

Course evaluations. CCG spring 2020

46 students submitted evaluations (53%). Although a bit of a lower response rate than usual, considering the Corona virus outbreak and subsequent restrictions in force at the very end of the courses where evaluations are also taking place, 53% is acceptable. Response rates across streams are not indicated, but when looking at each stream course, it seems that distribution is proportional with the estimated size of each stream. This unfortunately also means that for parts of this evaluation, only very few respondents make up the basis for percentages provided.

When it comes to learning objectives of each course, the respondents generally express familiarity. In terms of level and extent of the courses, these are overall considered appropriate. In terms of clarity in communication of learning objectives, the vast majority of respondents rate this positively. Also in terms of positive learning outcomes from courses, choice of materials in courses, and presentation of materials in class, the vast majority rate all courses positively, although some negative comments also prevail.

Communication in global contexts. Comments revolve around the relevance and purpose of the course, which by some respondents seemed unclear. Moreover, issues of broadness versus depth was also commented on, and the relevance to particular streams was criticized. Positive comments were given to the presentation materials.

Intercultural communication. Many positive comments on the teacher's way of engaging the students in class. Some critical comments address the relevance of the course at Master level, which is questioned by those already familiar with the topic. Critical comments at a general level are included, although not specific to this course.

Academic Written Communication. Comments are overall positive, and the usefulness of the course is mentioned. There was some confusion of the focus of the course, which was less prevalent in the comments though.

Cultural branding and Experience Economy. Many positive comments praising the lecturers, although some criticism of the choices of cases and examples, which were very much focused on city branding.

Global Consumer Culture. Lots of positive comments about the structure and presentation of the material, and thereby the informational output of the course. A few critical comments in terms of engaging the students.

Leadership and communication in the digital organization. This course had a completely different title in the evaluations, which makes it questionable if the students were able to identify the right course and therefore respond appropriately. Positive comments in general and in particular to the organization of the course.

Facilitation of Collaboration Models. This course had a completely different title in the evaluations, which makes it questionable if the students were able to identify the right course and therefore respond appropriately. Comments were overall positive.

Nation and nationalisms. A lot of comments on specific teachers and their engagement with the course. Some critical comments about the focus of the course.

Global Politics and Human Rights. Comments were both positive and negative, and very much revolved around the teaching style and focus of the course.

Key Concepts in International Migration and Ethnic Relation II. Very few comments to this course, but overall very positive about the content and teaching style.

Migration and Mechanisms of Inclusion and Exclusion. Only one comment to this course regarding the amount of readings, which is difficult to assess on this basis.

Applied Methods – all streams. Apart from positive comments about the teachers, there are some mentioning of overlaps to earlier courses, which seems to confuse students. This has been addressed by restructuring the course in the new curriculum.

The Arctic in the Age of Globalization. Nothing received

Project supervision:

Nothing received