

Procedures for evaluation of courses and supervision at MCC

Each semester, the study board at the Department of Media, Cognition and Communication (MCC) undertakes two evaluations of all courses for all programmes, and of the supervision of major written assignments (bachelor projects, academic internships and master's theses).

The *course* evaluations take the form of a verbal evaluation halfway through the semester and a written summative evaluation in the faculty's shared electronic evaluation system. The objective is to support the ongoing adjustment of the individual courses and to develop these in dialogue between teachers and students – both during the semester, when specific courses can be adjusted, and before semester start, when the evaluations from the previous semester are included in the planning of the following semester's courses.

The evaluation of *supervision* in connection with major written assignments likewise includes both a verbal interim evaluation and a written summative evaluation.

The programme secretariat must be notified when the verbal interim evaluation of the courses has taken place. However, this does not apply to the evaluation of major written assignments.

The written evaluations in particular are included in the study board's more long-term academic development, among other things in the evaluation of the existing curricula that is conducted every three years in MCC's study board in accordance with the faculty's quality assurance policy, and also in connection with the design of new or revised curricula. The evaluations are also part of the annual programme report and of the programme evaluations that are conducted every six years.

Prior to the written summative evaluation, the head of department sends an email to all teachers and students, to get as many as possible to participate.

The basis for the written summative course evaluations is a shared electronic system and a shared evaluation form, which is completed by students in all groups during classes on a date notified well in advance by the teacher. Evaluation is, however, possible within a period of 14 days. The evaluation takes place at the end of the semester, but in such good time that in the last class the group can discuss the overall quantitative evaluation and the written comments submitted (free-text responses).

If the evaluation gives special grounds for this, the individual teacher can submit comments concerning the evaluation to the study board no later than one week after the summative evaluation has been discussed by the group.

For the *written evaluation of supervision of major written assignments* a special form is used, which the study administration forwards to the students when the written assignments in question commence. After submission of the assignment, each student must send the completed form to the study administration. Evaluation of supervision is included in the study board's overall processing of the course evaluations, taking account of how the forms are not submitted to the study board and supervisor until after grades have been given and the deadline for appeals has expired.

The study board's consideration of the electronic summative evaluation:

The structure which is the basis for the implementation of the evaluations is continued in the subsequent processing, follow-up and reporting of the overall evaluation. This is a multi-stage process, which can be briefly described as follows:

1) The student and teacher representatives in the study board jointly review the automatically generated evaluation reports from the individual courses. The evaluation system automatically flags any course with a significant number of negative responses (more than 30% response within the poorest and the second-poorest categories). This can be taken to indicate courses that require special attention. If the teacher has submitted comments on the evaluation, these are included in the review.

2) On the basis of this review, the teacher and student representatives draw up a written report of approximately 1-2 pages, in which the results of the evaluations are summarised. The report classifies the courses evaluated, to show which course activities stand out by having a particularly excellent and exemplary quality (classification: A); which teaching activities are overall satisfactory, and which therefore do not require a detailed description (classification: B); and, finally, which teaching activities present problems, and which should therefore be improved (classification: C).

This classification may relate to the automatic classification, but may also deviate from this. The classification system should not be mechanical, since this does not concern the classification of simple entities. In view of how the study board perceives education, no simple point or chart system can reasonably be set up either. Complex processes are involved, of which the

quality can only be illuminated through academic discussions and by using a plurality of sources, taking into account that no teaching activity can be evaluated exhaustively on the basis of just one single measurement method. The unit that is classified is an education activity that may be a single element, such as a syllabus, or a full course.

3) The report is then presented to the study board for discussion. On the basis of this discussion, the relevant teacher and student representatives on the study board adjust the report, where necessary.

4) On the basis of the individual reports and the study board's discussion, the chairman of the study board and the head of studies compile an *overall internal report*, in which there is emphasis on how the quality of the courses can be developed. The final report is built up to clearly show which educational activities are classified as A, B or C. In the same way, where relevant, the report will indicate how previous evaluation reports have been followed up.

5) The report is presented to the head of department for discussion of further measures. For internal use, the head of studies and head of department will draw up a plan to follow up on any critical matters. If specific courses are assessed to be problematic, the study board, to the extent that this is economically feasible, will be able to arrange wider cooperation between a group of teachers, with a view to working together to improve the course quality. The plan may also include follow-up on other elements of the report. This may include whether resources can be allocated to further didactic training of teachers, including how the experience from particularly successful teaching activities can be disseminated to a wider circle.

Course evaluations are included in the annual performance and development reviews (PDR), at which the head of section holds reviews with full-time academic staff, while the head of studies holds reviews with part-time academic staff.

6) On the basis of the internal report, in accordance with the faculty's guidelines and in cooperation with the chairman of the study board, the head of studies prepares a final report of 2-3 pages intended for publication. The final report is then forwarded to all teaching staff for information and at the same time is published on the department's website and added as an annex to the study board's minutes. The half-yearly course evaluation will also be presented to the wider management team and department council. As the range of courses in the department's disciplines is relatively limited, it will not

normally be possible to give direct access from the website to the underlying data basis without infringing the Danish Data Protection Act.

HS, 12.11.2018