



## Møteinnkalling

Utvalg: **Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet**  
Møtested: Digitalt møte i Teams  
Møtedato: 23.02.2021  
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 1/21                  | Referat og meldinger - ph.d.-utvalgets møte 23. februar 2021               | X             | 2021/946         |
| <b>Ordinære saker</b>    |  |               |                  |
| PHD-U 1/21               | Innmelding av ph.d.-emner ved HSL-fakultetet høst 2021 og vår 2022         |               | 2021/613         |
| PHD-U 2/21               | Bedømmelse av avhandling for ph.d.-graden i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap | X             | 2020/2526        |
| PHD-U 3/21               | Bedømmelse for dr.philos.-graden i samfunnsvitenskap                       | X             | 2020/7658        |
| PHD-U 4/21               | Evaluering av emnet SVH-8001 Research dissemination                        |               | 2020/971         |
| PHD-U 5/21               | Evaluering av emnet SVH-8004 Social Inequality in Health                   |               | 2020/971         |
|                          | Eventuelt  |               |                  |

## **Orienteringssaker**

**OS 1/21 Referat og meldinger - ph.d.-utvalgets møte 23. februar 2021  
2021/946**

## SAKSFRAMLEGG

---

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

Møtedato:  
23.02.2021

Sak:  
1/21

---

Innmelding av ph.d.-emner ved HSL-fakultetet høst 2021 og vår 2022

### **Innstilling til vedtak:**

Ph.d.-utvalget ber administrasjonen om å tilrettelegge for at følgende emner revideres, opprettes og arrangeres **høsten 2021**:

SVF-8062 Programvarebasert analyse av kvalitative data - innføring i NVIVO 12 TM (5 stp.)

SVF-8066 Introduction to scientific approaches and theoretical State of the Art to child welfare, professional social work and social policy (5 stp.) (nytt)

SVF-8055 Evoking Gender (5 stp.)

Ph.d.-utvalget ber administrasjonen om å tilrettelegge for at følgende emner revideres, opprettes og arrangeres **våren 2022**:

HIF-8101 Illness in Children's and Young Adult Literature (5 stp.) (nytt)

Alle fire innmeldte emner skal evalueres i slutten av semesteret de tilbys. Praksisen er at nye emner evalueres etter første gangs gjennomføring, samt at eksisterende emner skal evalueres en gang i løpet av programperioden, altså hvert tredje år.

### **Bakgrunn:**

Instituttene/sentrene ved HSL-fakultetet har meldt inn ph.d.-emner for studieåret 2021/2022 innen fristen som var 15. januar 2021. De 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. Digital tilrettelegging av undervisning (pga. Covid-19)

Emnebeskrivelse for nye og reviderte emner er vedlagt saken.

### **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**

#### **Nye emner:**

#### **SVF-8066 Introduction to scientific approaches and theoretical State of the Art to child welfare, professional social work and social policy (5 stp.)**

Institutt for barnevern og sosialt arbeid (IBS)

Fagansvarlig Ole Henrik Hansen

#### **HIF-8101 Illness in Children's and Young Adult Literature (5 stp.)**

Institutt for språk og kultur (ISK)

Fagansvarlig: Henrik Johnsson.

### **Revidert emne:**

#### **SVF-8055 Evoking Gender (5 stp.)**

Senter for kvinne og kjønnsforskning (SKK)

Fagansvarlig: Katrin Losleben

Studieadministrativt ansvarlig: Siv Aina Hansen

Dette har tidligere vært et norskspråklig emne (*SVF-8055 Fornemmelse for kjønn*), men senteret ønsker å endre undervisnings- og eksamensspråk til engelsk.

### **Eksisterende emne, uten revidering:**

#### **SVF-8062 Programvarebasert analyse av kvalitative data – innføring i NVIVO 12 TM (5 stp.)**

Institutt for barnevern og sosialt arbeid (IBS)

Fagansvarlig: Walter Schönfelder

Studieadministrativt ansvarlig: Bjørg Malmö

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

### **Høst 2021:**

- **SVF-8054 Theory of Science** – fagansvarlig Attila Tanyi (IFF), studieadministrativt ansvarlig Lena Bogstrand
- **GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey** – fagansvarlig Helene N. Andreassen (UB), studieadministrativt ansvarlig Martin-Arne Andersen
- **SVH-8001 Research Dissemination** (engelsk versjon) – fagansvarlig AHR, studieadministrativt ansvarlig Lena Bogstrand

### **Vår 2022:**

- **SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning** – fagansvarlig Gry Paulgaard (ILP), studieadministrativt ansvarlig Lena Bogstrand
- **GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey** – fagansvarlig Helene N. Andreassen, (UB), studieadministrativt ansvarlig Martin-Arne Andersen
- **SVF-8038 Research Ethics** – fagansvarlig Kjersti Fjærtøft (IFF) studieadministrativt ansvarlig Lena Bogstrand
- **SVH-8002 Forskningsformidling** (norsk versjon) fagansvarlig AHR, studieadministrativt ansvarlig Lena Bogstrand

### **Administrasjonens kommentar til innmeldte ph.d.-emner for studieåret 2021/2022**

Administrasjonen har kontrollert de innmeldte emnene, og ser at de samsvarer med fakultetets utfyllende regler for oppretting og innmelding av ph.d.-emner.

#### *Drastisk nedgang i antall innmeldte ph.d.-emner*

Det er verdt å merke seg at det kun er meldt inn fire fagspesifikke emner for kommende studieår, noe som er betydelig mindre enn foregående år. Studieåret 2020/2021 var det meldt inn 9 emner, mens det studieåret 2019/2020 var til sammen 18 innmeldte emner. Spørsmålet er om tilbudet er godt nok til at våre egne programstudenter vil kunne oppfylle kravet til opplæringsdelen, og gjennomføre denne tidsnok i sine studieløp uten at de samlet sett blir forsinket i studiene sine. Oversikten under viser hvor mange av studentene på kull 2018, 2019 og 2020 som mangler studiepoeng i opplæringsdelene sine (med forbehold om at enkelte av studentene kan ha fullført opplæringsdelene sine uten at det har blitt registrert i systemet - slik at tallene kan være noe lavere):

- Kull 2018: 19 studenter

- Kull 2019: 27 studenter
- Kull 2020: 10 studenter

I tillegg til det forholdsvis høye antallet med studenter som ikke har fullført opplæringsdelene sine er det også 24 stipendiater under tilsetning/opptak ved fakultetet, så det totale antall studenter med behov for fagspesifikke emner vil fortsatt være stort. Nedgangen i emnetilbudet vil på sikt kunne føre til at fakultetets ph.d.-studenter vil være avhengig av andre fakultet- eller institusjoners emnetilbud for å kunne fullføre opplæringsdelen sin. Ph.d.-utvalget bes derfor om å ta stilling til om det skal åpnes opp for at institutt/senter skal gis mulighet til å melde inn emner for kommende studieår ytterligere en gang. Det vil i så fall bli med frist i slutten av vårsemesteret, gjeldende for emner som skal tilbys våren 2022. Normalt sett blir institutt/senter en gang i året bedt om å melde inn ph.d.-emner som skal tilbys ved HSL-fakultetet kommende studieår.

#### *Fakultetets tilbud i metode for ph.d.-studenter*

Fakultetet har ett felles metodeemne, SVF-8040 Kvalitativ forskning, 5 stp, som kun tilbys annet hvert år. Emnet gikk sist gang våren 2019 og var opprinnelig satt opp for å tilbys våren 2021, der ILP skulle ha hovedansvaret for emnet. Dette ville ha vært i tråd med den syklusen som den tidligere oppnevnte arbeidsgruppen for revidering av emnet satte opp (arkivref. 2020/555-7):

- 2021: ILP har har ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet
- 2023: CPS, SESAM og SKK har ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet
- 2025: ISV har ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet

ILP fulgte ikke opp dette ansvaret og meldte at de ikke hadde mulighet til å ta på seg ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av SVF-8040 våren 2021. Det var ikke tid til å finne få på plass ny fagansvarlig fra noen av de andre instituttene. Eneste løsning er at emnet må flyttes til våren 2022. Dette var uheldig da nye ph.d.-studenter på programmet (med opptak i perioden høsten 2019 og våren 2021) ikke har fått tilbud om metodeopplæring ved fakultetet, men har måtte se seg om et metodeemner ved andre institusjoner der de ikke rangeres høyst for å få plass dersom adgangsregulering. Det skaper utfordringer for kvaliteten i tilbudet ved fakultetet. Utsatt kjøring av SVF-8040 gjør at hele den oppsatte syklusen forskyves med ett år. Ny syklus er godkjent av de involverte enhetene:

- 2022: ILP har har ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet
- 2024: CPS, SESAM og SKK har ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet
- 2026: ISV har ansvaret for planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet

#### *Midtveisevaluering som obligatorisk arbeidskrav til SVH-8900 Ph.d.-avhandling i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap*

Da forskrift for graden ph.d. ved UiT ble revidert i 2018, ble det i § 21. *Kvalitetssikring og rapportering*, andre ledd, innført obligatorisk midtveisevaluering for alle studenter med opptak til ph.d.-programmer fra høsten 2018 og senere. Hensikten med kravet var å få målt fremdriften og få avdekt om det er vesentlige svakheter ved arbeidet slik at det er fare for utdanninga ikke kan gjennomføres på normert tid. Forskriften tar ikke opp hvilke konsekvenser det skal få dersom instituttet ikke tilbyr midtveisevaluering, eller dersom studenten ikke gjennomfører denne, men brudd på oppfølgingsplikten og vesentlige forsinkelser i studiet kan medføre tvungen avslutning (jamfør ph.d.-forskriften § 25). Om midtveisevalueringen i § 21 står det: *Fakultetet bestemmer formen på midtveisevalueringa.*

For bedre å synliggjøre kravet for studenten og veileder, samt institutt og sentre, bes ph.d.-utvalget vurdere om midtveiseevalueringen skal legges inn som arbeidskrav knyttet til emnet *SVH-8900 Ph.d.-avhandling i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap*. Det vil da bli et obligatorisk krav studenten må gjennomføre og få godkjent for å kunne levere avhandlingen inn til bedømmelse for graden (tilsvarende arbeidskravet om godkjent opplæringsdel).

Synnøve T. Andersen  
prodekan forskning

Olav Skare  
seksjonsleder

*Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur*

Saksbehandler: Lena Bogstrand, rådgiver

Vedlegg:

- 1) Emnebeskrivelse SVF-8062 Programvarebasert analyse av kvalitative data - innføring i NVIVO 12 TM
- 2) Emnebeskrivelse SVF-8066 Introduction to scientific approaches and theoretical State of the Art to child welfare, professional social work and social policy
- 3) Emnebeskrivelse SVF-8055 Evoking Gender
- 4) Emnebeskrivelse HIF-8101 Illness in Children's and Young Adult Literature



|  |  |
|--|--|
| Institutt for barnevern og sosialt arbeid (IBS), UiT Norges arktiske universitet, 11.01.2019 | <b>EMNEBESKRIVELSE FOR PH.D.-EMNE, HSL-FAKULTETET</b>  |
| <b>Navn</b>  | <p>Bokmål: <b>PROGRAMVAREBASERT ANALYSE AV KVALITATIVE DATA – INNFØRING I NVIVO 12™</b></p> <p>Nynorsk: <b>PROGRAMVAREBASERT ANALYSE AV KVALITATIVE DATA – INNFØRING I NVIVO 12™</b></p> <p>English: <b>COMPUTER ASSISTED QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS – INTRODUCTION TO NVIVO 12™</b></p>  |
| <b>Emnekode og emnenivå</b>  | Administrasjonen gir kode  |
| <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 utdanningsinstitusjonen 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 +2 år (eller tilsvarende) for å være kvalifiserte søkere.</p> <p>Deltakerne må ha tilstrekkelig kunnskap i kvalitativ metodikk til å kunne planlegge et kvalitativt forskningsprosjekt. Grunnlag og slutningslogikk for kvalitativ metodikk forutsettes kjent.</p> <p>Maksimum antall deltakere er <b>12</b>. Opptak foretas etter følgende prioritering:</p> <p>Kategori 1: Personer som er tatt opp på ph.d.-program ved UiT i sosial-, samfunnsvitenskapelige og humanistiske fag.</p> <p>Kategori 2: Personer som er tatt opp på ph.d.-program ved andre fakultet på UiT</p> <p>Kategori 3: Deltakere på førstelektorprogrammet som oppfyller utdanningskravet.</p> <p>Kategori 4: Ph.d.-studenter i sosial-, samfunnsvitenskapelige og humanistiske fag fra andre institusjoner.</p> <p>Dersom det er flere enn <b>12</b> 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. Minst antall deltakere for at emnet skal tilbys er: <b>8</b>.</p> |
| <b>Faglig innhold.</b>   | <p>Kurset gir en innføring i prinsipper og funksjoner i programvarebasert analyse av kvalitative data. I kursets første del drøftes muligheter og begrensninger av såkalte CAQDAS (<u>C</u>omputer <u>A</u>ssisted <u>Q</u>ualitative <u>D</u>ata <u>A</u>nalysis <u>S</u>oftware), sammenliknet med manuelle metoder. Det gis også en kort oversikt over de mest brukte programmene.</p> <p>I kursets andre del gis det en praksisrettet innføring i grunnleggende funksjoner for bearbeiding og analyse av kvalitative data i programvaren NVivo 12™.</p> <p>Praksiseksempler for kurset er hentet fra sosialfaglig forskning. Deltakerne kan med fordel gjennomføre øvelser med deler av datamateriale fra egen forskning. Det vil også være anledning til begrenset individuell veiledning for å opprette et prosjekt i NVivo, tilpasset deltakernes egne metodologiske prosjektdesign.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Læringsutbytte</b>                  | <p>Etter bestått emne skal studentene ha følgende læringsresultat:</p> <p><b>Kunnskaper og forståelse</b></p> <p>Studenten har kunnskap om:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- muligheter og begrensninger som ligger i computerbasert analyse av kvalitative data, sammenliknet med manuell analyse.</li> <li>- muligheter og begrensninger for ulike kvalitative metodologiske analysestrategier som ligger i computerbasert analyse av kvalitative data.</li> </ul> <p><b>Ferdigheter</b></p> <p>Studenten kan bruke NVivo 12™ til å:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- opprette et prosjekt</li> <li>- importere ulike datakilder</li> <li>- kode datamaterialet</li> <li>- opprette linker mellom ulike tekstsekvenser, interne og eksterne datakilder</li> <li>- søke i prosjektmaterialet ved hjelp av ulike søkefunksjoner</li> <li>- benytte modellbyggingsmodulen til teoridannelse.</li> </ul> <p><b>Kompetanse</b></p> <p>Etter bestått emne har studenten kompetanse i bruk av NVivo 12™ til å organisere og analysere kvalitative data i et større (ph.d.-) prosjekt.</p> |
| <b>Relevans i studieprogram</b>        | Kurset henvender seg først og fremst til ph.d. studenter som jobber med sosialfaglig relevante problemstillinger og som bruker et kvalitativt analyseperspektiv. Eksempelene som brukes i undervisningen er hentet fra sosialfaglig forskning. Kurset er likevel egnet for deltakere med annen faglig bakgrunn, siden muligheter og begrensninger i bruk av programvarebasert analyse av kvalitative data relevant for alle som benytter et kvalitativt analyseperspektiv.   |
| <b>Undervisnings- og arbeidsform</b>   | <p>Undervisning gis som forelesninger og praktiske øvelser med to undervisningsdager á 7,5 timer, fordelt på to undervisningsdager med tre uker mellomrom.</p> <p>Tida mellom undervisningsdag 1 og 2 benyttes til egenarbeid og skriving av arbeidskrav.</p>  |
| <b>Kvalitetssikring av emnet</b>       | Alle emner evalueres en gang i løpet av programperioden. Ph.d. utvalget 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> <p>Studenten leverer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• en NVivo 12™ prosjektfil der et utvalg av studentens egne data er organisert og bearbeidet i.h.h.t. valgt metodologisk perspektiv</li> <li>• en tekstfil på inntil 1500 ord med begrunnelse for valgt prosjektstruktur.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Eksamen og vurdering</b>            | <p><u>Eksamen</u> består av en skriftlig prøve der studenten demonstrerer sin kompetanse i praktisk bruk av NVivo 12™.</p> <p>Eksamen vurderes med “Bestått” / “Ikke bestått”.</p>   |
| <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>                          | 350 sider  |
| <b>Undervisnings- og eksamensspråk</b> | Norsk bokmål.  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| HSL Faculty, UiT<br>The Arctic<br>University of<br>Norway, 2.10.2017 | <b>TEMPLATE FOR COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR PHD COURSES, THE HSL FACULTY</b><br><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:<br>Nynorsk:<br>English: Introduction to scientific approaches and theoretical State of the Art to child welfare, professional social work and social policy.   |
| <b>Course code and level</b>   | SVF-8066   |
| <b>Type of course</b>  | This course may be taken as a single course by students who meet the admission requirements for the degree program in the PhD Programme in Humanities and Social Science.  |
| <b>Scope of course</b>   | Amount of ECTS points: 5   |
| <b>Required / recommended previous knowledge</b>                     | <p>The primary target group for the course are candidates who have been admitted to the PhD programme in Humanities and Social Science, but will also be open to others who wish to study the topic of the course in depth, including international students.</p> <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:<br/> <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></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:<br/> <a href="https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf">https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf</a></p> <p>-----</p> <p>Postdoctoral researchers will be accepted if space permits. The minimum number of participants are 5. If the number of applicants exceeds the number of places available (20 seats) on the PhD course, applicants will be ranked from category 1 to 4.</p> <p>Category 1: Doctoral students admitted to the PhD Programme at UiT</p> <p>Category 2: Participants in the Associate Professor Programme that fulfil the educational requirements</p> <p>Category 3: Doctoral students from other universities</p> <p>Category 4: Applicants with a Master's degree (120 ECTS) or equivalent.</p> |
| <b>Course contents</b>   | The focus of the course is on institutions and practices designed to secure children's welfare. Lectures given in the course investigate and discuss the preconditions for children's young adults and families participation in the welfare societies of the Nordic states. We look thoroughly on processes of inequality, multicultural environments, child services, minority perspectives, marginalization and parental abilities and conditions, and how these processes are structured by  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>social services. A running theme is how their interrelations are shaped and influenced by national and international political institutions and practices. The course will apply an interdisciplinary theoretical and scientific perspective and draw on disciplines and research fields like professional social work, social care, sociology, international and national law, political science, and comparative social policy. During the course, examples from research about different institutions and practices designed to secure children's, young adults and families welfare are presented and discussed. Research examples will discuss, among others the concepts of children's, young adults and families welfare, participation, gender, ethnicity, inequality and diversity – all in particular dimensions related to the national and international trends and patterns that influence and challenge the Nordic welfare model.</p> <p>In addition to the lectures, participants will have the opportunity and are expected to discuss their own projects in the context of the main focus of the course</p>  |
| <p><b>Learning outcomes</b><br/>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 PhD candidates have the following learning outcomes:</p> <p><b>Knowledge</b></p> <p>The PhD candidates have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>thorough knowledge of the links between child welfare, professional social work and social policy in welfare societies, and how they are shaped by social and cultural conditions and institutional contexts.</li> <li>knowledge of the diversity of policies and schemes that are implemented to integrate individuals and groups into the welfare society.</li> <li>knowledge about prominent research traditions and their theoretical and methodological aspects.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills</b></p> <p>The PhD candidates have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the ability to make research informed, critical assessments of different theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches to professional social work approaches and consequences of different social policies for child welfare.</li> <li>a systematic basis for designing and conducting studies about children's welfare influenced by welfare institutions.</li> </ul> <p><b>General competence</b></p> <p>The PhD candidates are able to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>assess and identify new research questions in the field.</li> <li>take part in debates in national and international fora.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Relevance in the degree program</b>   | The course is relevant as an introduction to research within social work, social policy, and children's wellbeing  |
| <p><b>Teaching and working methods</b><br/>Teaching methods, scope and frequency should be described. Also provide information about the number of lectures / classes.</p>   | The teaching is organised as a combination of lectures, group work and presentations of the participants' own projects. Course language is English or, in case that all participants are sufficiently proficient, in a Scandinavian language. The course duration is 5 days (35 hours).  |
| <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><br>The required coursework must be clear and feasible. Keep the scope of the course in mind.  | The course duration are 5 days (35 hours). Participation is mandatory, and candidates are expected to attend all days of teaching. A minor absence (up to 20 %) can only be accepted under certain circumstances and upon application. In the event of absences that are not approved, candidates will lose their right to have their essays assessed.  |
| <b>Assessment and exam</b><br>Provide clear information about exam form(s). The amount of hours/days/weeks must be given.<br><br>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).<br><br>A-F grades scale or Pass/Fail | Students must write an essay, in English, of 15 pages / 6000 word related to the main theme of the course. The essay shall take the candidates PhD-project as its point of departure. The essay must be handed in for assessment no later than two months after the end of the course. A passed essay is a precondition for being awarded the 5 ECTS. If the essay is awarded a fail grade, the candidate can submit a revised essay once, by a specified deadline. The essay will be graded by the course lecturers. The exam will be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis. |
| <b>Retake</b>   | Retake is offered in in the beginning of the following semester in cases of fail grade. 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>   | 1000 pages.   |
| <b>Language of instruction and examination</b>  | English or Scandinavian, depending on the participants language proficiency.  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| HSL Faculty, UiT<br>The Arctic<br>University of<br>Norway, 2.10.2017 | <b>TEMPLATE FOR COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR PHD COURSES, THE HSL FACULTY</b><br><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>  | <del>Bokmål:</del><br><del>Nynorsk:</del><br><u>Evoking Gender</u>  |
| <b>Course code and level</b>   | SVF-8055  |
| <b>Type of course</b>  | This course may be taken as a single course by PhD-students. Students who hold 5 ECTS from SVF-8003 Feminist Theories, Methodologies and Epistemologies can only obtain 3 ECTS due to overlap in literature and course content.   |
| <b>Scope of course</b>   | 5 ECTS points   |
| <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:<br/> <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></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:<br/> <a href="https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf">https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf</a></p> <p>-----</p> <p>The course has 20 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.</p> <p>Category 1: People admitted to the PhD Programme at UiT</p> <p>Category 2: Participants in the Associate Professor Programme that fulfil the educational requirements</p> <p>Category 3: Doctoral students from other universities</p> <p><i>Category 4: 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 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> <p>There is a lower limit of 5 registered students required for the course to be held.</p>   |
| <p><b>Course contents</b></p>  | <p>This course is for PhD students from the humanities and social sciences who wish to deepen their research from feminist and gender studies perspectives.</p> <p>Students with all levels of experience with gender and feminist theories and research are welcome to this course. The course will be taught by a team of scholars from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds and with specific expertise within gender and feminist research, including but not restricted to transnational/postcolonial feminisms, feminist critical race studies, transgender studies, gay and lesbian studies, sexuality studies, masculinity studies and feminist technoscience studies.</p> <p>The 3-day course runs under the aegis of both the SKK at UiT and the Norwegian Research School for Gender Research. It consists of lectures and seminars where the students will discuss both assigned course readings and their own research projects.</p> <p>The aim of the course is to assist the students in developing theoretical and analytical approaches to their material, applying advanced methods and discussing benefits and challenges of doing feminist and gender research.</p> |
| <p><b>Learning outcomes</b><br/>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>By the end of the course the student has obtained the following:</p> <p><b>Knowledge</b><br/>The students will have a wide knowledge of fundamental and current feminist/gender theories and their application in research.</p> <p>They will have a deep and thorough understanding of perspectives, subjects and terminologies within feminist and gender scholarship.</p> <p>They will have an advanced knowledge of how to apply gender methodologies relevant within their research field.</p> <p><b>Skills</b><br/>The students will be able to theorize and analyze independently, both orally and in writing, their material through the lens of feminist and gender theory, to discuss connections of gender to productions of race, class and sexuality and to reflect on different methodologies. They will be able to analyze gender and power in relation to their material.</p> <p><b>Competence</b><br/>Through understanding and discussing research with feminist theories and methodologies, the students will be able to think in</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | 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 its social and scientific relevance.   |
| <b>Relevance in the degree program</b>  |  |
| <b>Teaching and working methods</b><br>Teaching methods, scope and frequency should be described. Also provide information about the number of lectures / classes.  | Lectures, seminars, oral presentations, written assignments like i.e. the 500 words to be submitted prior to course and the final paper after the course (see below), group assignments reflecting the content of the course and the students' enhancement of it.<br><br>The course runs on three consecutive days on the campus in Tromsø.  |
| <b>Practice</b>   |  |
| <b>Quality assurance of the course</b>  | The course will be evaluated once.   |
| <b>Coursework</b><br>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:<br><br>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><br>Provide clear information about exam form(s). The amount of hours/days/weeks must be given.<br><br>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).<br><br>A-F grades scale or Pass/Fail | The exam is a final paper of 10 to 15 pages, referring the course literature. The students will have 2 weeks to write the exam.<br><br>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>   | The reading list (ca. 1000 pages) will be provided well in advance of the course event.  |
| <b>Language of instruction and examination</b>  | The language of instruction is English. Depending on the   |



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>composition of the student group some of the teaching could be in Norwegian.</p> <p>The paper can be submitted in English, Norwegian, Danish or Swedish.</p> |
|--|---|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| HSL Faculty, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, 2.10.2017 | <b>TEMPLATE FOR COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR PHD COURSES, THE HSL FACULTY</b><br><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>   | English: Illness in Children's and Young Adult Literature<br>Bokmål: Illness in Children's and Young Adult Literature<br>Nynorsk: Illness in Children's and Young Adult Literature   |
| <b>Course code and level</b>                                | HIF-8101   |
| <b>Type of course</b>                                       | The course may be taken as a single course.  |
| <b>Scope of course</b>                                      | 5  |
| <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:<br/> <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:<br/> <a href="https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf">https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf</a></p> <p>There is a lower limit of 5 registered students required for the course to be held.</p>   |
| <b>Course contents</b>                                      | <p>The course deals with representations of illness in Scandinavian children's and young adult literature. Illness has long been an established motif in children's literature, with prominent examples such as Astrid Lindgren's <i>The Brothers Lionheart</i> (1973), while the amount of young adult novels dealing with illness has steadily increased following the commercial success of John Green's <i>The Fault in Our Stars</i> (2012). The course explores Scandinavian illness narratives intended for children and young adults using several different approaches. From the perspective of the sociology of literature, we investigate both the book market and the intended readership of such narratives. Within the context of the medical humanities, we make use of the academic field of literature and medicine to study the style and structure of these narratives. We employ a gender studies perspective to examine gendered depictions of sick children and young adults, as well as the genderization of illness in itself.</p> <p>The interdisciplinary nature of the course will ensure that students receive training in combining research methodologies from within and without the discipline of literary studies. Primary literature may be read in the Scandinavian languages or in translation. Secondary literature will include texts written by medical professionals. The historical span of the course will range from the 19th century until today. While the course is suitable for all interested students, it is particularly suited to students who wish to make use of illness narratives in their own research projects.</p> |
| <b>Learning outcomes</b>                                    | The students have the following learning outcomes:   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>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><b>Knowledge</b><br/>The student has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- advanced knowledge of illness as a motif in classical and contemporary children's and young adult literature</li> <li>- insight into the processes of production, reception and canonization of illness narratives intended for children and young adults</li> <li>- an understanding of methodological issues relating to the academic study of illness narratives as a literary genre</li> </ul> <p><b>Skills</b><br/>The student can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- give an account of the development of illness as a theme in literature written for a young audience</li> <li>- identify the common characteristics of illness narratives intended for children and young adults</li> <li>- critically appraise the processes of reception and canonization of children's and young adult literature</li> </ul> <p><b>Competence</b><br/>The student can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- conduct an independent analysis of children's and young adult literature, making use of established and emerging research methodologies</li> </ul> |
| <b>Relevance in the degree program</b>  |  |
| <p><b>Teaching and working methods</b><br/>Teaching methods, scope and frequency should be described. Also provide information about the number of lectures / classes.</p>  | Three days of seminars, student presentations, and individual supervision of participating ph.d. students.   |
| <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><br/>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 short essay (4-5 pages) based on the student's dissertation project.</li> <li>- An oral presentation of one or several texts included in the course reading list.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Assessment and exam</b><br/>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</p>   | <p>The exam will consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A written text (12-15 pages) based on the student's coursework essay and revised in accordance with feedback given during the course.</li> </ul> <p>The exam will be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>provide the required amount of words. If desired: provide information about line space, font etc. (standard: 1 ½).</p> <p>A-F grades scale or Pass/Fail</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>  | Ca. 700 pages.   |

## SAKSFRAMLEGG

---

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

Møtedato:  
23.02.2021

Sak:  
4/21

---

### Evaluering av emnet SVH-8001 Research dissemination

#### Innstilling til vedtak:

Ph.d.-utvalget tar tilbakemeldingen i studentevalueringen til etterretning og ber om at faglærers kommentarer tas med videre.

#### Bakgrunn:

Institutt for arkeologi, historie, religionsvitenskap og teologi (AHR) har høsten 2020 arrangert undervisning og eksamen i emnet SVH-8001 *Research dissemination* (5 stp.). Dette er et obligatorisk emne i opplæringsdelen for ph.d.-studentene ved HSL-fakultetet. Emnet har kapasitet på 15 plasser, og det var 15 stykker som fikk plass høsten 2020. Alle 15 studenter møtte til eksamen.

Førsteamanuensis Christina Lentz hadde det faglige ansvaret for emnet.

#### Studentevaluering:

Studentevalueringen ble sendt ut via Nettskjema etter at undervisningen var over, og 9 stykker responderte på skjemaet. Resultatet viste at studentene er fornøyde med undervisningen og opplegget i emnet, og spesielt den praktiske orienteringen i undervisningsopplegget er noe de trekker frem. Pensumet hadde passelig mengde og vanskelighetsgrad. De var også veldig fornøyde med egen læringsprosess.

Atmosfæren i undervisningssituasjonen var veldig god, og den gjorde at studentene ble oppmuntret til å presentere og diskutere arbeidet sitt.

Av forbedringspotensialer foreslås det at man kan fokusere litt mer på akademisk/vitenskapelig formidling, i stedet for at hovedfokuset ligger på offentlig formidling.

#### Faglærerevaluering:

Det var første gang emnet ble tilbudt, og faglærer ble tildelt undervisningsoppdraget bare en måned før oppstart. Hun følte likevel at hun hadde nok tid til å forberede seg. Det viste seg fort at hun ikke ville ha tid til å gå gjennom alt hun hadde planlagt i løpet av den tiden de hadde til rådighet, så hun ble nødt til å justere det underveis i løpet.

I likhet med studentene mener også faglærer at det var for stort fokus på offentlig formidling i stedet for akademisk formidling i emnet. Det er fint at emnet inkluderer begge deler, siden man da får muligheten til å sammenligne de to, men det er et problem at man ikke har nok undervisningstid til å fokusere på begge deler. Dette er noe faglærer ønsker å finne en løsning på til neste gang emnet skal gå, men foreløpig vet hun ikke hvordan det kan gjennomføres tidsmessig.

Videre mener faglærer at studentintervjuene tok mye tid, så neste gang vil gruppa deles i to for å kunne være mer effektiv. Neste gang emnet tilbys vil det også være workshoper om podkast og Twitter, noe studentene har etterspurt.

Faglærer har gitt studentene skriftlige tilbakemeldinger på innleveringene sine, i tillegg til at studentene også har gitt hverandre tilbakemeldinger. Dette har fungert veldig fint, og det er noe som kommer til å videreføres til neste semester.

Synnøve Thomassen Andersen  
prodekan forskning

Olav Skare  
Seksjonsleder

*Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur*

Saksbehandler: Lena Bogstrand, rådgiver

Vedlegg.

- 1) Studentevaluering
- 2) Faglærerevaluering

## Rapport fra «Research Dissemination»

Innhentede svar pr. 18. januar 2021 08:23

- Leverte svar: **9**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

### Med fritekstsvar

## How do you respond to the following statements, in connection with the Covid-19 situation?

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 strongly disagrees and 5 strongly agrees:

### Svar fordelt på antall

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not relevant |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| I would have preferred a digital organization of the class          | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2            |
| I can learn better with in classroom teaching                       | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0            |
| The Covid-19 situation did not affect my participation in the class | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0            |
| The Covid-19 situation did not affect my learning progress          | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0            |
| The overall handling of the Covid-19 situation was satisfactory     | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0            |

### Svar fordelt på prosent

|   | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | Not relevant |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|
| I would have preferred a digital organization of the class          | 22,2 % | 22,2 % | 11,1 % | 0 %    | 22,2 % | 22,2 %       |
| I can learn better with in classroom teaching                       | 11,1 % | 11,1 % | 22,2 % | 22,2 % | 33,3 % | 0 %          |
| The Covid-19 situation did not affect my participation in the class | 22,2 % | 0 %    | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 66,7 % | 0 %          |
| The Covid-19 situation did not affect my learning progress          | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 11,1 % | 11,1 % | 66,7 % | 0 %          |
| The overall handling of the Covid-19 situation was satisfactory     | 0 %    | 0 %    | 22,2 % | 33,3 % | 44,4 % | 0 %          |

## How do you evaluate your own efforts in the course?

| Svar               | Antall | Prosent |  |
|--------------------|--------|---------|--|
| Very satisfied     | 3      | 33,3 %  |  |
| Satisfied          | 6      | 66,7 %  |  |
| Slightly satisfied | 0      | 0 %     |  |
| Not satisfied      | 0      | 0 %     |  |

## If you are not satisfied with your own efforts in the course, state the main reason for this.

| Svar                        | Antall | Prosent |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------|--|
| Private matters             | 1      | 50 %    |  |
| The structure of the course | 1      | 50 %    |  |
| Other                       | 0      | 0 %     |  |

## How do you evaluate your learning progress in the course?

| Svar               | Antall | Prosent |  |
|--------------------|--------|---------|--|
| Very satisfied     | 2      | 22,2 %  |  |
| Satisfied          | 6      | 66,7 %  |  |
| Slightly satisfied | 1      | 11,1 %  |  |
| Not satisfied      | 0      | 0 %     |  |

## Teaching and academic content

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very bad and 5 is very good:

### Svar fordelt på antall

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not relevant |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
|  |   |   |   |   |   |              |

|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The teaching has covered the content of the course       | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| I benefited from presenting in groups                    | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| I think the case discussions worked well                 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| The teacher has been helpful and available for questions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| The teacher explained the content well                   | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |

**Svar fordelt på prosent**

|  | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | Not relevant |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|
| The teaching has covered the content of the course       | 0 %    | 0 %    | 33,3 % | 22,2 % | 44,4 % | 0 %          |
| I benefited from presenting in groups                    | 0 %    | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 44,4 % | 44,4 % | 0 %          |
| I think the case discussions worked well                 | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 0 %    | 44,4 % | 44,4 % | 0 %          |
| The teacher has been helpful and available for questions | 0 %    | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 0 %    | 88,9 % | 0 %          |
| The teacher explained the content well                   | 11,1 % | 0 %    | 0 %    | 44,4 % | 44,4 % | 0 %          |

**About the course**

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is to a very small degree and 5 is to a very large degree:

**Svar fordelt på antall**

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| The course has met my expectations               | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| The course requires more time than other courses | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| The course is perceived as demanding             | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |

**Svar fordelt på prosent**

|  | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| The course has met my expectations               | 11,1 % | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 66,7 % | 11,1 % |
| The course requires more time than other courses | 0 %    | 33,3 % | 55,6 % | 0 %    | 11,1 % |
| The course is perceived as demanding             | 0 %    | 33,3 % | 33,3 % | 33,3 % | 0 %    |

**Learning environment**

To what extent do you use the following in your work with the course. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is to a very small degree and 5 is to a very large degree:

**Svar fordelt på antall**

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not relevant |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| Participation in study groups                  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1            |
| Canvas/digital learning resources              | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1            |
| The material provided within the course itself | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0            |

**Svar fordelt på prosent**

|  | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | Not relevant |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|
| Participation in study groups                  | 11,1 % | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 33,3 % | 33,3 % | 11,1 %       |
| Canvas/digital learning resources              | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 22,2 % | 44,4 % | 11,1 % | 11,1 %       |
| The material provided within the course itself | 0 %    | 11,1 % | 11,1 % | 55,6 % | 22,2 % | 0 %          |

**Assessment and assessment methods**

How do you respond to the following statements about the course's atmosphere

**Svar fordelt på antall**

|  | Agree | Slightly agree | Disagree |
|--|-------|----------------|----------|
| I am encouraged to speak and present the results of work tasks | 9     | 0              | 0        |



|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is a good culture of debate and feedback from the fellow students' side                 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| There is a good culture of debate and feedback from the teacher's side                        | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| The overall atmosphere of the class was friendly and I was looking forward to attending class | 8 | 0 | 1 |

### Svar fordelt på prosent

|   | Agree  | Slightly agree | Disagree |
|---|--------|----------------|----------|
| I am encouraged to speak and present the results of work tasks                                | 100 %  | 0 %            | 0 %      |
| There is a good culture of debate and feedback from the fellow students' side                 | 88,9 % | 11,1 %         | 0 %      |
| There is a good culture of debate and feedback from the teacher's side                        | 100 %  | 0 %            | 0 %      |
| The overall atmosphere of the class was friendly and I was looking forward to attending class | 88,9 % | 0 %            | 11,1 %   |

### Syllabus

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 completely disagrees and 5 completely agrees:

### Svar fordelt på antall

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| The syllabus has a suitable scope                          | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| The syllabus has a suitable degree of difficulty           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| The syllabus is relevant in relation to the course content | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 |

### Svar fordelt på prosent

|  | 1   | 2   | 3      | 4      | 5      |
|--|-----|-----|--------|--------|--------|
| The syllabus has a suitable scope                          | 0 % | 0 % | 44,4 % | 33,3 % | 22,2 % |
| The syllabus has a suitable degree of difficulty           | 0 % | 0 % | 33,3 % | 22,2 % | 44,4 % |
| The syllabus is relevant in relation to the course content | 0 % | 0 % | 44,4 % | 22,2 % | 33,3 % |

### Was there anything that worked particularly well with the course?

- The discussions worked really well. It was also great to gain knowledge about such a diversity of tools/channels/possibilities for research dissemination. In general, very positive feedback!
- The large degree of focus on practical assignments worked well, and made the material feel relevant.
- I love the practical way of doing a course - actually producing stuff that I need. I was happy I could attend online even though there were some technical challenges.
- As a course about research dissemination, a lot of time was spent on ways of disseminating our own research and also seeing ways other students are disseminating their research. A variety of methods and practices were presented within a short amount of time. The course was well planned and presented.
- I liked that we had to work on the assignments already during the course, so that we received feedback and saw other students' work as well. I also liked that we conducted interviews with experienced researchers at UiT!
- The overall presentation, group work and classroom environment was functional and for the most part engaging. Doing assignments and examination as part of the teaching really helped with handing in the exam. I like this: if the exam consists of a portfolio of our work, then it is an obvious solution
- Provided an opportunity to think about the importance of disseminating research for the general audience as well as an academic audience -- and think of my own thoughts on how to do the same.

### Do you have any suggestions for improvements in the course?

- I would have liked to learn about how to make a podcast
- More focus on scientific dissemination. More focus on other kinds of popular dissemination apart from digital/SoME platforms (for instance participation in debates, public lectures, facilitating public fora etc.).
- I do think that it would be helpful to have some kind of reading before we started to get in the right mood for what will come, or what this is all about. The better prepared, the better pay-off (is often the rule). I felt a bit lost when we met the first time. The second time I have more of a feeling what it was all about. I think it is important to not do this course too early in the phd-process. Difficult to do some of the work without actual findings yet. I would have liked to have more info on HOW to actually give constructive feedback.
- The academic interviews with researchers was not as useful as other course activities. Time spent reviewing and commenting on other students' projects and writing would be more beneficial than interviewing.
- We often had very little time to prepare the in-class exercises, e.g. 5 minutes to prepare a conference introduction for another student who we didn't know before + inform them about us in turn. The focus couldn't be on how to conduct a GOOD introduction, but rather on if we could figure out the most basic facts about the person in this short time. Also: breaks are important, even if the teacher doesn't need any :)
- Please make the assignment and examination criteria more clear. It is needlessly complicated, and it kept changing throughout the course. I understand that this is the first time the course is held like this, and some growing pains are expected. But please, from the beginning: make it absolutely clear what the student needs to do to pass the course, and stick to this. Otherwise, there will be confusion and uncertainty with regards to the tasks at hand. Participant restriction seems needlessly strict. I think the course can easily handle more students than the limit, and that this should be considered for later students. Spend more time on academic dissemination. In my view, the course was slanted towards public dissemination a bit too much.
- The course should be taken seriously by the faculty, and be conducted by professionals in the field. While the teacher made striding efforts to cover the syllabus and give feedback, learning would have been holistic and meaningful if someone proficient with - has experience of - media and technology, and its encounter with academia, had conducted the course. Big marks to the teacher for making efforts despite this, and much less to the faculty for allotting someone with limited expertise on the matter to tackle the subject. Confusing instructions did not make this cumbersome course any easier - when assignments are many, instructions should be concise and clear. Every exercise in classroom need not go through each and every person; only 1-3 cases are needed to exemplify a certain exercise (going through every person in the classroom for basic exercises means sitting through a one hour lecture for three hours!). Group exercises can be well designed to achieve participation as well as have good learning outcomes. Breaks are necessary every 45 minutes.



## **Personal evaluation Research Dissemination SVH-8001-1 20H**

**Christina Lentz**

### **About the course**

The course is intended to give international UiT PhD students an introductory overview over possibilities of research dissemination in regard to a scientific as well as to a general audience. There were 15 participants from different countries and different fields of research. The course put a specific focus on the following topics:

- The Why and How of research dissemination
- How to write scientifically and for general audiences
- How to verbally present research to a scientific and general audience in short presentations and interviews
- How to visualize research in form of poster presentations
- Different ways to disseminate research

In addition to course and group discussions as well as different in and out of class assignment we had some external contributors to the class.

- Hanne Hammer-Stien was talking about “research dissemination through art”
- PhD student Anatolijs Venovcevs was talking about his participation in Forsker Grand Prix
- Torjer Olsen contributed with a talk about “participating in a public debate”
- Per Pippin Aspaas gave an introduction into Open Access

In addition, we had 5 UiT researchers (research dissemination experts) who thankfully took time for student interviews.

### **Main Aims of the course:**

The main aim was to organize a class with me not acting as a “traditional” teacher with a lot of speaking time but rather as a moderator, giving the students lots of possibilities to discuss and work on their own projects.

In the course of the class the students had to work on different forms of dissemination of research

- A short 20 second video teaser of their research
- An article about their research directed towards a general audience
- A draft of a poster presentation for a conference of their own field
- Giving and conducting an interview with a fellow student
- Conducting a group interview with an experienced researcher

The students were supposed to work on assignments they could really use in order to disseminate their research and potentially publish or use at a conference and were therefore supposed to communicate what they wanted to do with their works beyond class.

In general, the class was meant to encourage students to get out of their “comfort zone” of just devoting themselves to research dissemination in the academic field and also try new forms of communicating about their research.

## **Reflections on the/my realization of the course:**

### *Time management and breaks*

This was the first time I taught the course and I got the assignment only a month before the course started. I still had more than enough time to organize the class, but it was on a rather short notice to invite speakers. That is why the first two days/session 1 of the class was rather focused around the class itself, which had the advantage of getting to know each other and each other's research projects well.

The main "mistake" from my side was, that I overloaded the course content wise, which meant that I had to be flexible and spontaneously shift content from session 1 to session 2. Still, the students got very little time for breaks. Also, I am not used well enough to the Norwegian system with lots of tiny breaks and I am still surprised how important these breaks are to the students, especially taken into consideration the fact that they are on a PhD level, where I expected more willingness on focus work.

We handled the situation by joking about it and for day 2 of session 1, which was entirely focused on mutual interviews, I created different interview groups with shifting breaks, which was quite to the satisfaction of the students.

### *Content*

I thankfully received a great introduction into how to manage the course from my predecessor Torjer Olsen. Still, I misjudged some of the content in regard to its relevance to PhD students. This was the case for the one-hour session about blogging. Obviously, this was not of importance at all to the students and nobody was planning of using a blog as a means of research communication. That's why I spontaneously decided to skip this content and rather talk about something else that mattered more.

I also misjudged the knowledge students already had about research dissemination and it turned out that they knew way less than I had expected about how to communicate towards a general audience. This was not a problem at all, since I designed the class on an introductory level, but it still came unexpected.

I was also surprised that the students had extremely little previous knowledge about visualization of research in form of poster presentations. I consider this content rather crucial, since visualization of research is not just relevant for posters but for general presentations as well since it helps a lot to structure thoughts.

In general, I think the course put too much focus on dissemination of research towards a general audience and neglected the academic part of it. I do appreciate that the course includes both, because it gives the opportunity to directly compare the two, but it provides an organizational and structural challenge, because two two-day sessions are actually not a lot of time for the content that is supposed to be taught to the students. I am trying to find a solution for this in the next class, but still don't have a perfect answer to this dilemma to be honest.

## **Reflection on the students:**

I taught a very open minded, friendly and motivated group of students on different stages of their PhD research, some of them still at the very beginning, some of them close to submitting. Even though all the students were very engaged in the class, the submission of their work shows very different levels of quality and engagement. While many of them submitted first class work some of them either showed a lack of interest or simply skill in their assignments.

My biggest surprise was the lack of independent, creative thinking when it came to the course assignments and I would like to talk a little bit about this. The students needed very concrete instructions about what to do and the freedom I was willing to provide in the execution of their tasks was not appreciated by some of the students. To name an example: The students were supposed to write an article directed to a popular audience. Writing the article, they should also consider possible ways to publish it. That could be their research group blog, forskning.no etc. Where you publish such an article of course determines the length and the style of it quite a bit. But still, we had a lengthy discussion about the word count of the article.

Something similar happened when it came to the group interviews that the students conducted with experienced researchers. I wanted them to summon the results of the interviews, either in form of a transcript, or a portrait or simply a summary, but the lack of very concrete instructions was simply overwhelming some of them.

This, of course, was not true for all students, but there was a vocal group of students mainly concerned about “making mistakes” and possibly not to pass the submission of the portfolio in the end.

In my opinion, the main purpose of pursuing a PhD is, beyond producing new knowledge of course, developing creative approaches and own critical thinking and I was totally unprepared to have these kinds of discussions with students at this level.

In session two of the class I learned from this and was very concrete, giving clear examples about every detail of the submission, but it again ended up in a big discussion, fed by fear that their submission could possibly not be acknowledged. I have to admit that I was a bit helpless, because I did not manage to get through to the students with my message that independent thinking and creative approaches are always appreciated in academia, even if they turn out not to be the best approaches. I would never punish students for own thinking, but they were still afraid that the co-sensor or someone else in the system would.

And even though I was extremely clear in my message, learning from my mistakes in session 1, I had to experience that students were not listening to what I said, asking the same questions over and over or simply ignoring the instructions in their final submission.

I was quite lengthy about this even though it only were the final 15 minutes of each session, but of course the fear of making mistakes came up several times during the course. One example for this is that one student wanted to have some literature to read ahead to prepare, because that is what they are used to do for other classes. Of course, this doesn't make too much sense for Research Dissemination, since the course is very much focused on practical work. This very same student by the way came up with a whole new idea of poster presentation and it made me very happy to see the courage to realize own projects.

### **What would I handle differently or do the same way**

As I wrote, I tried to work on the main deficits (time management, communication of class requirements) already while the class was still going on. But there are still some things I would do differently in the next Research dissemination course.

The mutual student interview took a lot of time, even though I established a system where different groups could go on breaks. Next time I will divide the class into two and will have a good student from my previous Research Dissemination class helping me with the interviews. This should save valuable time. Also, we conducted the interviews with experienced researchers on the same day as we conducted the mutual interviews and that created a very tight time schedule. Still, the students gave

me a positive feedback about these expert interviews, and that's why I will stick to them but make them a home assignment.

Again, I will try to work in a more balanced way on research dissemination in academia and in public, but still have to find a good solution for it.

I will plan in more breaks for the next course and try to communicate even clearer without giving up on encouraging students to independent and creative thinking. I like to think of myself as a very relatable and open minded teaching person but I feel that I was not patient enough when the students asked about concrete instructions and did not, as I perceived it, appreciate the freedom I was willing to give them. Even though this concerned just a tiny part of the entire course, I am very unsatisfied with me handling this situation and will absolutely work on being more understanding to the specific needs of my students. I am prepared for this now and will hopefully be able to handle this kind of situation better, if it occurs again next course.

When it comes to content, I learned from the feedback I got from the class and will add two workshops to the next class, one about Twitter (using Twitter; writing a Twitter conference paper) and one about podcasts (general about podcasts, creating a short oral contribution).

There are also things that worked well and that I will keep on doing:

Instead of just let the students draft their assignments, as envisioned in the course description, I will stick to letting the students write a full article with the option to be published. A draft might very well up in the dust bin and it would be a waste of time whereas I want the student to see purpose in what they do.

We invested a lot of time on feedback in class and the students received a short written-feedback for each of their assignments from me on Canvas before the official portfolio submission on Wiseflow. Especially for a class like research dissemination it is extremely important to get a lot input in order to evolve. That's why in addition to my feedback, we also invested a system with feedback teams in regard to the articles written for a publish audience. In that way the students learned not only from their own work but also from the fellow PhD students' work, which also happened whenever we collectively discussed assignments, like for example the posters or the interviews in class.

I was very lucky that a lot of colleagues helped me preparing for this class and contributed to it. They could bring in input that I simply could not. Next class, I will again invite expert speakers.

In general, it was fun teaching this class and I am looking forward to teaching it again with the mentioned adjustments.

Christina Lentz

## **SAKSFRAMLEGG**

---

Evaluering av emnet SVH-8004 Social Inequality in Health

### **Innstilling til vedtak:**

Ph.d.-utvalget tar tilbakemeldingen i studentevalueringen til etterretning, og ber om at faglærers kommentarer tas med videre.

### **Bakgrunn:**

Institutt for arkeologi, historie, religionsvitenskap og teologi (AHR) har høsten 2020 arrangert undervisning og eksamen i emnet SVH-8004 *Social Inequality in Health* (5 stp.) i samarbeid med Handelshøgskolen og ISV. Dette er et valgfritt emne i opplæringsdelen for ph.d.-studentene ved UiT, primært ved HSL-fakultetet, BFE-fakultetet og Det helsevitenskapelige fakultet. Emnet har en kapasitet på 30 plasser, og det var 14 oppmeldte studenter. 8 stykker tok eksamen.

Ved en feil ble ikke emnet publisert i emnekatalogen før etter at søknadsfristen for eksterne søkere hadde gått ut. Følgelig var det kun interne søkere som hadde mulighet til å ta dette emnet i høst.

Professor Hilde Leikny Sommerseth var fagansvarlig for emnet.

### **Studentevaluering:**

Studentevalueringen ble sendt ut via Nettskjema, og det var 5 studenter som responderte på skjemaet. Studentene var fornøyde med undervisningen. De syntes at undervisningen hadde dekket innholdet i kurset, og spesielt plenumsdiskusjonene fungerte godt. De fleste syntes også at de fikk mye ut av gruppearbeidet.

De digitale forelesningene og interaksjonen fungerte overraskende bra, men studentene var likevel delte i oppfatningen om digital undervisning gir like god læring som fysisk undervisning. På samme måte var de også delte i ønsket om å kunne fortsette med digital undervisning.

### **Faglærerevaluering:**

I tillegg til at undervisningen ble gitt av ansatte ved AHR, ISV og Handelshøgskolen var det også invitert inn tre eksterne forelesere (som holdt forelesningene digitalt). Undervisningen var lagt opp med forelesninger, etterfulgt av gruppearbeid og en felles diskusjon til slutt. Tilbakemeldingene fra

studentene viste at man med fordel kunne sjonglert med gruppene, så det tar faglærerne til etterretning.

Ellers så viste det seg vanskelig å få de eksterne foreleserne til å forholde seg til oppsatte frister for innlevering av pensum, forelesningstema og gruppeoppgaver. Det resulterte blant annet i at pensumlistene ble publisert først en uke før undervisningen startet.

Emnet er en del av den tverrfaglige strategiske satsingen *Befolkningsundersøkelser i nord* ved UiT. I planleggingen av dette emnet forsøkte de fagansvarlige å gjenspeile strategiens fremste mål, nemlig flerfakultær satsing. Det viste seg derimot vanskelig, da det ikke lot seg gjøre å tilby et emne uten noe eierskap hos ett fakultet.

Synnøve Thomassen Andersen  
prodekan forskning

Olav Skare  
seksjonsleder

*Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur*

Saksbehandler: Lena Bogstrand, rådgiver

Vedlegg:

- 1) Studentevaluering
- 2) Faglærerevaluering



## Rapport fra «Evaluering SVH-8004 Social inequality in Health»

Innhentede svar pr. 1. februar 2021 16:35

- Leverte svar: **5**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

### Med fritekstsvar

**How do you respond to the following statements, in connection with the changes that were made in the course as a result of Covid-19?**

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 strongly disagrees and 5 strongly agrees:

#### Svar fordelt på antall

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not relevant |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| The organization of the teaching enabled me to complete the exam in a good way                                | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0            |
| Teaching on digital platforms provides as good learning as traditional classroom teaching                     | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0            |
| Based on the experiences this semester, I hope there will be more teaching on online digital platforms at UiT | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0            |

#### Svar fordelt på prosent

|   | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | Not relevant |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| The organization of the teaching enabled me to complete the exam in a good way                                | 0 %  | 0 %  | 0 %  | 40 % | 60 % | 0 %          |
| Teaching on digital platforms provides as good learning as traditional classroom teaching                     | 20 % | 20 % | 20 % | 20 % | 20 % | 0 %          |
| Based on the experiences this semester, I hope there will be more teaching on online digital platforms at UiT | 0 %  | 40 % | 20 % | 40 % | 0 %  | 0 %          |




#### To what extent have you participated in the teaching?

| Svar   | Antall | Prosent |   |
|--------|--------|---------|---|
| Never  | 0      | 0 %     |   |
| Seldom | 0      | 0 %     |   |
| Often  | 1      | 20 %    |  |
| Always | 4      | 80 %    |  |


#### What is the reason why you have seldom or never participated in the teaching?

| Svar  | Antall | Prosent |   |
|---|--------|---------|---|
| I do not benefit from going to the lectures | 0      | 0 %     |   |
| The lectures collide with other teaching    | 0      | 0 %     |   |
| Other                                       | 1      | 20 %    |  |

#### How do you evaluate your own efforts in the course?

| Svar               | Antall | Prosent |   |
|--------------------|--------|---------|---|
| Very satisfied     | 1      | 20 %    |  |
| Satisfied          | 3      | 60 %    |  |
| Slightly satisfied | 1      | 20 %    |  |
| Not satisfied      | 0      | 0 %     |   |

If you are not satisfied with your own efforts in the course, state the main reason for this.

| Svar                        | Antall | Prosent   |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|---|--|
| Private matters             | 0      | 0 %   |  |
| The structure of the course | 0      | 0 %   |  |
| Other                       | 1      | 100 %  |  |

### Teaching and academic content

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very bad and 5 is very good:

#### Svar fordelt på antall

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not relevant |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| The teaching has covered the content of the course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0            |
| I benefited from the group work                    | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0            |
| I think the plenary discussions worked well        | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0            |

#### Svar fordelt på prosent

|  | 1   | 2    | 3   | 4    | 5    | Not relevant |
|--|-----|------|-----|------|------|--------------|
| The teaching has covered the content of the course | 0 % | 0 %  | 0 % | 40 % | 60 % | 0 %          |
| I benefited from the group work                    | 0 % | 20 % | 0 % | 20 % | 60 % | 0 %          |
| I think the plenary discussions worked well        | 0 % | 0 %  | 0 % | 20 % | 80 % | 0 %          |

### About the course

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is to a very small degree and 5 is to a very large degree:

#### Svar fordelt på antall

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| The course has met my expectations               | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| The course requires more time than other courses | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| The course is perceived as demanding             | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

#### Svar fordelt på prosent

|  | 1   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|
| The course has met my expectations               | 0 % | 0 %  | 0 %  | 20 % | 80 % |
| The course requires more time than other courses | 0 % | 20 % | 20 % | 40 % | 20 % |
| The course is perceived as demanding             | 0 % | 0 %  | 40 % | 40 % | 20 % |

### Learning environment

To what extent do you use the following in your work with the course. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is to a very small degree and 5 is to a very large degree:

#### Svar fordelt på antall

|                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not relevant |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| Participation in seminars         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0            |
| Participation in study groups     | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1            |
| Canvas/digital learning resources | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0            |

#### Svar fordelt på prosent

|                                   | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | Not relevant |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| Participation in seminars         | 0 %  | 0 %  | 0 %  | 40 % | 60 % | 0 %          |
| Participation in study groups     | 20 % | 0 %  | 0 %  | 20 % | 40 % | 20 %         |
| Canvas/digital learning resources | 0 %  | 20 % | 40 % | 20 % | 20 % | 0 %          |

## Assessment and assessment methods

How do you respond to the following statements about the course's assessment methods

### Svar fordelt på antall

|  | Agree | Slightly agree | Disagree |
|--|-------|----------------|----------|
| They give me the opportunity to show my knowledge and skills | 4     | 0              | 0        |

### Svar fordelt på prosent

|  | Agree | Slightly agree | Disagree |
|--|-------|----------------|----------|
| They give me the opportunity to show my knowledge and skills | 100 % | 0 %            | 0 %      |

## Syllabus

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 completely disagrees and 5 completely agrees:

### Svar fordelt på antall

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| The syllabus has a suitable scope                          | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| The syllabus has a suitable degree of difficulty           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| The syllabus is relevant in relation to the course content | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| I read the syllabus / prepare for the teaching             | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

### Svar fordelt på prosent

|  | 1   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|
| The syllabus has a suitable scope                          | 0 % | 20 % | 0 %  | 40 % | 40 % |
| The syllabus has a suitable degree of difficulty           | 0 % | 0 %  | 0 %  | 20 % | 80 % |
| The syllabus is relevant in relation to the course content | 0 % | 0 %  | 0 %  | 40 % | 60 % |
| I read the syllabus / prepare for the teaching             | 0 % | 20 % | 40 % | 0 %  | 40 % |

### Was there anything that worked particularly well with the course?

- Discussions between students and the lecturers.
- The online lectures and interaction worked surprisingly well! It was good, that half of the course time was spend on group work and discussions.
- Multidisciplinary scope
- Meget gode forelesere og god struktur på undervisningsdagene. Veldig spennende pensum.

### Do you have any suggestions for improvements in the course?

- Obviously, to have the lecturers physically in Tromsø! Apart from that, I found the first day a bit too long. Maybe not necessary to have group work for each section.
- The syllabus was too extensive given that it was published quite late.
- Change persons in the study groups so you can discuss with different persons throughout the course, not always the same persons. Less study group discussions
- Informasjon om kurset kom sent. Jeg skulle også gjerne hatt pensumliste tilgjengelig minst en måned før kurset. For meg som ikke hadde så mye kunnskap om sosial ulikhet i helse fra før av ble det utfordrende å være med på gruppe- og plenumsdiskusjoner når jeg ikke fikk tid til å lese meg opp.

[Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema \(v1039\\_0rc398\)](#)

Organisert og planlagt i samarbeid mellom ansatte ved HSL og Handelshøyskolen, Marcus Buck (ISV), Mikko Moilanen (Handelshøyskolen), Hilde Sommerseth (AHR).

Kurset hadde et omfang på 5 studiepoeng, og det var totalt oppmeldt 14 studenter. 8 studenter tok eksamen. 10 studenter som møtte fysisk til kurset.

Kurset gikk over fire dager (20.10-23.10.2020), fra kl. 9-ca 17 hver dag. Dagene ble inndelt i morgen- og ettermiddagsforelesninger, med gruppearbeid etter hver forelesning. Etter gruppearbeid samlet vi oss til felles diskusjon. I tillegg hadde vi felles morgen- og ettermiddagskaffe, samt felles lunsj.

Vi hadde tre eksterne forelesere som holdt sine respektive forelesninger via zoom. Foreleserne var også med under felles diskusjon. Disse var Maarten Lindeboom, Professor of Economics and Head of the Department of Economics at VU University Amsterdam; Clare Bambra, Professor of Public Health, Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, David Leon is Professor of Epidemiology at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine. Sistnevnte har i tillegg en professor 2 stilling ved UiT. De eksterne foreleserne hadde ansvar for hver sin dag. I tillegg hadde hver av dem ansvar for å lage en pensumliste på ca. 1000 sider og problemstillinger til gruppearbeid. Den første dagen hadde Buck, Moilanen og Sommerseth ansvar for tre innledende forelesninger med hver seg tilhørende gruppearbeid og felles diskusjon.

**Vurdering:** Organisasjonsgruppa forholdt seg til universitetets frister for oppmelding av PhD kurs. Likevel, kurset ble ikke annonsert utenfor UiT sine korridorer, noe som var svært uheldig for oss. Det har i ettertid kommet en beklagelse fra administrasjonen, og det takker vi for. Vi undrer oss imidlertid fortsatt over hvorfor det var helt umulig å forlenge påmeldingsfrist for kandidater som ønsker å ta kurset, men som ikke var studenter ved UiT. Vi kan alle gjøre feil, det er ikke der skoen trykker. Men om feil skjer, så forsøker man å rette det opp, om det så koster noen ekstra timer med arbeid. Det eneste svaret jeg fikk var at «det går ikke». Tross dette, vi fikk god administrativ støtte når det gjaldt logistikken (mat/drikke/rom), og god teknisk support fra ingeniør ved Registreringssentral for historiske data.

Vi hadde lagt opp til faste grupper gjennom alle fire dagene. Tilbakemeldingene fra studentene var at vi med fordel kunne sjonglert med gruppene. Dette tas til etterretning.

Vi var avhengige av at eksterne forelesere forholdt seg til oppsatte frister for innlevering av pensum forelesningstema, og gruppeoppgaver. Det viste seg vanskelig å overholde. Purringer ble sendt, men pensumlistene kom sent inn, og ble ikke lagt ut i Canvas for ca. en uke før kurset.

Som nevnt, dagene med eksterne forelesere ble organisert rundt to forelesninger, en om morgenen og en etter lunsj – begge forelesninger med etterfulgt gruppearbeid og diskusjon. Den første dagen var litt annerledes, med tre forelesninger (ca. 30-40 min) hver seg med gruppearbeid og diskusjon etter hver del. Vi bør vurdere en annen organisering på dette: tre innledninger ca 20 min hver, deretter noe lengre gruppearbeid etterfulgt av diskusjon.

Kurset er en del av UiT sin flerfakultære satsing, Befolkningsundersøkelser i Nord. Fra tidspunktet vi begynte å planlegge dette kurset, så forsøkte vi ved flere anledninger å la kurset gjenspeile strategiens fremste mål, nemlig flerfakultær satsing. Vi ønsket rett og slett å bryte ned fakultetsvisse vegger og fremme et felles PhD kurs uten noe særeierskap hos ett fakultet. Dette syntes veldig

vanskelig. Om vi skal satse på flerfakultær forskning, så er det nødvendig at også administrasjonen tenker flerfakultær administrasjon!

Erfaringene med opprettingen og gjennomføringen av dette emnet ga inspirasjon til et helt seminar i BiN-regi om utfordringene med tverrfaglig forskning i et system som ikke er rigget for dette. Vi inviterte professor John Aldrich ved Duke U, som har forsket på tverrfaglighet.