

Course evaluations. CCG Spring 2017

44 students submitted evaluations, and attendance is proportional with the size of each stream course as well as core courses and electives. Regarding the level, extent, learning objectives, course materials, communication and outcome, the general rating is 'appropriate'.

Challenges and Future of Communication in Global Contexts. The majority of respondents (40%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course. Comments revolve around wanting more classes and applicability to various cases. This seems to revolve around different ideas of how stream specific this should be. Some of the comments appear to be placed under the wrong core course, which makes it difficult to base much on.

Media Consumption, Culture Globalization and Ethnic Relations. The majority of respondents (52%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course. Comments mostly revolve around positives to the teacher and a guest lecturer as a way to gain practical relevance, and some critical comments regarding structure.

Optional - Policy Analysis in Practice. The majority of respondents state to have spent somewhere between 1-3 hours (43%) and 4-6 hours (43%). Comments on the length of this course point in both positive and negative directions – easy to fit in because it is short (four sessions), but also too short to get around everything.

Optional - Academic Written Communication. The majority of respondents (56%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course. Most critical comments related to organization and information on exam.

Branding and Experience Economy. The majority of respondents (53%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course. Comments are somewhat contradictory in that the merge of theory and practice is both praised and criticized for the way that it was carried out in the course.

Global Consumer Culture. The title is incorrect in the evaluation, which may have confused respondents. For example, this is reflected in comments about ECTS points that seem out of place here. The majority of respondents (66%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course.

Organizational Culture and Change for Sustainability. The majority of respondents (50%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course. There were very few comments to this course, but the teaching style was highlighted as a positive.

Facilitation of Collaboration Models. The majority of respondents (50%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course. There were very few comments to this course, but the structure of the course was highlighted as a positive.

Nation and nationalisms. The majority of respondents state to have spent somewhere between 1-3 hours (50%) and 4-6 hours (50%). Comments were generally positive, particularly about the atmosphere in class.

Global Politics and Human Rights. The majority of respondents (67%) state to have spent 1-3 hours per week on this course. Very few but only positive comments were presented, and respondents would like more classes.

Key Concepts in International Migration and Ethnic Relation II. The majority of respondents (86%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course. Many positive comments about the team of lecturers, but a couple of negatives about the organization of the classes.

Migration and Mechanisms of Inclusion and Exclusion. The majority of respondents (71%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course. Many positive comments, but a few negative ones regarding discrepancies in the teaching styles.

Applied Methods – all streams. The majority of respondents (from 33% to 67%) state to have spent 4-6 hours per week on this course across the different streams. Apart from positive comments about the teachers, some mentioning of repetition from 7th sem. and not learning anything new was apparent. This is not necessarily reflecting the teachers' and supervisors impressions of the necessity of these courses.

Project supervision:

36 students submitted evaluations on supervision, referring to 17 different supervisors, and generally the comments were very positive. The few negatives can all be related back to issues of supervisors being too busy (in the words of respondents), and therefore hard to reach, long response times etc. This is unfortunately a premise for all supervisors, but of course it is important that students are equipped to work under such circumstances.