjennomgått innmeldte emner opp mot de krav og anbefalinger som er satt i regelverket.

Emnene SVF-8048 Allmennretta forskningsformidling og SVF-8049 Vitenskapelig vitenskapskommunikasjon legges ned fordi begge har 100 % overlapp med det foreslåtte, nye emnene SVH-8001/SVH-8002, jf. egen sak.

### **Plan og rutine for evaluering av ph.d.-emner**

Hvert emne som arrangeres jevnlig skal evalueres én gang i løpet av programperioden, det vil hvert tredje år. Den vanlige praksisen er at et nytt emne eller et vesentlig revidert emne, evalueres etter første gangs gjennomføring. Emner som tilbys kun én gang, skal også evalueres.

Det er ulike former for evaluering av emnene. Hvilken form som passer det enkelte emnet best avgjøres av faglig ansvarlig. Det kan dreie seg om muntlig evaluering i plenum, skjema utlevert direkte til studentene eller bruk av Nettskjema. Faglig ansvarlig (og faglærer på evt. undergrupper på emnet) leverer også evalueringsrapport.

For de fagspesifikke emnene skal administrativ kontaktperson ved instituttet/senteret oversende fakultetet student- og faglærerevaluering etter gjennomført ph.d.-emne. Emneevalueringene vil legges frem for ph.d.-utvalget som ledd i kvalitetssikringen av ph.d.-studiet. Ph.d.-emneevaluering har **felles saksmappe i ePhorte 2020/971**.

Synnøve Thomassen Andersen  
prodekan forskning

—

Olav Skare  
seksjonsleder

—

*Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur*

### **Saksbehandlere:**

seniorrådgiver Anne Kjøsnæs og rådgiver Nina Norum Anda

Vedlegg:

1. Samlet oversikt over innmeldte ph.d.-emner for studieåret 2020/2021
2. SVH-8003 Feminist Theories, Methodologies and Epistemologies in Research Processes
3. SVH-8004 Social Inequality in Health
4. SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning
5. LIN-8011 Statistics for Linguistics with R bootcamp
6. Innstilling fra team for utvikling og drift av ph.d.-emnet SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning

## Emneoversikt HSL-fak høsten 2020/våren 2021

HØST 2020								
Emne	Faglig ansvarlig	Adm. ansvarlig	Undervisning (måned/uker)	Studieplasser	Søkerkode	Søknadsfrist eksterne søkere	Søknadsfrist interne søkere	MERKNAD - endringer?
SVH-8003 Feminist theories, methodologies and epistemologies in research processes (5 stp)	Karin Losleben	Siv Aina Hansen		åpent	9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	NYTT
SVH-8004 Social inequality in Health (5 stp)	Hilde L. Sommersest	Isak Måseide		30	9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	NYTT
LIN-8011 Statistics for linguistics with R bootcamp (5 stp)	Jason Rothman	Kari Torill Guldahl	3.-7. august			01.06.2020	01.06.2020	NYTT
HIF-8008 Professional skills in linguistics (5 stp)	Gillian Ramschand	Kari Torill Guldahl		åpent	9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	Søknadsfrist og kode må endres.
HIF-8028 Cognitive Grammar: Basic course for PhD students (10 stp)	Tore Nasset	Torhild Skillingstad		åpent	9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	Søknadsfrist og kode må endres.
HIF-8100 Litteratur og medisin (5 stp)	Henik Johnsson	Kari Torill Guldahl?			9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	Endre "undervisning" og "frist"
LIN-8004 Syntax (5 stp)	Gillian Ramschand	Kari Torill Guldahl		åpent	9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	Søknadsfrist og kode må endres.
GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey (2 stp)	Helene Andreassen	Martin-Arne Andersen	oktober	30	9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	"Språkvask"
SVF-8054 Theory of Science (7 stp)	Attila Tanyi	FUF		åpent	9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	Ta bort antall dager undervisning.
SVH-8001 Research dissemination (5 stp)	AHR	FUF	2x2 dager	15	9301	01.06.2020	01.09.2020	NYTT

VÅR 2021								
LIN-8001 Semantics (5 stp)	Gillian Ramschand	Kari Torill Guldahl		åpent	9301	01.12.2020	01.02.2021	Søknadsfrist og kode må endres.
GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey (2 stp)	Helene Andreassen	Martin-Arne Andersen	februar?	30	9301	01.12.2020	01.02.2021	Ingen endringer.
SVF-8038 Research Ethics (3 stp)	Kjersti Fjørtoft	FUF	mars?	35	9301	01.12.2020	01.02.2021	Søknadsfrist og kode må endres.
SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning (5 stp)	Gry Paulgaard	FUF	juni?	åpent	9301	01.12.2020	01.02.2021	Hele emnet er revidert
SVH-8002 Forskningsformidling (5 stp)	AHR	FUF	2x2 dager	15	9301	01.12.2020	01.02.2021	NYTT

Nedlegging av emner
SVF-8048
SVF-8049

HSL Faculty, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, 8.2.2017	<b>TEMPLATE FOR COURSE DESCRIPTIONS, THE HSL FACULTY</b> <b>Please see explanation to each point below.</b> The template is based on requirements for modules within the UiT quality system.
<b>Name</b>	Bokmål: Feministiske teorier, metodologier og epistemologier i forskningsprosesser Nynorsk: English: Feminist theories, methodologies and epistemologies in research processes
<b>Course code and level</b>	SVH-8003
<b>Type of course</b>	The course may be taken as a single course.
<b>Scope of course</b>	5 ECTS  Students who hold 5 ECTS from SVF-8055 Evoking Gender can only obtain 3 ECTS due to overlap in literature and course content.
<b>Søknadsfrist</b>	PhD students apply by registering in Studentweb by September 1th.  Other applicants apply in Søknadsweb by application deadline June 1th. Application code 9301.  If there are less than 5 qualified applicants, the course will not be offered.
<b>Required / recommended previous knowledge</b>	PhD students or holders of a Norwegian Master's Degree of five years or 3+ 2 years (or equivalent) may be admitted. PhD students must upload a document from their university stating that they are registered PhD students.  Holders of a Master's Degree must upload a Master's Diploma with Diploma Supplement / English translation of the diploma. Applicants from listed countries must document proficiency in English. To find out if this applies to you see the following list: <a href="http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Utenlandsk_utdanning/GSUlista/2016/GSU_list_English_14112016.pdf">http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Utenlandsk_utdanning/GSUlista/2016/GSU_list_English_14112016.pdf</a>  For more information on accepted English proficiency tests and scores, as well as exemptions from the English proficiency tests, please see the following document: <a href="https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf">https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf</a>  The course has <b>20</b> seats. If the number of applicants exceeds the number of places available on the PhD course, applicants will be ranked from category 1 to 5.  Category 1: Doctoral students from UiT or other Norwegian universities who follow the national research school in gender research  Category 2: Students admitted to any PhD Programme at UiT  Category 3: Participants in the Associate Professor Programme that fulfil the educational requirements  Category 4: Doctoral students from other universities  <i>Category 5: People with a minimum of a Master's Degree (or equivalent). (A Norwegian Master's Degree of 5 years or 3 (Bachelor Degree) + 2 years (Master's</i>

	<p><i>Degree).</i></p> <p>If there are more than 20 PhD students from HSL who apply. The students who have studied the longest will be given preference.</p>
<b>Course contents</b>	<p>We welcome applications from PhD-students who wish to expand their understanding of feminist and gender epistemologies, theories and methodologies. By exploring the genealogies of and current discussions within these fields the students will be encouraged to think in innovative and critical ways about the materials they are investigating. Thus, they will gain the competence to advance the critical originality, profoundness and innovating potential of their thesis.</p> <p>The aim of the course is to develop the students' ability to theorize and analyze their material, to apply advancing methods and to discuss challenges and pitfalls that occur when doing feminist and gender research. The research process and the research design of each thesis will be discussed. The course will have a special focus on theorizing gender and power in their intersections with class, race, ethnicity, age etc. in relation to politics, artefacts and societies. The course highlights the inter- and cross-disciplinary character of gender studies. Accordingly, students from a wide variety of backgrounds and interest are welcomed to apply and benefit from the group discussions beyond disciplines. The course is divided into two kinds of sessions: The students will present their topics and open up to group discussions. The lecturers will provide presentations with examples of their own research and approach to materials from their respective points of expertise.</p>
<p><b>Learning outcomes</b> Be concise and consequent: Outcomes should relate to each other as well as to the teaching methods and the coursework requirements / examination form.</p> <p>Learning outcomes should be formulated in such a way that they may be checked.</p> <p>Make sure the outcomes are realistic and in accordance with the amount of ECTS (they must not be too ambitious).</p> <p>Description of competence is not required for 10 ECTS courses.</p>	<p>The students have the following learning outcomes:</p> <p><b>Knowledge</b> The student has profound insights in fundamental and current feminist/queer theories. They have a deep and thorough understanding of perspectives, subjects and terminologies within feminist and gender epistemologies, theories and methodologies.</p> <p><b>Skills</b> The student is able to theorize and analyze independently, both orally and written, their material according to relevant discourses within feminist and gender research, to apply advancing methods and to discuss challenges and pitfalls that occur when doing feminist and gender research. The student is able to analyze gender and power in relation to politics, artefacts and societies.</p> <p><b>Competence</b> Through understanding and approaching research with feminist methodologies, the student will be able to think in new and critical ways about the materials they are investigating. Thus, they will gain the competence to advance the critical originality and profoundness of their thesis and deepen their social and scientific relevance.</p> <p>It and will provide students with the opportunity of focusing on one of these in the course assignment. The 3-day course meeting will consist of lectures and group discussion seminars where the students both will discuss assigned course readings, as well as their own research projects.</p>
<b>Relevance in the degree program</b>	Should be provided, but not a requirement.
<b>Teaching and working methods</b> Teaching methods, scope	Lectures, seminars, student presentations, group assignments

and frequency should be described. Also provide information about the number of lectures / classes.	
<b>Practice</b>	
<b>Quality assurance of the course</b>	All courses will be evaluated once during the period of the study program. The board of the program decides which courses will be evaluated by students and teacher each year.
<b>Coursework</b> The required coursework must be clear and feasible. Keep the scope of the course in mind.	The following coursework requirements must be completed and approved in order to take the final exam:  Before you attend the course, you must prepare and send 500 words regarding your planned or conducted research and its feminist methodological angles and applications. You must also comment on the strengths of using feminist methodology in your work, and the challenges it poses.
<b>Assessment and exam</b> Provide clear information about exam form(s). The amount of hours/days/weeks must be given.  In the case of written assignments, please provide the required amount of words. If desired: provide information about line space, font etc. (standard: 1 ½).  A-F grades scale or Pass/Fail	The exam is a final paper of about 10 to 15 pages, referring the course literature. The students will have 2 weeks to write the exam.  The exam will be assessed as Pass/Fail.
<b>Retake</b>	Retake is offered in in the beginning of the following semester in cases of Fail. Deferred examination is offered in the beginning of the following semester if the student is unable to take the final exam due to illness or other exceptional circumstances. Registration deadline for retake is January 15 for autumn semester exams and August 15 for spring semester exams.
<b>Syllabus</b>	600 pages
<b>Language of instruction and examination</b>	English/Norwegian/Swedish

HSL Faculty, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, 2.10.2017	<b>TEMPLATE FOR COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR PHD COURSES, THE HSL FACULTY</b> <b>Please see explanation to each point below.</b> The template is based on requirements for modules within the UiT quality system.
<b>Name</b>	Bokmål: Sosial ulikhet i helse Nynorsk: Sosial ulikskap i helse English: Social inequality in Health
<b>Course code and level</b>	SVH-8004
<b>Type of course</b>	The course can be taken as a single topic
<b>Scope of course</b>	5 ECTS
<b>Søknadskode/frist</b>	<p>PhD students at UiT The Arctic University of Norway go directly to Studentweb to register for class and exam by 1 September.</p> <p>Other applicants: Application deadline is 1st June.</p> <p>Application code: 9301 in Søknadsweb.</p>
<b>Required / recommended previous knowledge</b>	<p>PhD students and participants in the 'Associate Professor Programme' at UiT who have completed a master's degree can apply for admission. Valid documentation is a confirmation from your educational institution stating that you are registered PhD students. Participants in the 'Associate Professor Programme' must document that they hold a Master's degree of five years or 3 +3 years (or equivalent) to be qualified applicants.</p> <p>The course has 30 seats. If the number of applicants exceeds the number of places available on the PhD course, applicants will be ranked from category 1 to 4.</p> <p>Category 1: People admitted to the PhD programme at the UiT in the humanities and social sciences, health sciences or economics.</p> <p>Category 2: Participants in the 'Associate Professor Programme' that meet the educational requirement.</p> <p>Category 3: PhD students in humanities and social sciences, health sciences or economics from other institutions.</p> <p>Category 4: People with a minimum of a master's degree (or equivalent) in the humanities or social sciences, health sciences or economics.</p> <p>If there are more than 30 PhD students from the HSL Faculty, a priority is given to those who are progressed further in their PhD programme. If this is equal, admission will be decided by lottery. The minimum number of participants for the course to be offered is: 5.</p>
<b>Course contents</b>	<p>The course offer theoretical perspectives of understanding social inequality in health.</p> <p>The last 250 years have manifested an increased life expectancy in large parts of the world's population. Research over the past two decades demonstrates a broad consensus that this increase has a social disadvantage, where people with short education and low incomes have poorer health and die earlier than people with long education and high incomes. Despite considerable knowledge, today's public health remains socially skewed.</p> <p>This course aims to bring in theoretical perspectives of research on health inequalities from different academic disciplines. A focal point of departure is that the conceptual understanding of the terms 'social', 'inequality' and</p>

	'health' varies between disciplines. An interdisciplinary approach could contribute to an increased understanding of the complexity of human behavior over time and place.
<p><b>Learning outcomes</b> Be concise and consequent: Outcomes should relate to each other as well as to the teaching methods and the coursework requirements / examination form.</p> <p>Learning outcomes should be formulated in such a way that they may be checked.</p> <p>Make sure the outcomes are realistic and in accordance with the amount of ECTS (they must not be too ambitious).</p> <p>Description of competence is not required for 10 ECTS courses.</p>	<p>The students have the following learning outcomes:</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b> The student has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wide knowledge of various theories regarding health inequalities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills</b> The student is able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain key theoretical perspectives for conceptualizing social inequality in health.</li> <li>• Reflect on one's chosen theoretical perspective for research on social inequality in health.</li> <li>• Express themselves in writing and orally about theoretical perspectives on social inequality in health related to their PhD work.</li> <li>• Provide constructive feedback on academic texts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Competence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acquire advanced knowledge and insight into theories regarding health inequalities.</li> <li>• Be able to critically evaluate and reflect on the theoretical perspectives presented.</li> </ul>
<b>Relevance in the degree program</b>	Should be provided, but not a requirement.
<p><b>Teaching and working methods</b> Teaching methods, scope and frequency should be described. Also provide information about the number of lectures / classes.</p>	<p>The course is offered every second year.</p> <p>It consists of four days of intensive classes, a total of 40 hours. Lectures and seminars in smaller groups. After the classes, the students are required to deliver a 2-3 page paper proposal within 10 work days. The students receive feedback on the paper proposals relatively shortly afterwards.</p>
<b>Practice</b>	
<b>Quality assurance of the course</b>	All courses will be evaluated once during the period of the study program. The board of the program decides which courses will be evaluated by students and teacher each year.
<p><b>Coursework</b> The required coursework must be clear and feasible. Keep the scope of the course in mind.</p>	<p>The following coursework requirements must be completed and approved in order to take the final exam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 2-3 page paper proposal.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assessment and exam</b> Provide clear information about exam form(s). The amount of hours/days/weeks must be given.</p> <p>In the case of written assignments, please provide the required</p>	<p>The exam will consist of: A research paper limited to 4000 words on the chosen topic presented in the paper proposal.</p> <p>The exam will be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis.</p>

amount of words. If desired: provide information about line space, font etc. (standard: 1 ½).  A-F grades scale or Pass/Fail	
<b>Retake</b>	Retake is offered in the beginning of the following semester in cases of Fail. Deferred examination is offered in the beginning of the following semester if the student is unable to take the final exam due to illness or other exceptional circumstances. Registration deadline for retake is January 15 for autumn semester exams and August 15 for spring semester exams.
<b>Syllabus</b>	Ca. 1000 pages of which around 50% should be directly related to the research paper.
<b>Language of instruction and examination</b>	English

HSL-fak, UiT Norges arktiske universitet, 11.12.2014	<b>MAL FOR EMNEBESKRIVELSER, HSL-FAKULTETET</b> <b>Forklaring til hvert punkt står i oversikt under her.</b> Malen er basert på krav til emner i UiTs kvalitetssystem, del 5, kap. 3, under «Krav til innhold i emnebeskrivelser»: <a href="http://uit.no/ansatte/organisasjon/artikkel?p_document_id=356731&amp;p_dimension_id=88203&amp;p_menu=65815">http://uit.no/ansatte/organisasjon/artikkel?p_document_id=356731&amp;p_dimension_id=88203&amp;p_menu=65815</a>
<b>Navn</b>	Bokmål: Kvalitativ forskning Nynorsk: Kvalitativ forskning English: Qualitative Research
<b>Emnekode og emnenivå</b>	SVF-8040
<b>Emnetype</b>	Emnet kan tas som enkeltemne. Målgruppe: Ph.d.-studenter, først og fremst innen samfunnsvitenskapelige og humanistiske fag, men og også for andre relevante fagområder.
<b>Omfang</b>	5
<b>Opptakskrav</b>	Forkunnskapskrav: Mastergrad eller tilsvarende samt kvalitativ metode på mastergradsnivå er obligatorisk forkunnskap. Studenter som ikke kan dokumentere metodekunnskap må ta et ekstra arbeidskrav (et forkurs) knyttet til SVF-8040.
<b>Frist</b>	Ph.d.-studenter ved UiT Norges arktiske universitet søker opptak ved å undervisningsmelde seg til emnet via studentweb. innen 1. februar. Andre søker opptak via søknadsweb.innen 1. februar. Søknadskode: 9301.
<b>Faglig innhold</b>	Emnet tar opp ulike temaer knyttet til kvalitativ forskning og metodologi i samfunnsvitenskapene. Temaene kan gjelde hele forskningsprosessen som for eksempel kvalitet i kvalitativ forskning, eller deler av den, for eksempel analyseprosessen. Det vil være tema og metoder som er alminnelig brukt, og ikke spesialiseringer.
<b>Læringsutbytte</b>	Etter bestått emne skal studentene ha følgende læringsresultat: <b>Kunnskaper</b> Studenten har: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gode kunnskaper og ferdigheter innen kvalitative metoder og metodologi på et høyt nivå.</li> <li>• God kunnskap om etiske retningslinjer for kvalitativ forskning.</li> <li>• God kjennskap til den vitenskapelige diskusjonen rundt de forskningsmetodene de velger å bruke i sitt arbeid.</li> <li>• God kunnskap om forskningsprosessen</li> </ul> <b>Ferdigheter</b> Studenten kan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kritisk lese og kommentere kvalitative arbeider gjort av andre.</li> <li>• Finne og anvende relevant faglitteratur.</li> <li>• Reflektere over datahåndtering.</li> </ul> <b>Kompetanse</b> Studenten skal:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Være godt kvalifisert til å gjennomføre en kvalitativ, empirisk undersøkelse på doktorgradsnivå.</li> </ul>
<b>Relevans i studieprogram</b>	Bør angis, men er ikke påkrevet.
<b>Undervisnings- og arbeidsform</b>	<p>Emnet tilbys hvert andre år (2021, 2023, 2025)</p> <p>Emnet tilbys i to samlinger og minimum en av samlingene vil være basert på fysisk fremmøte.</p> <p>I første samling vil det være to dager med undervisning. Ulike undervisningsformer vil kunne benyttes; forelesninger, seminarer, paper-presentasjoner og peer-learning. I andre samling vil hovedvekten ligge på presentasjon og diskusjon av utkast til paper. Begge samlingene har obligatorisk deltakelse.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undervisning: Første samling består av 8-10 timer undervisning.</li> </ul> <p>Paper-presentasjon: Presentasjonen skal skje i grupper. Alle deltakerne skal levere et utkast til paper (3-5 sider) til paper ca. to uker før andre samling. Paperne presenteres og diskuteres i grupper. Det skal være minst en faglærer som kommenterer utkastet til paper.</p>
<b>Praksis</b>	
<b>Kvalitetssikring av emnet</b>	Alle emner evalueres en gang i løpet av programperioden. Programstyret avgjør hvilke emner som skal evalueres av studenter og lærer per år.
<b>Arbeidskrav</b>	<p>Følgende arbeidskrav må være gjennomført og godkjent før man kan fremstille seg til eksamen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For studenter som ved opptak til emnet ikke har tilstrekkelig grunnlag i kvalitativ metode (tilsvarende mastergradsnivå), er det krav om gjennomføring av et ikke studiepoenggivende forkurs. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deltakelse i undervisning på forkurs (nett- eller campusbasert, undervisningsform kan variere)</li> <li>Godkjent skriftlig arbeidskrav (2-3 sider) ut fra oppgitt oppgavetekst. Vurderes som Bestått/Ikke bestått.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Utkast til paper (3-5 sider), og framlegg i gruppe.</li> <li>Muntlige kommentarer til medstudenter på deres paper.</li> <li>Obligatorisk fremmøte på undervisning. Ved fravær ut over 25 prosent vil arbeidskravet ikke bli godkjent.</li> </ol>
<b>Eksamen og vurdering</b>	<p>Eksamen består av:</p> <p>Paper knyttet til det tema som emnet tar opp det året studenten deltar. Det skal leveres utkast til paper ca. 6 uker før eksamen skal leveres, og utkastet skal legges fram og diskuteres i gruppe på emnets andre samling ca. 4 uker før eksamensbesvarelsen skal leveres.</p> <p>Eksamensbesvarelsen skal være på ca. 8-10 sider (3-4000 ord).</p> <p>Eksamen vurderes med Bestått/ Ikke bestått.</p>
<b>Kontinuasjoneksamen</b>	Ved karakter F/ikke bestått tilbys kontinuasjonseksamen i begynnelsen av påfølgende semester. Ved gyldig forfall tilbys utsatt eksamen i begynnelsen av påfølgende semester. Frist for oppmelding til kontinuasjonseksamen er 15. januar for eksamen i høstsemesteret og 15. august for eksamen i vårsemesteret.
<b>Pensum</b>	Her trenger bare omlag antall sider stå
<b>Undervisnings- og eksamensspråk</b>	Norsk

HSL Faculty, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, 8.2.2017	<b>TEMPLATE FOR COURSE DESCRIPTIONS, THE HSL FACULTY</b> <b>Please see explanation to each point below.</b> The template is based on requirements for modules within the UiT quality system.
<b>Name</b>	Bokmål: Statistics for linguistics with <i>R</i> bootcamp Nynorsk: English: Statistics for linguistics with <i>R</i> bootcamp
<b>Course code and level</b>	LIN-8011
<b>Type of course</b>	The course may be taken as a single course.
<b>Scope of course</b>	5 ECTS
<b>Søknadsfrist</b>	Ph.d.-students at UiT register for class and exam in Studentweb by June 1st. Other applicants: June 1 <sup>st</sup> Application code 9301 in Søknadsweb.
<b>Required / recommended previous knowledge</b>	PhD students or holders of a Norwegian Master's Degree of five years or 3+ 2 years (or equivalent) may be admitted. PhD students must upload a document from their university stating that they are registered PhD students.  Holders of a Master's Degree must upload a Master's Diploma with Diploma Supplement / English translation of the diploma. Applicants from listed countries must document proficiency in English. To find out if this applies to you see the following list: <a href="http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Utenlandsk_utdannin_g/GSULista/2016/GSU_list_English_14112016.pdf">http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Utenlandsk_utdannin_g/GSULista/2016/GSU_list_English_14112016.pdf</a>  For more information on accepted English proficiency tests and scores, as well as exemptions from the English proficiency tests, please see the following document: <a href="https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf">https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf</a>
<b>Course contents</b>	<i>Statistics for linguistics with R</i> is a hands-on introduction to statistical methods for both graduate students and seasoned researchers and is based on the second edition (2013) of Gries' textbook <i>Statistics for linguistics with R</i> . The course is mainly intended for linguists who already have a basic knowledge in statistics and some experience using <i>R</i> , and who wish to improve their proficiency in statistical analysis of linguistic data. Participants who are new to statistics and/or <i>R</i> should prepare beforehand by working through the readings listed below. The course puts a particularly strong emphasis on various kinds of fixed- and mixed-effects regression modeling as well the use of other predictive modeling techniques such as classification/conditional inference trees and (random) forests. The course features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a brief recap of basic aspects of statistical evaluation as well as several descriptive statistics insofar as they facilitate later predictive modeling approaches;</li> <li>• a selection of monofactorial statistical tests for frequencies, means, and correlations and how they constitute special (limiting) cases of regression methods;</li> <li>• an exploration of different kinds of multifactorial regression modeling approaches as well as other techniques on the basis of both observational and experimental, published and unpublished data.</li> </ul>

	For all modeling methods to be explored, we will discuss how to test their assumptions and visualize their results with instructive annotated statistical graphs. There also will be in depth discussion of different model selection strategies, how to interpret predictive modeling results (such as different kinds of interactions and contrasts), threats to the validity of modeling, etc.
<b>Learning outcomes</b>	<p>The students have the following learning outcomes:</p> <p>At the end of the course, participants will be able to understand any discussion of a regression model they come across in research literature and will be able to conduct their own fixed- and mixed-effects modeling analyses; time permitting, there will be a small section on how to write small statistical/visualization functions yourself.</p>
<b>Relevance in the degree program</b>	Should be provided, but not a requirement.
<b>Teaching and working methods</b> Teaching methods, scope and frequency should be described. Also provide information about the number of lectures / classes.	<p>This is a five-day intensive course that requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the reading assignment (see Required Readings listed below) to be completed prior to the start of the course;</li> <li>• downloading and installing the software (which you will have been emailed about) via links and emailed instructions prior to course start;</li> <li>• testing that the software packages are functional on your computer prior to class.</li> </ul> <p>The course will be taught in English and grading is done on a pass/no pass basis. The course will feature lecture-style teaching, with about half of the instructional time each day being hands-on work on a variety of different data sets. Data sets and (thousands of lines of) code will be provided to the participants, as will be a variety of helper functions that participants will be able to use for their own statistical applications. Also, we will discuss queries that were sent to <i>R</i> newsgroups as well as reviews of papers under review with an eye to help participants understand what mistakes to avoid. The course will consist of a morning and an afternoon teaching module from Monday through Friday of one week. It will run much longer than the typical “class”, hence the name bootcamp, starting at 9am and finishing at 5pm with a 1.5 hour break for lunch at midday, and 30-minute coffee breaks in the morning and afternoon.</p> <p><b>Course schedule:</b></p> <p>Day 1: 3-4 hours lecture: linear fixed-effects modeling; 2-3 hours practice</p> <p>Day 2: 3-4 hours lecture: generalized linear fixed-effects modeling; 2-3 hours practice</p> <p>Day 3: 3 hours lecture: linear mixed-effects modeling; 3 hours practice</p> <p>Day 4: 3 hours lecture: generalized linear mixed-effects modeling; 3 hours practice</p> <p>Day 5: 3-4 hours lecture: tree-based approaches; 2-3 hours practice</p> <p>(approx. 16 hours of teaching and 14 hours tutoring in total, yielding 5 classes and 30 hours)</p>
<b>Practice</b>	
<b>Quality assurance of the course</b>	The students will be expected to evaluate the overall quality of the lectures, relevance of the reading materials, student-instructor interaction and learning outcomes achieved. All course evaluation reports provided by students will be submitted to the Norwegian Graduate Researcher School in Linguistics and Philology (LingPhil)

	after the course. The template for course evaluation by students can be found at <a href="https://www.ntnu.edu/lingphil/course-proposals">https://www.ntnu.edu/lingphil/course-proposals</a> .
<b>Coursework</b>	
<b>Assessment and exam</b>	<p>PhD students will be awarded 5 ECTS if they</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• read the required texts and download and test the software prior to the course;</li> <li>• attend all teaching sessions;</li> <li>• provide a written question each evening to the instructor, a selection of which will be used in the course to go over common queries;</li> <li>• complete one practical assignment of a data set provided by the instructor as the final assessment.</li> </ul> <p>Any student with an interest in statistics for empirical research is encouraged to attend.</p> <p>The exam will be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis.</p>
<b>Retake</b>	Retake is offered in in the beginning of the following semester in cases of grade F or Fail. Deferred examination is offered in the beginning of the following semester if the student is unable to take the final exam due to illness or other exceptional circumstances. Registration deadline for retake is January 15 for autumn semester exams and August 15 for spring semester exams.
<b>Syllabus</b>	All registered applicants will receive a link to an on-line page where all readings can be downloaded. The reading assignment is to read all required readings and be familiar with recommended readings.
<b>Language of instruction and examination</b>	English

## **Innstilling fra team for utvikling og drift av ph.d emnet SVF-8040 Kvalitativ metode**

Det oppnevnte team med medlemmer fra ILP, SESAM, SKK og ISV takker for oppnevningen. Teamet fikk følgende oppdrag fra prodekan forskning HSL-fak.:

Mandat:

Temaet skal ta stilling til:

- Behovet for forkurs for kandidater med manglende metodeopplæring, og eventuelt utvikle forslag til emnebeskrivelse der dette tas inn.
- Vurdere om emnet også bør omhandle datahåndteringsplan. Sjekk eventuelt om GEN-8001 «Take control of your PhD journey» inneholder datahåndteringsplan og om det er et tilstrekkelig tilbud til våre ph.d.-kandidater.
- Drøfte om det er behov for at emnet tilbys årlig.
- Utarbeide forslag til plan for fordeling av undervisningsansvar mellom enhetene.

Leveranser:

- Ny/revidert emnebeskrivelse innen 15 januar 2020.
- Begrunnet svar på hvor ofte emnet bør tilbys.

Teamet har hatt to møter med påfølgende e-postutvekslinger. Vi innkalte tidligere emneansvarlig førsteamansvarlig Sissel H. Eriksen til ett av møtene. Vi vil i det følgende besvare de spørsmålene som er stilt.

### **1. Behov for forkurs.**

- a. Teamet vurderer at det er behov for et forkurs for å opprettholde kurset på ph.d nivå. Forkurset kan være et rent nettbasert kurs og formuleres som et arbeidskrav. Det må gjennomføres før kurset. Vi har tatt det inn i emnebeskrivelsen (her har vi tatt modell av SVF-3003 for hvordan det er tatt inn). Det bør også vurderes om det skal tilbys/utvikles noen korte nettforelesninger med eksempler som kan være tilgjengelig særlig knyttet til profesjonsfagene.

### **2. Bør emnet omhandle datahåndteringsplan?**

- a. Teamet vurderer at datahåndteringsplan bør inkluderes i et emne som er obligatorisk. Datahåndteringsplan bør nevnes i mange av emnene, men det er viktig at alle må forholde seg til det. Vi anbefaler at HSL ber UB om utvikle en nettbasert forelesning om dette spesielt knyttet til kvalitativ metode. Denne forelesningen, eventuelt med et kort notat fra HSL-fakultetet, bør sendes ut/legges ut i Canvas for ph.d studentene og den bør

være tilgjengelig for stipendiatene når de skriver sine prosjektskisser for opptak til ph.d programmet (når de må konkretisere prosjektets datahåndteringsplan). Det er viktig at stipendiater får denne informasjonen så tidlig som mulig i prosjektplanleggingen. Dersom denne informasjonen var tilgjengelig mens stipendiatene skriver sine opptakssøknader til ph.d programmet vil kunnskapen om utformingen av datahåndteringsplaner raskere spres til hele fagmiljøene da veiledere og to andre fagpersoner vurderer og kvalitetssikrer de enkelte skissene.

En slik netttforelesning med kort notat bør antakelig også informeres om i tilknytning til etikkurset (som er obligatorisk).

3. Teamet vurderer at det **er tilstrekkelig at kurset går annet hvert år** (ut fra søkertallene de siste år). Vi har tatt kontakt med Nord universitet for å drøfte muligheten for et samarbeid mellom fagmiljøene med tanke på å tilby kursene hver sine år. Pr i dag tilbys kursene annet hvert år og samme år ved begge universitetene. Man kunne tenke seg en modell der vår studenter ble anbefalt å ta Nord universitets kurs de årene vi ikke tilbyr det. Et innledende møte med Nord universitet vil bli gjennomført i Tromsø den 17. januar (ISV og prodekan forskning deltar fra UiT).
4. Utarbeide **plan for fordeling av undervisningsansvar mellom enhetene**. Gruppen foreslår følgende ansvarsfordeling:

ISV v/Flemmen har emneansvar for SVF-8040 og koordinerer arbeidet i teamet (jfr mandatet).

Ellers foreslår følgende syklus:

- ILP v/Paulgaard har ansvar for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet i 2021
- Sentrene CPS, SESAM og SKK v/nytilsatt i metodestilling har ansvar for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet i 2023
- ISV har ansvar for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet i 2025

Gruppen har også drøftet følgende tilleggspunkter:

5. **Tidspunkt på året**. Tidligere har kurset vært i juni, men det var ved forrige gjennomkjøring i 2019 skjøvet til april for å få kurset gjennomført innenfor rammen av ett semester. Dette var uheldig av to grunner; det var vanskelig å få forelesere på dette tidspunktet og det var vanskeligere med romtilgang på campus. Erfaringsmessig og for å sikre kvaliteten på emnet bør fakultetet derfor vurdere å gå tilbake til juni for første samling. Kurset må også koordineres mot de obligatoriske kursene i etikk (april) og vitenskapsteori (oktober).
6. **Innhold og opplegg for kurset**. Viktig å avgrense kurset mot etikkurset og vitenskapsteorien, selv om det er viktig og nødvendig med noe overlap.

Det er viktig at kursene på PhD nivå ikke er for smale og innrettet bare mot stipendiatenes prosjekter, slik at de har en allmenndannende effekt også.

Vi luftet tanker om:

- Første økt/samling:
  - Å utnytte det at de er samlet til å bruke summegrupper, slik at folk får snakket sammen.
  - Legge noen forelesninger tilgjengelig på nett (for å utnytte mer av tiden sammen til samtaler) og legge lenker til diverse nettressurser i Canvas. Evt også lage noen fagspesifikke tilbud til profesjonsfagene – nettbasert eller av de inviterte foreleserne. Studentene verdsetter kontakten med de eksterne foreleserne så denne bør ikke fjernes helt.
  - Ønske om noe felles pensumlitteratur. Dette er foreslått både for forkurset og for emnet.
- Andre økt/'samling':
  - Paperpresentasjon (her kan vi eventuelt lage små grupper i Alta, Harstad, Tromsø etter behov) slik at folk slipper å reise til denne samlingen. Hvis det er få på ett sted, kan vi bruke nettbaserte workshoper om ønskelig for deltakerne. Må veie dette opp mot hensynet til at det var kan være fint å møtes.

Konkluderer med at det ikke er hensiktsmessig at for mye spesifiseres i emnebeskrivelsen, slik at mest mulig fleksibilitet tillates.

Forslag til revidert emnebeskrivelse følger vedlagt.

Vennlig hilsen fra

Anne Britt Flemmen, ISV (referent)

Gry Paulgaard, ILP

Torjer Olsen, SESAM

Hege K. Andreassen, SKK

## SAKSFRAMLEGG

---

Til:  
Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet

Møtedato:  
25.02.2020

Sak:  
3/20

---

### Emneevaluering av emnet SVF-8054 Theory of Science høsten 2019

#### Innstilling til vedtak:

Ph.d.-utvalget takker faglærer for evalueringen, og ber om at antall dager i beskrivelsen av «undervisning» fjernes fra emnebeskrivelsen. Etter gjennomføringen av emnet høsten 2020 skal emnet igjen evalueres, og det skal vurderes om en større revisjon i tråd med alternativ 2 skal gjøres.

#### Bakgrunn:

Fakultetet nedsatte våren 2017 en ekstern komité for å evaluere ph.d.-emnet *SVF-8054 Theory of Science*. Den eksterne rapporten pekte på flere svakheter med emnet, og det ble foreslått ulike tiltak for å forbedre emnet. I januar 2018 ble det satt ned en intern gruppe som skulle revidere emnebeskrivelsen, og implementere forslag og innspill gitt av den eksterne evalueringskomiteen.

Høsten 2018 ble emnet for første gang gjennomført med ny struktur. Emneevalueringen ble lagt frem som sak for ph.d.-utvalget 12.02.2019<sup>1</sup>. Basert på tilbakemeldingene som da kom ble det klart at ambisjonene med revideringen av emnet ikke ble oppnådd. Spesielt var det fellesdelen som fikk dårlig tilbakemelding. Man lyktes ikke med å få til en god sammenbinding av innholdet i emnet mellom fellesdelen og seminardelene.

Videre uteble de økte ressursene som ble lovet av IFF. Pr dekan var etter dette møtet i kontakt med IFF og professor

Høsten 2019 ble emnet igjen tilbudt med den nye strukturen som arbeidsgruppen i 2018 kom frem til. I forkant av gjennomføringen ble professor Attila Tanyi (IFF) tildelt emneansvaret. Emnet hadde to samlinger. Den første samlingen gikk over 2,5 dager med fellesundervisning etterfulgt av 0,5 dag med seminarundervisning. Den andre samlingen over to dager hadde kun seminarundervisning.

#### Gjennomføring høsten 2019

Fagansvarlig for emnet professor Attila Tanyi har skrevet en meget utfyllende rapport om gjennomføringen av kurset høsten 2019, se vedlegg. Fagansvarlig refererer i sin rapport til to studentevalueringer som ble gjort etter hver samling i høst. Rapporten gir et godt sammendrag av

---

<sup>1</sup> ePhorte 2018/2711

studentenes tilbakemelding. Flere studenter enn tidligere er fornøyde med kurset som helhet, men igjen så er studentene langt mer fornøyde med seminarene enn fellesdelen.

Emnet har i alle år blitt kritisert av studenter fordi det er uklart hva som faktisk er hensikten med kurset. Fagansvarlig problematiserer også dette i sin rapport. Han sier at det forventes at filosofi skal sørve interessenes og behovene til fakultetet, men det er uklart hva disse behovene faktisk er både for ham selv og også for studentene. Faglærer mener at emnet i dag i altfor stor grad handler om å gi studentene direkte hjelp med avhandlingen. Fellesdelen er lite interessant for studentene fordi studentene klarer ikke å se relevansen av kurset opp imot egen avhandling. Seminarene er derimot meget populære fordi der får studentene direkte støtte opp imot egen forskning.

Fagansvarlig har tidligere undervist ph.d.-emnet *SVF-8060 Fenomenologi i et tverrfaglig perspektiv* (5 stp.). På dette emnet leverer studentene normalt ikke en eksamen basert på eget ph.d.-prosjektet, og forelesningene går heller ikke direkte på den enkelte students avhandling. I stedet for forventes det at studentene lærer mer generelt om etikk og vitenskapsteori og så er det opp til studentene å klare å relatere innholdet til deres egen forskning.

### **Forslag til revisjon av emnet**

For å kunne få til et bedre emne har faglærer og to av seminarlærerne presentert to alternative organisatoriske endringer av emnet.

#### Alternativ 1:

To samlinger

- 1) Samling 1:
  - a. Fellesdelen 1,5 dager (tidligere 2,5 dager)
  - b. Seminar som undervises i tråd med fellesdelen 1,5 dager (tidligere 0,5 dag)
- 2) Samling 2: 3-4 uker senere:
  - a. Seminarundervisning over 1,5 dager der utkast til eksamensbesvarelse diskuteres
  - b. Eksamen leveres 3-4 uker senere.

#### Alternativ 2:

- Emnets struktureres på samme måte som *SVF-8060 Fenomenologi i et tverrfaglig perspektiv*.
- Undervisningen består av forelesninger og seminar over en periode på to uker. Seminarene brukes for å diskutere det som er blitt forelest før.
- Undervisningen består av tema hentet fra både fellesdelen og seminarene i dag, og all undervisning er felles.
- Veiledningen skjer først etter at undervisningen er over.
- Fokuset vil i mindre grad være på studentenes eget forskningsprosjekt.

Alternativ 1 vil medføre at man vil sette et større fokus på seminardelen av emnet, og man vil kunne gjennomføre undervisningen innenfor rammen av dagens emnebeskrivelse. Alternativ 2 vil medføre en større revidering av dagens emnebeskrivelse, og både undervisning, eksamen og læringsmål må justeres. Det mest interessante alternativet er alternativ 2, men IFF har gitt beskjed om at de ikke vil klare å gjøre de nødvendige justeringene på emnebeskrivelsen som må til innen fristen (1. mars).

### **Prodekanens kommentar**

Det er ønskelige at alternativ 2 utredes som ny organisering av emnet.. Dette alternativet kan i større grad tvinge studentene til å heve blikket over eget prosjekt og se det i en større sammenheng. Det må også vurderes muligheter for et forkurs/innføring i vitenskapsteori for å opprettholde kurset på ph.d nivå. Studentene oppholder seg på flere campus, så dette bør organiseres som nettbasert kurs og eventuelt formuleres som et arbeidskrav. Dette må inkludere eksempler for både disiplin og profesjonsfagene.

Studentene opplever nå seminarene som utvidet veiledning av eget prosjekt, og de klarer ikke helt å relatere innholdet i fellesdelen til eget prosjekt. Siden IFF ikke har kapasitet nå til å gjøre endringene foreslått i alternativ 2, foreslås det at man for høsten 2020 følger alternativ 1 som er et forslag seminarlærerne også er enige i. Etter gjennomføringen skal emnet evalueres på nytt. Dersom evalueringen enda ikke er tilfredsstillende, bør man revidere emnet på nytt og undervise emnet i tråd med IFFs emne SVF-8060.

Olav Skare  
seksjonsleder

Nina Norum Anda  
rådgiver

*Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur*

Vedlegg: Fagansvarlig Attila Tanyis rapport og studentevalueringene

## SVF-8054 THEORY OF SCIENCE ASSESSMENT

Based on end-of-term, mid-term student feedbacks (both attached), Anniken's remarks and my own notes.

### Preparation for and work during the course

- Most students have read both prior to and during the course and by the time the course has ended, they have read at least 50% of the assigned readings.
- Some students complain about too much reading, the difficulty of the material (abstract, philosophical) or about the relevance (so they had to choose). By 'relevance' they seem to mean mainly relevance for their own work (= doctoral dissertation).
- One student mentions that we should have some kind of prior training for how to read philosophical texts. (Compare to SVF-8060 where there is a library course, although this offers usual literature search training only.)
- Students generally are happy with their own contribution to the course. (I agree: they were active and interested, most of the time.)

**MAIN TAKEAWAYS:** *Possibly reduce required readings; offer a session on how to write a philosophy essay (plenty of material available); offer a Library session on sourcing and literature search.*

### Common lectures

- I think we can say that students are generally satisfied with the lectures (nearly 50% rate them highly), but it is also clearly that (i) the lectures somewhat polarize opinion (there is a ca. 25% who didn't like the lectures) and (ii) many students (26%) thought the lectures were at best average. So there is clearly room for improvement. The mid-term evaluation is in line with this, although the sample is less representative.
- Several students complain again about relevance (meaning: for their own research/topic/field).
- Some point out that the lectures were too much oriented towards the philosophy of natural science and the social or human sciences. (Mentioned concrete misses: hermeneutics, interpretation). The mid-term evaluation is very clear on this – this is the most often mentioned problem.
- Some students point out that the lectures were difficult, exhausting, hard to understand at points. The mid-term evaluation has specifically asked about this and although most students think the level was appropriate, they do complain about organization, the lack of introduction to what is going to be covered and why.
- Some students complain about too wide a scope; too much included in the lectures. They want at least then an introduction that also explains to them why the discussed topics are relevant for them and how they connect to the required readings.
- The student-lecturer interaction is generally rated high (65%). This is even better in the mid-term evaluation. (Some students don't like that teachers also engage in the discussion but other students disagree.)
- Some students do complain about unorganized discussions (some persons dominating), lack of interactive teaching (more group work and follow-ups), lack of clear structure to the lectures. (I agree: we should pay more attention to making the lectures active and structured.)

- Students generally considered the level of lectures appropriate, although some point to parts that were difficult to comprehend. (Note: over 20% of students thought the lectured were too difficult. We should strive to reduce this number.)
- My own observation: Three days of lecturing in a row don't work, too much, there has to be breaks between teaching days. Or we could break it up into more diverse teaching, perhaps on more specific topics that are also more suitable to the interests of the students.

**MAIN TAKEAWAYS:** *make the lectures more focused and relevant for the students; engage them actively (case studies and presentations; PBL - forming groups of five, say, with a philosopher and a specialist and work a problem/challenge/question); provide clear structure for the lectures (what will happen, why, how does it relate); work out a better structure for these lecturing days.*

#### Specialist seminars

- Almost all students like the specialist seminars (over 90%). They frequently mention relevance, feedback, lecturer and seminar leader qualities as their main reasons.
- Same kind of assessment regarding student-teacher interaction. Very positive.
- Regarding level of difficulty, students are generally happy. Some point out that there were some difficult readings and that there was not much teaching. (I agree: the seminars were geared to discuss the student's own contributions. There was time for mini-lectures only, if at all. This is a point that Anniken also makes in her own assessment and considers to be the biggest problem with the course.)
- My own observation: the course at the moment is unbalanced. The students are not required but are likely to write their final essay on a topic related to their doctoral work. As a result, they look at the common lectures as largely irrelevant, whereas the specialist seminars become their main focus since these function as supervisory sessions. I think neither is good a thing – in any case, we need to re-assess if we want to continue this practice.

**MAIN TAKEAWAYS:** *these seminars are generally considered good and useful but teaching – lecturing, focusing on the theoretical syllabus – is missing and must be provided for (with time and occasion). There is also the question of what purpose these seminars serve (and how they relate to the common lectures).*

#### Entire course

- Overall satisfaction with the course shows a mixed picture: most students are more satisfied than unsatisfied (over 80%) but only about half of the students are (strongly) satisfied with the course. So there is room for improvement.
- Students were also asked about what they have learnt from the course. It is hard to pinpoint many common points, but it is clear that, one or two unsatisfied students aside, the course was seen as useful by the students. They seem to appreciate the philosophical perspective it offers. This is also clear from their views on the relevance of the course (over 80% are positive).
- Having said this, although students clearly found the course useful and its content have met their expectations (over 60% in clear support, another 21% is in the middle), the two parts of the course are seen differently: students overwhelmingly prefer the specialist seminars to the common lectures. This is underlined by their evaluation in the mid-term

form as well where many – albeit not the majority – report that the lectures didn't increase their interest in the subject (significantly).

- In the last part, students give diverse recommendations:
  - As often, many point out that the common lectures were not relevant for them. By this they mean, their doctoral project/work.
  - Some ask for more teaching – lectures – in the specialist seminar part.
  - One student recommends splitting the course along specialization lines and another agrees that one lecturer would be better.
  - More active teaching (group work, individual assignments).
- As Anniken also points out, there is also an issue with the exam assessment in the course. Students think about their final essay topic only after the common lectures, but there is no time set for discussing them with the specialist teachers outside the seminars.

**MAIN TAKEAWAYS:** *There is a clear need for this course, that much is obvious. However, the unclear function of the common lectures – and, in my view, the generally undecided purpose of the course – plagues the course. We need to decide what we do and why we do it. The lectures need to be more relevant, but how relevant? How much time should they take up? Etc.*

## **WHAT IS TO BE DONE? PROPOSALS FOR CHANGING THE COURSE**

I think the course runs good enough to survive with some tinkering also in its present format. (We could change somewhat the topic of the lectures, the form of assessment etc.) However, for it to be a truly better course, some more fundamental structural questions has to be decided. Two questions underlie these issues:

1. What exactly is the purpose of the course? Is this a *philosophy* course that is to be offered for the rest of the Faculty as an interesting background for doctoral students? Or is this *service* teaching where philosophy staff is brought in to teach what is, by others, considered to be directly relevant for doctoral research in the Faculty?
2. Who, therefore, runs this course? Is it IFF that offers this course on its own terms or is this a Faculty course where IFF is asked to contribute according to terms mainly set by others?

A comparison with another doctoral course I teach in – SVF-8060 – helps here. It is clear that we provide here service teaching and we are brought in to serve specific interests and needs.

It seems to me that at the moment it is unclear what purpose SVF-8054 serves. It often appears that philosophy is expected to serve the interests and needs of the Faculty. This is fine, but then the next problem is that it is unclear what exactly these needs and interests are.

Concerning this, the course at the moment operates with the – unofficial – aim that we help the participating students with their doctoral work. (It is fairly clear from the students' feedback that this is also their expectation – just read through the comments above the frequent criticism that the common lectures are not relevant for their work and take time away from it. It is for the same reason that they so much like the specialist seminars: these seminars function as prolonged supervisory sessions, sort of mini workshops on their doctoral thesis from the point of view the theory of science.) This is far from obvious. While it is clear that all/most of the advice/feedback above regarding the content and structure of lectures

should be heeded, this doesn't decide whether students should come to this course to receive help with their doctoral research *in the direct way we do this now*. Again, the comparison with SVF-8060 is instructive: here students do not normally submit their final essay on a topic related to their dissertation and no part of the teaching focuses on it. Instead, students are expected to learn more generally about the ethics and theory of science and it is left to them to relate this to their doctoral work. Their final submission is therefore often on something entirely unrelated to their doctoral work.

I wanted to note these more basic questions because I cannot decide them alone. In what follows I act on the assumption that the questions above might be answered differently. That is, the best would be to come up with a structure that can accommodate whatever answer is given above.

Here are two proposals.

#### PROPOSAL 1 (ANNIKEN'S PROPOSAL with some tinkering by me)

1. Teaching in the common part is reduced to one or a maximum of one and a half days.
2. The teaching in the specialization part is aligned with the common part and is given at least one and a half days.
3. In addition, each specialization gets a day and a half to discuss the sketches of the essays 3-4 weeks after, i.e. 3-4 weeks before the essay is to be delivered.

Re 1), the common lectures could either be configured to fit the specific needs of the specialist teaching or not so configured but still take on more of the relevant topics than before. What is important is that there would be less teaching and more focus would be needed.

Re 2), this should make it possible that the specialist teachers can also lecture/teach and not just discuss the essays of the students. This would also make it possible for the common lectures to not only focus on specifically relevant topics for the doctoral students but also for whatever is deemed important to know about the theory of science.

Re 3), students would deliver their essays either on their own dissertation or on some other topic. The structure itself doesn't decide this. The proposal's point is just that there would be extra time for supervision in addition to teaching.

In this structure, there would still be two clearly separated parts of the course – the common lectures and, probably weeks later, the specialist seminars – and IFF's contribution would mainly be confined to teaching in the first part.

I take it that this structure is compatible with any answers to the main questions raised above. Still, this proposed structure is more amenable to a service-teaching model from the IFF's point of view. This structure clearly puts the emphasis on the specialist teaching side of the course (specialist teachers are the primary supervisors and also get more time). Accordingly, to run a structure like this, IFF need not be the course's sole administrator.

PROPOSAL 2 (Structure similar to SVF-8060, see attached 2020 programme)

1. Teaching takes the form of lectures and seminars (and possibly other formats such as roundtable discussions or plenary debates) in a two-week period. Seminars are aligned with the lectures – i.e. the seminars that follow the lectures on a particular discuss topics raised in the lectures.
2. The lectures are to be offered on specific topics comprising both of what is now common lectures (IFF) and specialist teaching.
3. Supervision takes place after the course has ended, although of course students are encouraged to think and talk about their essay ideas throughout the course (see my remarks below).

Re 1), there would be no gap between teaching and we would no longer talk about the first and second part of the course. Presently, each student spends 5 or 5 1/2 days with the course. In this format more would be spent possibly, but not necessarily (in SVF-8060, 8 days are used, but two of those days is used only by those students who sign up for an extra Library course; for the rest we are talking about 6 days). The advantage would be, though, that students would get diverse teaching forms on each day and diverse lectures as well.

Re 2), lectures are offered on specific topics that are deemed relevant for the course – that is, this would be a mix of common lectures and specialist lectures using our present vocabulary. Otherwise, there would be no difference, except that in this format, the specialist lectures wouldn't be offered only to those students who 'belong' to the specialist group. I personally regard this as an advantage, but it is up for discussion (we can exempt students from attending specialist lectures that are not in their specialization). The seminar discussion need not be of a supervisory nature (in SVF 8060 they are self-managed discussions on assigned readings), but they could be.

Re 3), as I say above, the natural way to proceed is to leave supervision for after the course. If this is not acceptable, then the seminars could be used to gauge students' interests in certain topics. However, some (most) supervision would still have to be offered after the course.

This proposed structure requires a much more radical transformation of the present course (it should be added here though that SVF-8060 constantly receives high praise from students). It is also a structure that is more amenable to being administered by IFF as course-owner. In this structure, neither side – specialist or common/generalist – need dominate and we could just regard this as an interdisciplinary doctoral-level course with a philosophy course code.

## Rapport fra «SVF 8054 Theory of Science End of Term evaluation»

Innhentede svar pr. 19. november 2019 13:35

- Leverte svar: **23**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **34**

### Med fritekstsvar

## Questions concerning background, preparation and contribution

### What is your scientific background? \*

Please choose only one option.

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Humanities	9	39,1 %	<div><div></div></div>
Linguistics	3	13 %	<div><div></div></div>
Social sciences	11	47,8 %	<div><div></div></div>

### How much of the required readings had you read before the course started? \*

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
None	0	0 %	
Less than 25%	9	39,1 %	<div><div></div></div>
25-50%	10	43,5 %	<div><div></div></div>
More than 50%	1	4,3 %	<div><div></div></div>
Almost/All	3	13 %	<div><div></div></div>

### How much of the required readings had you read by the time the course ended? \*

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
None	0	0 %	
Less than 25%	4	17,4 %	<div><div></div></div>
25-50%	6	26,1 %	<div><div></div></div>
More than 50%	6	26,1 %	<div><div></div></div>
Almost/All	7	30,4 %	<div><div></div></div>

### In case your answer was not 'All/almost all', please explain why this was the case: \*

- Selected most valuable reading for paper/presentations.
- I did not get the time to read everything before the course ended. The texts in the field of theory of science is really abstract and theoretical that requires more time to read than more empirical texts.
- Some readings didn't seem relevant, expected that the essential points would be touched upon in the lectures, it was an extensive list.
- Partly because I was late to get hold of the books (they were loaned at the library), and partly because I found little of the required reading relevant for my exam paper, and felt that I had to prioritize reading relevant to that. Lastly - and more general, readings take time, and with teaching and other work with my project I were not able to get through all the readings.
- We're not at the end just yet. But ... A lot of the English texts are very difficult to understand when you don't have the basic knowledge. This meant I had to read a lot of theory of (social) science in Norwegian first. Then start on the English texts. All together I've read a lot, but not as much on the list as I like to.
- First time with social science. It's been a struggle, but finally I'm getting closer to understanding
- Due to a death in the family I had little time to focus on the course. I also had some problems finding the Benton and Craig book, but got it just before the second part of the course.
- My answer was all/almost all
- Didn't have time, and didn't see the relevance of all the literature for my area.
- Reading and writing is a process, so I will continue reading on the rest of the literature while working on the final draft for my paper.
- It takes a reeeeeeeaaally long time to read philosophical literature, if you are not used to it...
- Too much reading that I couldn't connect my work to. Plus how to read so much without knowing what to look for? There should be a part on how to read in the first place.
- -

- --
- Not finished the Toulmin book, because of time problems.
- A lot of the literature was irrelevant for my project (too much nature science focus), so I picked the literature that was relevant, and added more not from the required reading list.
- .
- Didn't find much of the reading interesting and these courses already feel like they take too much time away from your work.
- ?
- -
- too much to read on too little time, given that there were other things to do, that had to be done.
- Not enough time
- Because it is a bit difficult to read philosophical stuff during one month as I have other important things to do.

### How would you evaluate your own contribution (i.e. course attendance; reading literature; preparing for lectures; active participation) to the course? \*

1: very low; 5: very high

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	9	39,1 % 	
4	11	47,8 % 	
5	3	13 % 	

### Questions concerning the common lectures

#### How would you rate the lectures? \*

1: poor; 5: excellent

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	1	4,3 % 	
2	5	21,7 % 	
3	6	26,1 % 	
4	9	39,1 % 	
5	2	8,7 % 	

#### Please explain your rating: \*

- Other than the lectures being very long and exhausting, I enjoyed them.
- I think they were very good. They contributed in giving a better understanding of the field of theory of science in general and about central discussions about knowledge production. I miss more explicit discussion about how the naturalistic approaches are relevant to the fields of humanities and social sciences.
- Difficult to follow some, unclear roles during lectures, less relevant than presumed content wise
- I have answered this before
- Too general. Not possible to see the relation between the lectures and ones own PhD-project. No hermeneutics at all! That was a disappointment.
- Første samling: manglende intro og link mellom de forskjellige foredragsholderne gjør innholdet utrolig vanskelig å forstå. Kunne ikke bidra med noe på første samling fordi jeg ikke forstod. De som sa noe virket som de hadde mer bakgrunn med vitenskapsteori. Flere som sa det samme. Greide ikke linke det opp mot spesialiseringen. Siste samling med spesialisering og oppgavegjennomgang var veldig bra. Likte Håkons presentasjon veldig godt. Burde den kommet før? Usikker på om det hadde hjulpet. Har vært en modningsprosess for meg og da hjelper tid og lesing på
- Interesting, but hard to relate to my own project.
- Most lectures were interesting, but some of them were less relevant
- Covered several subjects and gave a decent introduction, but perhaps too broad and too much focus at times on certain topics (e.g. paradigms)
- The lectures given the first three days of the course were very little relevant for my field of study, so I struggled to be motivated. There was too much of a natural science focus on philosophies of science. The lectures in the social science specialisation were really good, relevant and interesting for my research and field of study.
- They were good! Sometimes a bit too fast, when it comes to difficult concepts.
- Boring and didn't quite help my work
- They were good, but a bit too (natural) science specific.
- Perfectly structured, highly relevant and with good sense of humour.
- The course was very much related to standard philosophy of science, but not that much about interpretation.
- The lectures were good, even though there is always the challenge of interdisciplinarity, where it is very difficult to make everything relevant to each of us.
- Some worse than others but none were particularly interesting. They're too broad and all of it has been well explored throughout my years in academia.
- These lectures was waste of time. Too much nature science focus, and literature that was not relevant (even though I tried to make it relevant).
- There was too much material for a limited amount of time.
- The lectures had a logical setup with references to the readings
- Most lectures were interesting, illuminating and easy to relate to the literature. Discussions in small groups was great, especially how it was organized the second day.
- Very informative and well structured
- Everything was perfect and very interesting to listen.

**How would you rate the student-lecturer interaction? \***

1: poor; 5: excellent

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	2	8,7 % 	
3	6	26,1 % 	
4	9	39,1 % 	
5	6	26,1 % 	

**Please explain your rating: \***

- Students were encouraged to engage with lecturers.
- I think the lecturers had good contact with the students.
- It was ok
- I have answered this before
- Same as my last comment.
- Bare få personer i klasserommet turte å si noe første samling. Mange sa det i pausen. Ble så abstrakt. Skulle hatt mer spesialisering og mindre av det vi brukte de to første dagene på. Hva med helt eget kurs bare på social science.
- Lack of connection between parts, lack of relevance.
- Interesting tasks and discussions in most of the lectures
- Easy to ask questions during the lectures, input from lecturers during group work
- Independent of the quality or relevance of the lecture, I thought student-lecturer interaction was good. There was always room for questions and dialogues.
- Great!
- Lots of questions taken but lecturers need to take a grip of the direction otherwise pointless discussions scatter the class and thoughts away
- Mostly good attempts to bring in the students perspectives in the lectures.
- All my questions were answered, I had an opportunity to actively participate in discussion
- The lectures have been good.
- We did not have much interaction in the general lectures, but in the specialization there was a lot.
- The lecturers did a good job activating us as students and ask for input in research fields different from their own.
- not much for the lectures. Some people dominated too much bad management of classroom
- I didn't feel like the lecturers "listened" to students. They raced through the material and didn't follow up on group work. There wasn't enough time for discussion. We didn't have a plan (of content) outlined at the start of the each lecture. That could have been a useful tool for students to follow.
- The student-lecturer interaction happened excellently for the humaniora specialisation, but less so for the general part
- i've got nothing to complain about.
- It was good to have Group work, but it should have been followed up more closely by the teachers.
- The lecturers organized the lectures in such a way that the students had to participate. Its great!

**Was the level of the lectures appropriate? \***

1: too easy; 5: too difficult

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	2	8,7 % 	
3	13	56,5 % 	
4	3	13 % 	
5	5	21,7 % 	

**Please explain your rating: \***



- Some harder topics along with some easier/more familiar ones. I'd say its appropriate for the Phd-level.
- I think the level was appropriate considering that this is a course on phd level.
- Some too high, some too low
- I have answered this before
- See other comments.
- Første samling: skjønnte ingenting. Manglet intro og link til hva de to første dagene betyr for meg
- Appropriate level of the lectures.
- The level was appropriate for non-philosophy students
- Too much time spent on certain topics (e.g. paradigm shifts) which didn't do much beyond the "base level", while certain topics seemed to be too far into linguistics, i.e. not appropriate/relevant for some.
- For me this varied according to the first and second part of the lectures. As said earlier, the first part was hard to follow, as it was quite far from my research field. The other part was easier to understand.
- It was definitely challenging, but manageable!
- Yes but not taught properly
- My background taken into consideration they were perhaps a bit easy, but for the general group it seemed appropriate.
- Yes
- The standard philosophy of science was close to an introduction.

- again, the general lectures take down the rating. They were not difficult as such, but they were hard to "grasp" because they were so far from my own field.
- The lectures were overall useful, although some were obviously more relevant than others.
- It's not that they were too easy but they were all too general
- At certain points I felt like it was difficult to follow along.
- In the lectures from the general part, some lectures were less appropriate because I felt they were remotely relevant for my thesis, thus more difficult to understand
- no, thank you.
- yes
- I had no philosophical background.

## Questions concerning the specialist seminars

### How would you rate the seminars? \*

1: poor; 5: excellent

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	1	4,3 % 	
4	9	39,1 % 	
5	13	56,5 % 	

### Please explain your rating: \*

- I enjoyed getting feedback and the "workshop" quality of the seminars.
- I found the specialist seminars in the second part of the course to be particularly useful. It made me see more clearly the link between the larger theoretical and methodological debates with my own field of research. The paper seminars were also very useful. Even though the students work in very different topics I found it very useful to read the others papers and commenting and listening to the comments from the group. This was helpful for my own work as well. It also gave me valuable feedback on my own paper.
- Knowledge, passion, drive of lecturer. Supportive and constructive.
- ....
- Possible to relate to one's own project.
- Håkon er kjempeflink. Veldig interessant og relevant.
- Better, more specific relevance.
- Interesting topics, engaging lecturer, interactive lectures
- Good to have focus on the assignment for most of the time, the more general lecture-part seemed a bit misplaced.
- I think the seminars were really good, as it gave space to go deeper into social science discussions, and to focus on the relevance for your own study. I liked the approach that this was supposed to be useful for our work, and not just a matter of obligations. The part where we had the presentation of the papers was especially good, as there was a lot of time set for feedbacks and discussion around each student's paper.
- Great!
- Anniken is fantastic in giving coherence to everyone's work in a way that you feel connected to everyone's work and still learn from them
- I feel like I learnt a lot
- Highly competent instructor
- Very much discussion, but not that many lectures.
- The humanities specific lectures were excellent, and I especially appreciate how much time has gone into making the papers useful to our research and our dissertations.
- The lecture with Leifsrud were made relevant for our own projects. This lecture opened up for our own thinking. I think that more of the specialization lectures could be made directly relevant for our projects. Btw; I also enjoyed and learned a lot from the lecture where we read and gave / was given feedback on the papers.
- Anniken was great. A very useful reader and although the students work varied hugely the small group led to some great discussions
- I feel like we were "heard" and the content is useful for my own research project.
- The lecturer had enormous knowledge about the subjects discussed which could be communicated in an understandable way
- it was ok.
- It would be useful to have more time so that we could discuss more of the syllabus.
- the seminars were a kind of provoking. AND I always had food for mind.

### How would you rate the student-seminar leader interaction? \*

1: poor; 5: excellent

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	2	8,7 % 	
4	6	26,1 % 	
5	15	65,2 % 	

### Please explain your rating: \*

- Engaging.
- The schedule was well organized, assuring that everyone got time both to comment on the papers and receiving comments on their own work.
- Excellent
- ..
- Ok.
- .
- Good feedback and more relevant.
- Very interesting discussions, feedback on our argumentations. Very valuable
- Same as previously.
- Good. The strict structure of the chairing and presentations helped to distribute time for everyone to speak and engage equally.
- Learning based on interaction and learning from each other
- Smaller group, so there was a good discussion flowing throughout all of the seminars.
- Paid attention to all students
- As earlier, very much discussion.
- Seminar leader was clear and firm. She was clear about how to do it and her expectations.
- Anniken Greve has given each of us thorough and thoughtful supervision and guidance that I have found to be most useful to my project.
- I enjoyed the seminars and got something out of it.
- I liked having the opportunity to sketch out our final exam paper and discussing it with our peers.
- Great interaction, especially in the sessions on the draft discussions
- There was enough space for interaction between the two, not only to discuss one's own concerns and questions, but also in relation to others in a non-judgmental way
- i got the impression that the seminar leaders wanted to be helpful to the students.
- Useful
- Great!

### Was the level of the seminars appropriate? \*

1=too easy; 5=too difficult

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	11	47,8 % 	
4	6	26,1 % 	
5	6	26,1 % 	





### Please explain your rating: \*

- Fine for PhD-level.
- I though it was appriate.
- Level was good.
- ..
- The last two days were good! Getting comments on your drafts from other students and teachers and reading other students drafts was useful and interesting.
- Første samling: spesialiseringen greide ikke helt å linke sammenheng ml det vi hadde hørt to første dager. Burde hatt mer tid på spesialiseringen første samling. Evt så burde alle lærerne introdusert seg ved oppstart dag 1. Og så sagt litt om hvordan det legges opp
- Appropriate level of difficulty.
- Appropriate for our level
- The non-assignment-related part of the seminars was at an appropriate level, more or less.
- Yes, because the seminars were based on the work that we are doing.
- Not too difficult, lots of time for questions!
- Called for some confusing reading and discussion but the seminar leader helped
- Learnt new stuff, was possible for me to grasp.
- yes
- The seminars did not have a large amount of teaching.
- Read above about Leifulsrud. The lecture that started from 14 on Oct 28. was too abstract to be directly useful. I don't like lectures where we need to go in groups to discuss topics. We need to start thinking about our own projects, and that is easier if we are allowed to reflect on our own. (I normally like team works, so it has nothing to do with whether or not I like to work with people. This has to do with opening up for creativity, and for me that happens when I am allowed to think on my own before discussing in groups). Leifulsrud had individual tasks, and that was brilliant!
- Obviously, in some cases, the interdisciplinary nature of the course entails that I do not understand everything to the degree that I can comment and contribute to the discussions, but overall, the level of the lectures have been great.
- We just discussed us paper so it matches ability - my answer is neutral.
- Just right.
- Some of the readings were quite difficult and I would have liked to go more into the readings. Because this was not possible, it became also difficult to understand some subjects discussed
- it was ok.
- yes
- A bit difficult as I cant think so fast

### Questions concerning the entire course

### How satisfied are you with the course in general? \*

1=not satisfied; 5=satisfied

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	0	0 %	
2	4	17,4 %	
3	8	34,8 %	
4	7	30,4 %	
5	4	17,4 %	

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

- Not three things, but framing the questions in a philosophical way is helpful as my background is theory of science "for social science". Considering the same questions with a philosophical perspective was very useful for me.
- The larger issues and concerns in the theory of science, the importance of theory in defining the research project and its contribution, transparency and the importance of spelling out the assumptions that we make.
- Expanded my understanding of the hermeneutic circle Learned a great deal about definitions and concepts Learned about and my fellow PhD-candidates' thoughts and Projects.
- ..
- Currently I find it hard to answer this question. I think most of all I've learned how limited my knowledge within the field is. But - I've gained some knowledge from reading and writing. Attending this course has made me to so.
- Hva vitenskapsteori er Hvordan en oppgave og vitenskapelig tekst bør se ut Bedre forståelse av posisjonering som forsker
- The course lacks direction and the general part lacks in organization. Canvas is messy and poorly organized.
- Argument structure Falsification arguments, modelling Attitude towards phd project
- Use of- and understanding of theory - Relation of theory of science to my PhD-project as a whole - Structuring and aim of assignment
- I am not so satisfied with the first part of the course, as explained above, but really satisfied with the second part. - I have learned to be more critical about the literature and theories I use. - Useful to learn from students making quite different theoretical and methodological choices. - It is important to also learn about the approaches to science you are opposing, to be able to make a more well founded argument.
- I need to reflect about the theoretical assumptions in my field and clarify the special challenges of social science compared to natural science. I am also inspired to reflect on notions of truth and accuracy in my research.
- 1. PhD courses have mediocre to bad administration 2. Would have loved to learn more 3. But alas
- Basic theory of science Freshening up of informal logic A lot of stuff relating to writing a good paper
- 
- Hermeneutics, different projects of others and interdisciplinary approaches.
- I have learned more about argumentation, method, and how my project comes across for scholars from different disciplines.
- Institutional approaches to arguments and essay writing. Helpful to be clearly stated Seminars with students and teacher are far more useful than abstract broad lectures PhD courses are largely a waste of time
- 1) I learned from the feedback I got on my own paper. 2) I learned interesting things about concepts (leiflursrud) 3) I learned something about writing paper (but I wish we could have more about that)
- Giving feedback to other students' projects Working through difficult aspects of my own project Learning how to review material
- 1. Approach to theory 2. Approach to methodology 3. Discussions and problematics between the natural sciences and humanities/social sciences
- practicing on reading and commenting others texts, and listen how others read and comment the same texts. repetition of basic science theories and introduction to some new concepts, problems, and realms of thinking about them. Scientists are divine creatures. the course improved my toolkit for critical thinking.
- \* informal Logic \* methodological issues in other Fields of research
- Two main approaches to linguistics Different sources of the data and their disadvantages

**Did the content of the course meet your expectations? \***

1= not at all; 5=yes, fully

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1	1	4,3 %	
2	3	13 %	
3	5	21,7 %	
4	9	39,1 %	
5	5	21,7 %	

**Which parts of the course (if any), did you enjoy the most? Please specify: \***

- The workshop presentations (mini conference).
- The specialist seminars, especially the lecture with Håkon Leiflursrud.
- Seminars by far.
- The students paper presentations with feedback
- The seminar.
- Håkons del var veldig interessant. Innledet veldig bra for å skape forståelse videre. Likte oppgavegjennomgangen veldig bra selv om det var tøft.
- Specialization parts were better, but still lacking in relevance for my specialization.
- Specialist part
- The assignment-specific lectures, and the seminar on theory
- I enjoyed the seminar of the specialisation the most, because it was directly relevant for what I am doing in my research project.
- Discussion of drafts, having to dive into the ideas and concepts of other PhD students and their research projects! Getting thorough feedback from both teachers and students.
- Humanities specialization

- The specialist seminar
- The existential crisis discussing logic of scientific discovery
- The discussion of others projects.
- 1. Reading the students paper, give and receive feedback (Oct 29. was a good day!) 2. Leifulsrud's lecture Oct 28. Very concrete and made me think about my own project. I also like that he gave us individual tasks. That makes us think about our own projects. And that is the point with the course, right?
- I enjoyed Anniken Greve's specific feedback and input on all our project.
- Seminars where you are critiques on your work
- Establishing an understanding of what the theory of science is
- The specialisation course was most enjoyable
- small-group discussions. first sections of day two.
- The common course.
- Specialized parts: The object of Inquiry

**Which parts of the course (if any), did you enjoy the least? Please specify: \***

- None in particular.
- The lecture on modeling, because I dont thin it was very useful for most of the participants in the course. I think we spent too much time on it.
- Joint lectures by far.
- ..
- The common lectures.
- Hele første samling. Ingen sammenheng. Ingen intro. Ingen god link til spesialisering. Rart at det hovedsaklig var lærere som stilte spørsmål og nesten ingen studenter. Ikke takhøyde til å spørre, da får man dårlig interaksjon.
- General part was interesting in a general way, but did little to enhance my knowledge of the theory of science in regards to my project.
- First day because less relevant
- Common lectures, due to them being too broad to easily relate to my own work.
- As said before, I think the first part of the course was hardly relevant for my work. It was to much focused on natural science.
- /
- The one seminar I attended in social sciences
- The common lectures
- linguistic seminars
- The introductory course on informal logic.
- The general lectures. (read above)
- It is demanding to spend two whole days critiquing other students' PhD project, many of whom are far from my field of knowledge, but this has been useful as well. Even better info to us as students about the run course, the syllabus, the required readings and the exams would have been appreciated.
- The lecture and the amount of time requires
- Parts of the common lecture that weren't presented in an interesting way.
- There were large parts of the general section that I did not enjoy, for example the part on pseudo science
- day one, although the themes were interesting and explained clearly, it was tiresome. although the lecturer seemed to be very well suited to give the lecture, he also seemed a bit unprepared. part about paradigms on day two. specialized session at the end of the third day was a bit confusing, unclear content (or exhausted mind)?
- discussions on social science
- General parts.

**Do you consider the course relevant for you as a PhD student? \***

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Yes	20	87 %	
No	3	13 %	

**Do you consider the course relevant for your PhD project? \***

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Yes	19	82,6 %	
No	4	17,4 %	

**Would you recommend the course to other PhD students? \***

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Yes	15	65,2 %	
No	8	34,8 %	

**Do you have other suggestions for improving the course? \***

- Not really.
- No.
- My three last answers need comments: I consider having such a course a necessity for a PhD candidate, but I would not recommend this particular course as a whole. The seminar groups were however VERY useful. Wish we would have had more specified lectures earlier. Finally, as always with the compulsory PhD courses in UiT the workload is somewhat too much for so few credits.
- I would neither recommend nor advise the course.. concerning this survey - I answered the last one very carefully with the comments I felt important to give feedback on, and used a lot of time on this. Having to fill out everything all over again (like my first answer does not count) I think is a ridicule of my time. I am highly provoked and will not take the effort to do it all over again! I know that this form also is about the specialist seminar - thats fine. But questions about the common lectures shcould not have been included here. At least there should have been a possibility to skip these questions in this survey (for those who already have answered the first survey).

- Split the group and the syllabus. Separate courses for linguistics, humanities, social science. Use one teacher. We are encouraged by the seminar leader to write in Norwegian, but the syllabus is in English. Should be possible to find both English and Norwegian literature on the syllabus.
- I would recommend the course if it gets a better structure especially the first day. Vitenskapsteorikurs er Viktor, men det må være et godt kurs da.
- Increase relevance for different specializations. Improve organization and information, especially in Canvas.
- no
- I did not see the point of the very first 2-page assignment. I don't see how the questions asked there relate to the rest of the course, and we never used the text again.
- It would be good to try to make the first part of the course relevant also for social scientists.
- no
- Yes.. much better lecturing required!
- Be a bit more specific about humanist and social science in the general part
- no
- More lectures on interpretation and less on philosophy of science, possibly in the seminars.
- Divide the general lectures. Today I feel that If I had chosen not to participate in the general lectures, I would still have the same degree of learning as I got from participating. And yes, I was active. I asked questions and took notes. I also read some of the articles before the general lectures: (measurements in science, models in science, science and pseudo science, thomas kuhn, the mechanical mind). So, my opinion is vested in a real effort to make this work. Do you consider the course relevant for your PhD project: both yes (specialization) and no.
- See box above!
- Maybe one lecturer for whole course and choose one that's a really good teacher. It was way to much time and effort for 7 credits. If we just have one day of lecture followed by one day of seminar that would be plenty!!!
- More group work, participation from students.
- I would recommend the course on the condition that would in the future account for different perspectives that are non-Western. I missed the inclusion of gendered perspectives as well. Are there no female philosophers that are taking up the philosophy of science? Where does the philosophy of science stand today, in 2019?
- After discussing with fellow students I have got the impression that many some struggle to see how some of the topics discussed in the literature and the lectures are of any relevance to their subjects. Although i don't necessarily agree, i see their point. on the first day it could have been some form of introduction clarifying the aims of the course and what it is not about. Given that the syllabus contains hundreds of pages with text about rather unfamiliar terms and frames of references, it could have been circulated even earlier. Announce that there will be some sort of tasks/discussions (specify the questions/problems, it triggers curiosity and/or motivates reading as way of maximizing the probability of avoiding the shameful feelings of being unprepared) related to the required literature during the common sessions. Also, the tasks should probably be included as part of the lectures.
- To have more lectures, especially in the specialization part.
- No

Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema (v771\_1rc1)

## Rapport fra «SVF-8054 Theory of Science mid-term evaluation »

Innhentede svar pr. 19. november 2019 13:36

- Leverte svar: **10**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **33**

How satisfied are you with the lectures in general? (1=totally unsatisfied; 5=very satisfied) \*

- 3
- 2
- 4
- 2
- 4
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 3
- 5

Please explain why you were satisfied/not satisfied: \*

- Generally i think the lectures were to monotonous, when it comes to teaching/working methods. I missed more group work (Michaels lessons had some), where we could summarise or discuss how we could relate the theme of the lecture to our field.
- Most of the general part was not relevant (with few exceptions). Even the part regarding Representation, which could have been very relevant for human sciences, but was more nature science focused. E.g. Mathematical equations and astronomy doesn't work very well with human sciences. The lecture about definitions was relevant. But failed to engage because it was mostly read from the pdf. The specialization was relevant, but because most of the days concerned the general topics, I rate according to the general ones.
- They were interesting in general. Although I find the natural sciences to be interesting, I feel more work could have been done to connect the extended discussion of those kinds of knowledge-production to the fields of research relevant to most of the students participating in this course.
- Most lectures fail to explain the link between the material and why it is important, how it will make us be better researchers. Almost all examples linked to hard science, few examples for social sciences.
- I think it was overall really interesting. However, I think in the beginning a general introduction to the world of theory/philosophy of science would have been nice! (Why is this relevant for every PhD student irrespective of their field of research? How will this knowledge/understanding benefit us as researchers? etc.)
- Some of the topics of common lectures were not directly related to the Humanities. Sometimes group work was not monitored properly.
- Good structure on lectures, relevant and interesting content.
- A bit messy and monotonous
- 1st day: the lecturer didn't seem to be fully prepared, which caused some confusion. Otherwise ok. 2nd day: generally very good, especially the two first sessions. Great questions for the group discussions. In the last session too much time was spent on explaining Kuhn's example of a paradigm shift. Guest lecturer, really interesting presentation of a tool for doing simulations, but failed to make a strong connection to theory of science. 3rd day: common lecture ok. Group session social sciences was ok and helpful.
- There were too much focus on the natural sciences, especially on day 2, and it was difficult to see the relevance abd applicability for the social sciences.

Was the level of the lectures appropriate? (1: too difficult; 5: too easy) \*

- 3
- 2
- 3
- 1. Because of lack of introduction ans sum-up to give relevance - also to social science people and real life research.
- 3
- 3
- 3
- 3
- 3
- 3
- 3

Please specify the lectures that missed the appropriate level, in your opinion, and state why: \*

- The level was Ok, I think. In such a big course - on a comprehensive theme as Theory of science, I know that all content cant be covered in the lectures. Therefore to get a better picture over the content of the course and the expected learning outcome, I think it would be smart that each lecturer states the goal for the lesson and also notifies why "this" topic are to be covered are to be covered in the lectures over other themes.
- Most of the general lectures (except the one regarding definitions) had very little relevance for my work.
- -
- Day 1, Jan Harald: an introduction is always helpful (totally lacking). All teachers should have been formally introcuded in the morning (since all are not able to join the evening before). Day 2, Michael: same as day 1. Introduction and sum-up - the basic distinction between questions of onthology and questins of epistemology are not at all clear. Day 3, Fredrik: also hear, unclear what this is about and why it is important. In general: Was not able to contribute to most group work, feeling stupid (because I don't understand) most of the time does not help. Avery few people in the class room (except teachers) did take part in the discussions.
- /
- The lecture on Informal logic, cause the group work was poorly organised.
- .
- One too easy, one too difficult
- Day 1, somewhat unprepared. Day 2, too much time explaining an example instead of discussing the issues it was meant to illustrate. And maybe it would have been more appropriate to spend more time on examples of paradigm shifts in the social sciences. There was only a swift reference to the model of peopling the american continent (how is that a paradigm shift?).
- I think the lectures had the appropriate level.

**How well was the instructors' presentation of material organised? (1=disorganized; 5=organized) \***

- 3
- 4
- 4
- With the lack of introduction and summing up (what does this really mean in the way you do your research) I would say a 2 over all. Jan Harald: too much reading from the presentation. Understandable though with all the difficult text. Michael: only hard science, hard to relate. Fredrik: other forms of presenting than sitting by the table?
- 5
- 4
- 5
- 3
- 4
- 4

**Please specify the lectures that were disorganized, in your opinion, and state why: \***

- Michaels lessons. Generally I think it is totally ok not having a power point or any other written material. But when not having anything concrete to hold on to during a lesson I think it is difficult knowing what really is the purpose. Making some bullet points about what are to be covered or the goal of the lecture, could well have been written on the blackboard in the start of the lesson. then it would have been easier to follow the lecture.
- The teachers in the general lectures were organized, but I don't think anyone managed to frame the relevance for our work. It was unclear where they wanted with the lectures.
- All the lectures were fairly well organized. However, I would have liked more engagement with the required readings, and more time devoted to discussion.
- Mostly lack of a good introduction and sum-up. Why is this and this interesting, how is it linked to ontology and epistemology, should I be able to understand more of my ontological and epistemological standpoint - how?
- /
- The lecture on Informal logic
- .
- 1 well (PP), 1 medium (detailed script), 1 less
- all lectures seemed to be organized, but time is always an issue.
- I did not find any of the lectures especially disorganized.

**Were the instructors willing to provide help for students who needed it? (1= seemed unwilling to help; 5= seemed willing to help) \***

- 4
- 5
- 5
- 5. IFF seems like a different world. Still important to take into account that one might come from different disciplines and provide more examples also from social sciences.
- 5
- 5
- 5
- 5
- 5
- 5

**Should you have any comments on student-teacher interaction, please make them here: \***

- Generally, I experienced that the teachers were willing to provide help. Only, in the first lecture on Wednesday, in my opinion, the lecturer was a bit too quick answering questions from the students. This resulted in that the students did not get opportunity to elaborate and sometimes make his/hers question clear.
- n/a
- Not student-teacher, but teacher-teacher. Some of the discussions between the teachers (while a lecture was ongoing) was unhelpful; it made it harder, rather than easier to understand what the teacher was trying to communicate, and took time from the lecture.
- Only a few people dare to make comments in class. Might have something to do with tension between the disciplines.
- I really liked the fact that also the other teachers engaged in the discussions (I know it might not be the normal case that the teachers participate in all lectures, but I really enjoyed to hear the different standpoints :))
- In general it was fine
- The group assignment did not work very well. I am not sure why.
- The amount of lecturers and their need to participate made learning complicated at times. Discussions and comment were not always relevant, they were not presented and their roles were not clarified. However, a few of the discussions and comments (when brief) could help make things clearer.
- ok
- No comment.

**To what extent have the lectures increased your interest in the topic on which it is focused? (1=no effect whatsoever; 5=made me very interested) \***

- 2
- The general part = 1. the social science part: 4
- 4
- 3. I want to be a good researcher and to know my standpoint. I will continue to read more to get a better understanding, but I had imagined the course would help me further along the way.
- 4
- 3
- 3
- 2
- 3
- 4

**Please specify the lectures that you learned the most of, and state why: \***

- The first lecture with Jan Harald, because this was the lecture that it was most clearly for me how I could relate what we talked about to my own work.

- The specialization in Social sciences. This was spot on regarding phd and paper writing.
- The specialization seminar was really good, and it helped to be in a smaller group, where the conversation could flow more naturally.
- Specialisation: but still hard to grasp the real meaning of. Was not able to use the group work in a good way because of lack of understanding. Specialisation should have had at least one full day.
- I really liked the discussion about what science is. It may have been the most basic one, but I realized how diffuse my own definition of science is.
- The Mind and Human Sciences by Fredrik Nyseth, cause it was well-organised and very relevant for my project
- The lecture on day 3: these subjects were partly new to me.
- The very last session - it was specific yet managed to cover a number of basis in a heartbeat, relevant, and helpful to my project. The first was also good, easy to follow the powerpoint and relevant group work. The practical tasks day II were also good and focused.
- Lecture one and two on the 2nd day. It was really helpful in clarifying something that often is confusing/messy.
- I learned most from the general lecture on the third day of the course because I found it more relevant for my dicipline and for my own phd project. However, I think that it was unfortunate that the lecture only lasted half a day. I think that the lecture could have talked even more on for instance interpretation.

**My overall opinion of this course so far is (1=a very poor course; 5=excellent course): \***

- 3
- 2
- 4
- 2
- 4
- 3
- 5
- 2
- 3
- 4

**Please list the three most important learning outcomes for you: \***

- ...
- The specialization in Social sciences was relevant because it was directed towards the phd and the paper. The most important learning was in this part.
- I am not sure that I am in a position to properly reflect on learning outcomes from this course as of yet, as I would believe that any good, lasting learning outcomes from this course would first and foremost be visible in the thesis. However, to humor you: 1. It was good to get an introduction to informal logic. 2. The introduction to metrology could prove useful to maintain a critical view of empirical research. 3. I got some good tips for being self-critical about my research from the specialization.
- Hard to say. One step closer to an understanding, but still a long way to go.
- Reflecting on the definitions I use (and what type of definitions those are); figuring out the paradigm in which I am conducting my research; reflecting on the limits of my chosen methodology for explaining/understanding the phenomena which I am conducting research about.
- I have started to think about the place of my research in the wider context
- Problems related to method in the humanities and social sciences
- Relationship QL-QT, aspects of definitions, unclear understanding of science
- discussion of questions in small groups was a good exercise in thinking and explaining science theory in relation to my own field.
- I now have a better understanding of what theory of science is than what I had before the course started. How to read and interpret arguments. The difference of methods between natural and social sciences, and why the methods in natural sciences is not applicable to the social sciences.

**I should rate the instruction in the course so far as (1=very poor; 5=excellent): \***

- 3
- 4
- 4
- What does this mean? Instructions before we met in Tromsø: good
- 4
- 3
- 5
- 3
- 3
- 4

**Please explain why you were satisfied/not satisfied: \***

- ..
- The teachers was good, but as mentioned above, the general lectures was made very little relevant for my field (human sciences)
- -
- There is a missing link between all the teory, what is said from the teacher, and how this is linked to how I can become the best possible researcher. Maybe there are other articles that can help with this. For me (no ex-phil in the bag), it is very hard to grasp the mening. You might say that I have to be better prepared. Well, I have read a lot, nad I thought that the course would help mi with the link (some kind of translation) between theory and research.
- /
- --
- .
- It is evident that the involved lecturers are very knowledgeable and prepared, but the course is too ambitious in its attempt to cover all of the disciplines.
- Generally very interesting and its good training in thinking about science theory.
- Too much emphasis on the natural sciences.

**Is there a topic that the course should address that is not addressed, or that is being addressed but should not be? \***

- ..
- less focus on nature science and more about human science. Or have two separate courses.
- There should be a part about epistemology. How is the question of how we come to know things not relevant for a course like this?
- more hands on, maybe in the specialisation part.
- /
- --
- .

- I missed an introductory lecture focusing on the general scientific directions and lines before going into specific conflict areas. All of the topics that were presented and problematised were interesting, but it would have been nice to have some categories. Perhaps the course should be more tailored to the disciplines or offered in several shorter seminars of which the student could choose what would be most relevant. After a general first day.
- More time should be used on connecting the issues to "non-natural" sciences.
- Too much emphasis on the natural sciences.

**Any other comments on the course: \***

- I missed the course personell to present themselves in the very start of the course. It was obvious for me that some of the persons taking the word in the lectures in the start where not students. I would like to know who everyone was from the beginning, to know which field that were theirs base for discussion
- The point I am trying to make is that the lectures was not to difficult, but didn't meet my expectations in regards to relevance.
- -
- Maybe it is an idea to have 1 hour of specialisation each day to sum-up the take-aways from the day into the specialisation.
- I liked the informal Pizza-gathering, it was nice to get to know some people before the lectures started! :)
- --
- .
- There are too many requirements (submissions, presentations, attendance) for few credits.
- I am not sure if having a kick off event after working hours is a good idea. Maybe it would be better to do this in the lunch break of the first day.
- No

Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema (v771\_1rc1)

## SVF-8600, spring 2020

Time	<b>Mon 3 Feb</b> <i>Theme: An introduction to the philosophy of science</i>	<b>Tue 4 Feb</b> <i>University library course</i>	<b>Wed 5 Feb</b> <i>Theme: Rationality and disciplinarity</i>	<b>Fri 7 Feb</b> <i>Theme: Modelling, inference, and evidence</i>
09:15-10:00	Welcome, presentation, and overview of the course (Peter Arbo)	Evaluation and use of sources (Helene N. Andreassen/Eirik Reierth)	Are we as rational as we think we are? (Jørgen Sundby)	Models and modelling (Nigel Yoccoz)
10:15-11:00	Why philosophy of science? (Peter Arbo)		The logic of collective judgement (Michael Morreau)	
11:15-12:00	Theory and reality (Peter Arbo)			Reproducibility and inference under uncertainty (Nigel Yoccoz)
12:00-13:15	Lunch		Lunch	Lunch
13:15-14:00	Sociology of knowledge (Petter Holm)		From mono- to transdisciplinarity (Melania Borit)	Causal inference: confounding and statistical evidence (Nigel Yoccoz)
14:15-15:00	Seminar groups			Seminar groups followed by social gathering
15:15-16:00				

Time	<b>Mon 10 Feb</b> <i>Theme: Ethical positions</i>	<b>Tue 11 Feb</b> <i>University library course</i>	<b>Wed 12 Feb</b> <i>Theme: Research ethics</i>	<b>Fri 14 Feb</b> <i>Theme: Publishing ethics</i>
09:15-10:00	Ethical theory (Attila Tanyi)	Literature search (Helene N. Andreassen/Eirik Reierth)	Guidelines for research ethics (Michaela Aschan)	Publishing ethics: authorship, peer review, and reproducibility (Maarten Beerepoot)
10:15-11:00				
11:15-12:00	Ethics in the age of the Anthropocene (Jennifer Clare Heyward)		Seminar groups	Seminar groups
12:00-13:15	Lunch		Lunch	Lunch
13:15-14:00	Ethics in the age of the smart machine (Robert Jenssen)		Commercialization of research (Balpreet Singh Ahluwalia)	Seminar groups
14:15-15:00	Seminar groups		Politicization of research (Peter Arbo)	Info, Q&A about writing of essay, course feedback (Peter Arbo)
15:15-16:00			Seminar groups	

## SAKSFRAMLEGG

---

Til:  
Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet

Møtedato:  
25.02.2020

Sak:  
4/20

---

Emneevaluering av emnet HIF-8100 Litteratur og medisin (ISK) høsten 2019

### **Innstilling til vedtak:**

Ph.d.-utvalget takker for evalueringen og ber om at følgende setning legges inn under opptak i emnebeskrivelsen: «Minst antall deltakere for at emnet skal tilbys er: 5.»

### **Bakgrunn:**

Emnet *HIF-8100 Litteratur og medisin* (5 stp.) ble tilbudt for første gang høsten 2019. Emnet ble undervist av førsteamanuensis Henrik Johnsson ved ISK 11.–13. november, 2019. Tre studenter meldte seg til emnet, to tok eksamen og begge kandidatene besto.

Emnet ble evaluert, og studentene har gitt positive tilbakemeldinger på emnet. Studentene mener at undervisningen var i samsvar med emnebeskrivelsen, emnet hadde et tilfredsstillende faglig nivå og omfanget av pensum var bra. Det ble gitt kritikk for at pensumlisten ble publisert for sent. Videre ønsket studentene at det var flere medstudenter på emnet.

Faglærer kommenterer i sin evalueringen at han vil prøve å gjøre pensumlisten tilgjengelig tidligere neste gang. Han sier også at han vil prøve å jobbe mer aktivt for å rekruttere flere studenter, og at han ønsker å forbedre kommunikasjonen mellom de ulike lærerne.

### **Administrasjonens kommentar**

I fakultetets brev til instituttene om innspill til ph.d.-emner og i fakultetets mal for ph.d.-emner, står det at det skal legges inn en setning om at emnet tilbys under forutsetning av minst 5 studenter. En slik begrensning ligger ikke inne i emnebeskrivelsen i dag. Dette emnet hadde høsten 2019 bare tre studenter, noe studentene også mente var for få studenter. Emnet skal også tilbys høsten 2020. Det anbefales at det legges inn en setning om at emnet tilbys under forutsetning av minst fem kvalifiserte søkere.

Olav Skare  
seksjonsleder

Nina Norum Anda  
rådgiver

—

nina.n.anda@uit.no  
77 64 41 67

*Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur*

Vedlegg: Evaluering fra studenter og faglærer

Utvärderingsrapport HIF-8100  
Litteratur og medisin – hösten 2019

Av 3 registrerade studenter har 3 svarat.

**1. Har kurset levd opp til kursbeskrivelsen og til de faglige målene?**

Ja (3). En student skriver att "Det var et stort privilegium å få være med på".

**2. Har kurset hatt et tilfredsstillende faglig nivå?**

Ja (3).

**3. Har litteraturgrunnlaget/lesepensum vært passende?**

Ja (3), men litteraturlistan borde ha publicerats tidigare (2).

**4. Hvilke læringsaktiviteter vurderer de studerende som utbytterike/mindre utbytterike for læringen?**

Undervisningen fungerade bra (3), men särskilt framhålls värdet av att ha en "dialog med gjesteforeleserne om teoretisk relevans for stipendiatenes prosjekter". En student kommenterar att "Premissene for det muntlige arbeidskravet kunne gjerne vært tydeliggjort ytterligere", men att "Resten var strålende".

**5. Har det vært sammenheng mellom undervisningsform og læringsaktiviteter?**

Ja (3).

**6. Har de studentenes forberedelse og deltagelse vært passende?**

Ja (1), vet ej (1). En tredje student kommenterar att det inte gick att läsa all kurslitteratur på förhand, eftersom litteraturlistan publicerades sent.

#### **7. Hva kan gjøres for å forbedre undervisningen, både tekst- og språkmessig?**

Skicka ut litteraturlistan tidigare (2). En student föreslår att undervisningen börjar något senare och att det är önskvärt med fler deltagande studenter.

#### **8. Hvordan har kursets praktiske informasjon blitt formidlet, og har klasserommet vært tilfredsstillende? (Kommenter gjerne også anvendelsen av Canvas.)**

Bra (3). En student framhåller vikten av att publicera litteraturlistan tidigare, och kommenterar det sociala umgänget: "Veldig flott at vi fikk kaffe og lunsj". En student föreslår att externa föreläsare ges tillgång till Canvas för att förbättra kommunikationen mellan lärare.

#### Kommentar från kursansvarig:

- Litteraturlistan skall publiceras tidigare nästa gång kursen ges.
- Kursansvarig bör arbeta mer aktivt för att rekrytera fler studenter.
- Den inbördes kommunikationen mellan deltagande lärare kan förbättras.



Henrik Johnsson



Studentrepresentant