

Course Evaluation Report Fall 2025

Course coordinators: Audun Rosslund and Ida Tidemann – PSY4204 – Hands on training in emotional and cognitive development

Introduction

About the evaluation:

The course evaluation was conducted at the end of the semester using a student survey during a lecture, and 12 out of 35 students responded. The results below summarize students' responses to closed questions and open-ended feedback regarding the structure, content, workload, and learning outcomes of the course.

Course structure:

The course combined lectures with interactive and practical elements, including varied tasks and opportunities for student–teacher interaction. The course included continuous coursework with final written and/or oral, group-based presentations for each of the three course modules.

General evaluation of the course

Overall, students report a high level of satisfaction with the course. Communication was evaluated positively, with 75% of students responding “yes” and 25% “rather yes” to questions regarding clarity and organization. The content of the course was perceived as novel and interesting by all respondents (67% “yes”, 33% “rather yes”).

The quality of teaching and teacher engagement received particularly strong evaluations. A clear majority found the quality of teaching satisfactory (75% “yes”, 25% “rather yes”), while teacher engagement was rated very highly (92% “yes”). Availability and supportiveness of teachers were also evaluated positively by all students.

Teaching, learning environment, and course design

Students generally reported satisfaction with the diversity of teaching methods, with 91% responding “yes” or “rather yes”. However, a small proportion (8%) expressed some dissatisfaction in this area.

Regarding course difficulty, most students (83%) considered the level appropriate, though 17% felt that the course was too difficult. The tempo of the course emerged as a clearer challenge: while 58% found the pace satisfactory, 42% reported that the course progressed too quickly.

Open-ended responses indicate that students particularly valued:

- Practical, hands-on elements
- High engagement from teachers
- Variation in tasks
- An interactive teaching style and dialogue between students and teachers

Workload, effort, and understanding

Most students found the overall workload acceptable (75% “yes” or “rather yes”), although 25% reported that the amount of work was too high. The reported weekly workload varied, with 58% spending 6–8 hours per week on the course and 42% spending 3–5 hours.

In terms of learning outcomes, 83% of students reported understanding most of the course content, while 17% indicated understanding about half of it. All respondents reported improvement in their knowledge over the course (75% “yes”, 25% “rather yes”).

Assessment and relevance

The examination format was evaluated positively by all students, with 58% responding “yes” and 42% “rather yes” to whether it was adequate. The course was also perceived as highly relevant for future academic and professional work.

Course coordinator’s assessment

The evaluation indicates that the course is largely perceived as well-structured, engaging, and relevant, with particularly strong evaluations of teacher engagement, practical components, and perceived usefulness for future academic and professional work.

At the same time, the feedback highlights areas for improvement. Students most frequently mentioned the high level of difficulty and fast pace of Module 1, as well as the overall workload, as challenging aspects of the course. These results suggest a need to review the pacing and workload distribution, particularly early in the course, to support student learning and reduce overload.

These findings will be taken into account in future iterations of the course, with the aim of maintaining its strengths while improving balance between difficulty, pace, and workload