

Til: Programrådet i spesialpedagogikk

Dato: 18.01.2022

Saksnr.: 2022/7037 MARIKAV

Referat fra møte i programrådet i spesialpedagogikk 18.01.2022

Tilstede:

Programrådsleder: Kristine Stadskleiv, faglig studieleder

Representanter for bachelorprogrammet: Christian Brandmo (inkludert metodeperspektivet)

Vararepresentant: Guri Engernes Nielsen (for Imac Zambrana)

Representanter for masterprogrammet: Åste Mjelve Hagen og Luca Tateo

Studentrepresentanter 2021/2022: Malin Stilger og Allison Lee Passaneau

Sekretær: Marika Vartun (fungerende administrativ studieleder)

Invitert inn til saksframlegget: Trude Schmidt Øvergard (seniorkonsulent i studieadm)

1. Diskusjonssak: Nye rutiner for gjennomføring av emneevalueringer

Bakgrunn

Som følge av [UiOs nye kvalitetssystem](#) (vedtatt 8. desember 2020) er det behov for å revidere ISP sine rutiner og retningslinjer for gjennomføring av emneevalueringer.

På bakgrunn av [kvalitetsbeskrivelsens kapittel 3 om emneevalueringer](#) må ISP legge til rette for at emneevalueringer gjennomføres underveis i undervisningsperioden. Videre må ISP legge til rette for dialog og tilbakemeldinger mellom emneansvarlig og studenter underveis, og for løpende videreutvikling av emnet.

Til diskusjon

Programrådet diskuterte og ga innspill på forslag til rutiner, mal for studentevaluering, og revidert mal for oppsummeringsrapport. Diskusjonen var på engelsk:

Innspill:

- The evaluation scheme should be easy to use and make sense.
- The evaluation should be a recourse not a burden in the work with study quality.



- Although this is the department's responsibility, the students also have a responsibility by contributing with their feedback and experiences.
- We can mention the evaluation at the first lecture with our students and that we want the students to be active.
- Maybe use additional evaluation on the midterm and a standard evaluation at the end.
- The students must have knowledge enough to answer the questions about quality and learning outcomes; in the beginning of the semester we may ask if this information was clearly conveyed, but the students will not have sufficient basis for evaluating whether or not the learning objectives were met
- If we ask students about whether the course is updated and relevant - I don't think they can evaluate that- we put too much responsibility on the students.
- The students can say something about the teaching, but not about the goals of the course, whether it is updated or relevant.
- Save "Læringsutbytte"- questions to the end-evaluation.
- Questions that are easier to answer in the beginning / midterm: Do you find the information in Canvas? Are teachers available for you? Are the groups and seminars working well? Do you have suggestions for better interactivity?
- We must be flexible – Midways in SNE (8 weeks) versus giving it during or at the end of a whole-term-course- must be adjustable to the different topics
- Different people may need some things answered (adm / faglig / emneansvar / underviser) all this can be additional information in the form.
- We should assess who needs what kind of information?
- Motto should be "Never ask something to our citizens if you can't change it!"
- Continued feedback is important during of the course (e.g. "please improve your powerpoints")
- We need to look at the index for quality for our studies
- Not motivated students will not answer at the end of the semester.
- Hard for SNE to evaluate mid-term, as most courses are only of short duration
- The lecturer is important for quality – how enthusiastic is the teacher? How is the curriculum – is it relevant, is it only articles?, the seminars: is it relevant task? Can I use it for my exams.
- LINK is the experts, we can check with them – and also the other departments at the faculty (and other faculties) – have they already a good evaluation scheme ready to use?
- Evaluate learning outcome - at the end of the semester versus Do you understand what you are going to learn - in the beginning of the semester
- Why don't we start to list WHAT does WHO need (adm/emneans/teacher) and WHEN is it needed? And see how this map in the quality criteria.
- We are an educational department and maybe we can suggest something / improve the Quality assurance system for the educational activities at the University of Oslo

2. Veien videre:

- Marika asks LINK / CEMO/ILS/IPED and other faculties
- Kristine challenge the staff at the next staff meeting March 15th
- Marika, Kristine and Trude present a new draft on the next meeting in Programrådet

Med hilsen

Kristine Stadsklevi
Studieleder

Dette dokumentet er godkjent elektronisk ved UiO og er derfor ikke signert.

Saksbehandler:
Marika Vartun
, *marika.vartun@isp.uio.no*