

Course evaluations report

SOSANT9015/16 – Writing and Method

Rebekah Ciribassi and Alessandro Rippa

Course evaluations were carried out on May 5, 2026, the second day of this 2-day course. The format we selected for the evaluations featured four open ended questions, which students addressed in writing during class. The key aims of the evaluations were the following:

- To gain practical, hands-on feedback on how to improve activities for future iterations of the course.
- To assess to what extent the course was meeting its stated objectives in the eyes of the students, and what (if anything) was missing.

The four questions we asked were the following:

- 1) What in-class and take-home exercises have been most beneficial to your learning, and what did not felt particularly helpful?
- 2) Are the assigned readings comprehensible and useful?
- 3) Were the course requirements and assignments adequate?
- 4) If you could change or add one thing to this course, what would it be? For example, are there topics missing that you would like to discuss? Or topics that you do not find particularly interesting? Or, is there something about the structure of the course that you would change?

All 5 students who took the course submitted their evaluation.

Summary:

In-class exercises: very positive feedback – students appreciated the hands-on approach and benefitted from the various frameworks for writing that we offered

Feedback sessions: Very positive feedback here too, with a couple of students singling out those sessions as the most useful.

Readings: appropriate, and useful – neither too little nor too much.

Suggestions

Students made some practical suggestions, namely:

- spread out writing exercises over three days instead of two;
- have a chance to read drafts at different stages (hence possibly having the course in 2 parts, with some weeks in between);
- presentations should take place in seminar: these would take less time away from lecture, imply less stress for presenting students, and offer more time for actual feedback.

Conclusions and planned changes

In general, feedback has been overwhelmingly positive, and clearly points to the fact that there is no need for an overhaul of the course especially given the fact that the new PhD

programme envisions a re-organised post-fieldwork writing course that should address the wishes of the students (more sessions, over an extended period of time)