

TIK4011 course evaluation S24

Updated: 26 April 2024 at 10:21

What do you think about the course overall? (1–10, 10 being the best score)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 7.20 Median: 8

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	0	0%	0%
4	3	20%	20%
5	1	6.7%	6.7%
6	0	0%	0%
7	2	13.3%	13.3%
8	6	40%	40%
9	1	6.7%	6.7%
10	2	13.3%	13.3%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 8

- Mye som er veldig vagt, føler ikke jeg har lært hvordan jeg skal bruke det i praksis, sliter med å se sammenhenger og koblinger
- Love that I’ve been challenged during the lectures and seminars. My analytical skills have improved
- I think the first part of the course was very good (climate), but then it kinda sleed out a bit. No “pre” explanation, we just jumped straight in. So it was hard to understand what was what, ex. What is the concepts.
- Interesting course, with interesting themes.
- It was really nice, but sometimes confusing, but I guess it is the nature of STS, to sometimes be hard to grasp because it doesn't come naturally.
- Maybe restructuring the module in some way could be an idea? E.g. doing theme 2 (valuation etc) first, then theme 3 (the digital), and finally the climate module, as the climate module could also function as a case study, uniting theory from the other two modules and concretising it. I found valuation studies to be the most challenging module, and would have liked to start with that, personally.
- More in dept learning about specific concepts. Focus on learning the concepts first properly, before building on them, drawing Lines
- Lots of interesting readings and lectures. Climate, care and valuation was in themselves great. Digital was too much in a too short amount of time, and curriculum was uncomprehensive. The lectures suffered from this, I think.

What do you think about the size and scope of the curriculum? (1–10, 1 is not challenging enough, 10 is overwhelming)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 7.60 Median: 8

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	0	0%	0%
4	1	6.7%	6.7%
5	0	0%	0%
6	3	20%	20%
7	2	13.3%	13.3%
8	5	33.3%	33.3%
9	2	13.3%	13.3%
10	2	13.3%	13.3%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 10

- It didn't feel that we had the possibility to really read or digest everything. I think having a key text that encapsulates something, discussing it closely would be better. Then the rest of the curriculum could be recommended
- Veldig mye pensum
- A bit much, but feels like it was needed. Main drawback is that you don't get a lot of time reflecting along the way. I study 6-8 hours (productive) 6 days a week. Manage to read it all, but struggle with letting the material mature.
- A lot to read, couldn't get through it all.
- Some modules might have too much curriculum. It is hard to be up to date for the lectures because of this. Especially with the longer, more "classical" texts.
- Sometimes it was quite challenging to read everything, especially the lecture of Kristin Asdahl, when we had to read maybe 200 pages or more for just one lecture. Especially, since some of the articles can be quite hard to read when we don't know anything about the field.
- Some weeks/lectures had a lot more on the curriculum compared to others and it was hard to get through all the articles, whereas other lectures had a lot less on the curriculum - although overall it was manageable. Like I suggested above, rearranging the modules so that the most curriculum-heavy module comes first, could be an idea.
- The course can be a little overwhelming, we had quite a bit of readings, and a lot of concepts and themes to navigate
- The Dewey (1939) wAs overwhelming. Having only one text for the workshop wAs very Nice (like we did in the climate part). Gives a starting point and when understanding the key concepts here we can use the text to refer to other Texts we've had within the module/other modules.
- Should be an option to not attend one of the modules

How do you rate the relevance of the curriculum? (1–10, 10 being the most relevant)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 7.93 Median: 8

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	0	0%	0%
4	0	0%	0%
5	3	20%	20%
6	0	0%	0%
7	1	6.7%	6.7%
8	6	40%	40%
9	1	6.7%	6.7%
10	4	26.7%	26.7%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 6

- Mye pensum jeg ikke helt skjønner hvorfor skal leses. Er teorier osv som tas opp i det som jeg forstår, men mange av tekstene er så spisset og irrelevante for å kunne benytte til eget arbeid
- The relevance was good!
- In some lectures, the curriculum is not even mentioned. It kind of makes you think that it is not relevant, and therefore hard to understand why it was put on the list.
- I guess it was relevant, it's hard to say whether or not it's relevant since I am no specialist of the field.
- As the curriculum has been decreased from previous years, but the lectures still mentioned some of the articles that were previously on the curriculum, it could have been nice to do a "recommended curriculum" for the lectures relying on non-curriculum articles
- See last comment

How do you rate the difficulty of the curriculum? (1–10, from too easy to too difficult)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 7.47 Median: 8

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	0	0%	0%
4	0	0%	0%
5	1	6.7%	6.7%
6	1	6.7%	6.7%
7	5	33.3%	33.3%
8	7	46.7%	46.7%
9	0	0%	0%
10	1	6.7%	6.7%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 9

- There was some issues with the compendium and some of the text had the wrong date.
- Mye veldig tungt pensum, vanskelig å komme seg gjennom og vanskelig å forstå. Samt veldig mye pensum som gjør at man ikke har tid eller mulighet til å sette seg inn i det man leser. Blir overveldende
- Some text was awful at the beginning, but ended up loving some of those the most! It's been a journey and I think that it's the right level of challenge at master level
- Many heavy papers
- Most of the texts are good. But I find some of them extremely difficult to follow - especially on financialization.
- Sometimes it was very easy to understand, and sometimes it was very challenging, because the articles were long, from authors who are interested in using complex terms. I guess one difficulty in particular is the scope of the curriculum. We talk about so many different topics that it's hard to draw things together, and to see the innate connection between the subfields of STS.
- The difficulty to me mostly came from the very large range of informations and concepts to understand
- Some Are very long. If it exists litterature that covers the same but compromised (15-20p instead of 30/40) that would feel less overwhelming.
- Some very accessible, some very little so. Could spend a day or more for one article. Thats fine, but should be reflected in the course load.

How do you rate the coherence between the different parts of the course? (1–10, 10 being the most coherent)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 6.00 Median: 5

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	1	6.7%	6.7%
4	3	20%	20%
5	5	33.3%	33.3%
6	1	6.7%	6.7%
7	0	0%	0%
8	3	20%	20%
9	0	0%	0%
10	2	13.3%	13.3%

Question without text

Number of submissions: 10

- Some lectures were great at wrapping things up, especially Asdal and Engen, but others felt more like a random mixture of details
- Should be made clearer how the different moduls relates to each other.
- Sliter med å se sammenhenger og en rød tråd, samtidig som det er vanskelig å skjønner hvor de ulike konseptene og begrepene passer under
- Could have been a lot better. I feel like when we change themes and teachers, they don't overlap and explain the new theme from a "beginner" perspective. So it was hard to follow along at first.
- I feel like the course could have worked more on how the different themes are connected or how you could make them connected. It feels like some themes are inherently more connected to each other and others not connected at all.
- Well, the scope was very large and made it hard to find a link between every lecture and especially every part of STS, but inside the topics studied it felt natural.
- The topics are related to each other smoothly, on the seminars there always has been the opportunity to rethink the connections between the modules
- It would be nice to make links between the different modules more apparent
- The coherence is there, but the topics Are very lagre and have many concepts so all the time is spent understanding the concepts wothin each part. Havent a bridge modul would be cool.
- Very little. And todays session with the drawing things together should be organized different. Maybe a panel talk with representatives for each field would be nice

How to you rate the written assignments or exercises in the course? (1–10, from disliked to liked)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 6.80 Median: 7

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	0	0%	0%
4	2	13.3%	13.3%
5	5	33.3%	33.3%
6	0	0%	0%
7	1	6.7%	6.7%
8	3	20%	20%
9	2	13.3%	13.3%
10	2	13.3%	13.3%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 13

- Some were great!
- Even more focus on how to apply the concepts.
- There should be a more structured idea about how to do exercises in class.
- Ikke fått så mye ut av de
- Challenged myself here, just as it should!
- Me, and many others, think that it's nice to have assignments in the course. But we were just told to write in the seminar example, so I feel like I didn't get anything out of it.
- Should have been a written assignment to help prepare for the exam
- Student presentations worked really well.
- Sometimes it was hard to get started, to speak about the articles or the topics because the questions are very broad and it feels a bit overwhelming. I guess the main problem is that we may lack a prompt.
- The presentation task was a great method to understand the concepts better, since there was a task to try to explain them to the group. Maybe would be a nice idea to add more writing exercises and then discussions on them to check on ourselves before the exam
- They were very helpful to try and see if we understood properly everything and if we could articulate the arguments. Maybe a little more from the lecturers would be nice to see what we did right/wrong/what could be improved
- I did not Get so much out of writing 2hours by myself. I can do this outside of the meetings we have together.
- The climate format was great. The valuation one ok. The digital was too unstructured. Would be better to have received questions in advance

How to you rate the lectures? (1–10, from low to high)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 7.67 Median: 8

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	0	0%	0%
4	1	6.7%	6.7%
5	1	6.7%	6.7%
6	2	13.3%	13.3%
7	1	6.7%	6.7%
8	5	33.3%	33.3%
9	3	20%	20%
10	2	13.3%	13.3%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 9

- Some were great! Especially module 1 and 2B.
- Veldig avhengig av foreleseren, noen flinke og noen veldig uklare
- Fell out on the digital lecture. A bit much references outside the curriculum
- Many good, but also some bad. Examples bad PowerPoint, no structure etc.
- Everything that was said about how to use concepts in STS in this last lecture should have been explained in the beginning of the course
- I think it is easier to follow the lectures when they take the curriculum as a point of departure, and use different cases to show how you could use the different concepts to study something.
- <3
- I liked the variety of topics and themes we discussed
- Introduvtion to the digital could cover less. I experienced it as many new concepts without getting properly into any of them, in this sense just Word-dropping.

How do you rate the lecturers? (1–10, from low to high)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 7.67 Median: 8

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	0	0%	0%
4	1	6.7%	6.7%
5	2	13.3%	13.3%
6	0	0%	0%
7	2	13.3%	13.3%
8	5	33.3%	33.3%
9	3	20%	20%
10	2	13.3%	13.3%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 5

- Should be more experienced lecturers.
- Igjen veldig forskjellig, noen forelesere er tydelige og går bra gjennom pensum! Andre har for mye informasjon som er for uklar og vag, og går heller ikke gjennom pensum..
- Same as above.
- <3
- Digital one was the only one I didnt like.

How do you rate the external visits? (1–10, from low to high)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 8.20 Median: 8

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	0	0%	0%
4	0	0%	0%
5	1	6.7%	6.7%
6	2	13.3%	13.3%
7	3	20%	20%
8	2	13.3%	13.3%
9	1	6.7%	6.7%
10	6	40%	40%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 7

- Interesting and relevant external visit to CICERO, should have been more of these.
- Hadde vært gøy med flere, for å forstå det vi lærer mer i praksis, og hvordan det kan brukes/benyttes på arbeidsplasser
- Was good, learned a lot.
- There was only one if I remember, and it was nice to visit CICERO, but it felt challenging to come up with relevant questions very early on.
- Very interesting to see more practical examples of what we studied and to discuss with a variety of people working in the field
- Wish we had more!
- Cicero was interesting, but overlapped quite a bit with a lecture we already had.

How do you rate the information flow in the couse? (1–10, from low to high)

Number of submissions: 15 Average: 8.47 Median: 9

Submissions	Count	% of submissions	
1	0	0%	0%
2	0	0%	0%
3	1	6.7%	6.7%
4	0	0%	0%
5	1	6.7%	6.7%
6	0	0%	0%
7	1	6.7%	6.7%
8	3	20%	20%
9	2	13.3%	13.3%
10	7	46.7%	46.7%

Comments/suggestions for improvement

Number of submissions: 3

- The lecturer could have done more to prepare us for the exam, by for example give out old exams. This was denied by the lecturer.
- It was good :)
- Some more info about exam would be nice