



Summary course evaluation report

Basic Information

Degree programme(s):	Global Development
Head of Studies:	John Rand
Period:	Academic year 2024-25

Response rates

Autumn	
Response rate, Autumn Semester courses	Block 1: 64.9% (46.9%+79.0%) Block 2: 60.8% (70.0%+51.9%)
Response rate, Autumn semester Master's Thesis	8%
Response rate, Autumn semester Academic Internship	24%
Response rate, last year, Autumn Semester	55%
Spring	
Response rate, Spring Semester courses	Block 4: 54.7% + spring 25: 62.1% (70.8% + 54.5%)
Response rate, Spring semester Master's Thesis	28%
Response rate, Spring semester Academic Internship	0%
Response rate, last year, Spring Semester	39%

Processing of the course evaluations

Distribution of the evaluations in the categories A, B and C	Number, autumn	Number, spring
Category-A assessment Category-A assessments are given when evaluations are particularly good, for example when lecturers have taken exemplary initiatives, and positive experience has been gained from which other teachers or course elements can benefit.	2	0

Distribution of the evaluations in the categories A, B and C	Number, autumn	Number, spring
Category-B assessment Category-B assessments are given when standards are satisfactory. The communication of the result to the lecturer may still be accompanied by suggested improvements and adjustments, but it is basically up to the lecturer to introduce initiatives.	<i>2 + Due to the low response rates for both the Academic Internships and the Master's Thesis the board decided to rate all courses as B-courses.</i>	3 + Master's Thesis
Category-C assessment Category-C assessments are given when one or more aspects of the degree programme are so problematic that improvements must be made, supervised by the programme management and/or the departmental management (depending on the nature of the problem(s)). Category-C assessments can also be given if other aspects of a subject element than the teaching as such need to be adjusted, e.g. the course content, requirements in relation to the academic background of participants, the academic level or the extent of the teaching.	0	0

Head of Studies' comment

This report will be published on samf.ku.dk (must not contain sensitive personal information, including specific course titles, names, etc.). The Head of Studies' comment should not exceed 3 pages.

At SAMF, all ECTS-awarding study activities are evaluated at each iteration. Are there any courses or other ECTS-awarding study activities for which evaluation forms have not been sent out by mistake?
No. All ECTS-awarding study activities within Global Development have been correctly included in the evaluation process. The administrative routines and automated evaluation setup appear to function reliably, and we have not identified any omissions or technical errors in the distribution of evaluation forms.
Are there any courses or other ECTS-generating study activities that haven't been rated due to no or too few responses to the evaluation? If so, what has the Study Board done to ensure the quality of the study activity?
No. All courses have received sufficient responses to allow for meaningful evaluation results. The existing measures to encourage student participation, including reminders from lecturers and in-class completion time, have ensured adequate data quality and coverage.
Does Head of Studies encourage lecturers to evaluate during teaching hours?

Yes. The Head of Studies explicitly encourages lecturers to allocate time during scheduled teaching hours for students to complete the evaluations. This practice has proven effective in improving response rates and in ensuring that students perceive the evaluation process as an integral and valued part of the teaching cycle rather than as an administrative afterthought.
Does the Head of Studies encourage lecturers to inform new students on which changes have been made to their courses compared to last year, and why?
Yes. Lecturers are encouraged to communicate openly with students about any adjustments made to the course structure, readings, assignments, or assessment forms compared with previous years. This practice enhances transparency, reinforces the notion of continuous improvement, and helps students understand the pedagogical reasoning behind course design decisions.
SAMF's target response rate is 50% ¹ . If the response rates do not meet the target: Briefly elaborate on what initiatives Head of Studies, Study Board, Head of Department and/or lecturers have implemented to increase the response rates in the future:
To sustain and further improve response rates, we remind lecturers of the importance of course evaluations throughout the semester and encourage them to allocate specific in-class time for completion. This approach ensures that all students have the opportunity to provide feedback in a structured and supportive environment. Additionally, we emphasize to lecturers the value of communicating how evaluation results are used to make tangible course improvements, which helps motivate students to participate meaningfully.
Briefly comment on the trends and fluctuations in response rates:
Response rates have shown a noticeable improvement compared to previous evaluation rounds. The increased institutional focus on the evaluation process, particularly the emphasis on in-class completion and clearer communication of the purpose and impact of evaluations, appears to have had a positive effect. Sustaining this level of engagement will remain a focus in the coming academic year.
Reflect on the distribution of teaching evaluations in the categories A, B and C:
Given the relatively small number of courses within the Global Development programme, generalizations are difficult. However, the 2024/25 evaluations indicate a positive trend compared to 2023/24. We now have two courses rated in category A (compared to none last year) and no courses in category C (down from one last year). This suggests a general improvement in the perceived quality of teaching and learning outcomes. One newly introduced course faced some initial challenges, which will be addressed through targeted follow-up and support measures for next year's iteration.
What positive experiences have been gained in the A category? Are there any of these experiences which can serve as inspiration for other courses?
Courses rated in the A category have benefited from diversity in teaching approaches, including the integration of interactive and practice-oriented learning activities, and strong coordination between multiple instructors involved in co-taught modules. These elements have contributed to high student engagement and coherence across course components. Such practices could serve as valuable inspiration for other courses, particularly those involving multiple lecturers or interdisciplinary content.

¹ The target response rate applies to courses, bachelor's projects, master's theses, academic internship, and master's projects.

Briefly comment on what characterizes the evaluations of the B-rated courses. What works well in these courses, and what can be improved?

Courses in the B category continue to demonstrate a high academic standard and are generally well-received by students in terms of intellectual challenge and relevance. Students appreciate the academic rigor and the critical perspectives offered. Areas for potential improvement typically relate to clarity of course expectations, workload balance, or more consistent feedback mechanisms across assignments. These aspects are currently being discussed among teaching staff to ensure continuous enhancement.

What key points are highlighted by the evaluations of the courses in category C? What adjustments or follow-up initiatives are planned to address these key points?

Not applicable. There were no category C evaluations in the current cycle. This absence is encouraging and reflects a general improvement in course delivery and coordination compared to the previous year.

What competence development initiatives have been or will be implemented?

A digitalisation initiative has been successfully implemented in four courses (ARMs, TFC, FIELD, and GloBE) as part of a broader effort to enhance digital learning integration. While most digital elements have functioned as intended, the introduction of ChatTutor in the GloBE course did not yield the desired outcomes. This experience provided valuable insight into the challenges of implementing AI-supported learning tools, especially regarding student engagement and the balance between automation and human interaction. Future initiatives will build on these lessons to refine our approach to digital competence development and pedagogical innovation.

Head of Studies is responsible for informing Head(s) of Department(s)/Center Director² on the results of the course evaluations. Does Head of Studies inform the Head(s) of Department(s) Center Director on the results of the course evaluations and other notable circumstances related to the teaching of a course³?

Yes. The Head of Studies maintains an ongoing dialogue with the Heads of the Departments of Anthropology and Economics, both of whom are actively involved in the Global Development programme. Evaluation results and other notable issues related to teaching are discussed regularly and formally presented at the annual Global Development teachers' meeting held in May. This collaborative setup ensures that departmental leadership remains closely informed and engaged in quality assurance and pedagogical development processes.

² There is no Head of Department at the Copenhagen Center for Social Data Science (SODAS). The Director of SODAS is acting as Head of Department in the course evaluation report process.

³ For example, exceptionally coherent courses, special efforts by the lecturer with learning and teaching materials, experiments with new teaching methods, surprising pass rates, dropout rates, or grades.