

A. FORBEREDELSE TIL KOLLEGAVEILEDNING

En kopi av dette skjemaet bør gis til din kollega for samtalen før observasjonen.

Lærerens navn: André Frainer

Observatørens navn: Michaela Aschan

Dato: 28.10.2016

Sted: Tromsø

Kurs: Semesteroppgave B-1101

Studentgruppe: Vegar Seljestokken

Antall deltakere: 1

Lengde på observasjon: 1 time

Undervisningsmetode: Supervision and comments on essay writing.

1. Hensikten med økta/hvem er den beregnet på?

The supervision is part of the “semesteroppgave” for first-year students.

2. Resultat som planlegges oppnådd i løpet av denne timen/disse timene

At the end of the supervision the student should have learnt to (i) structure an essay following scientific writing guidelines; (ii) learn to cite scientific literature; and (iii) increase his knowledge on the specific research topic.

3. Studentene/de lærende – gi en kort beskrivelse av hva du vet om dem

The student is on his first year of undergraduate studies. He has no experience in writing scientific essays but seems very eager to work on his assignment.

4. Begrunnelse for valg av undervisningsmetode (Se didaktisk relasjonsmodell.)

Given the short time available for supervision (delivery deadline is soon after the meeting), there will be an one-hour meeting where questions about the work will be addressed. This includes issues related to the scientific background, result interpretation, and writing format. After this first meeting, the student will continue with the writing and versions of his essay will be exchanged via e-mail.

5. Plan for økta med innhold og tidsangivelser

First 15 min: conversation on what the student has achieved so far, where questions from student will be encouraged.

Remaining time will be spent explaining where improvements can be made in the text, including the addition of references when necessary.

6. Muligheter for studentene til å delta og for å komme med tilbakemeldinger

The meeting is planned to be a conversation between the student and the supervisor where the student is encouraged to ask questions and further develop his understanding of the research topic.

7. Vurdering: Hvordan kan jeg som underviser identifisere hva studentene har lært i løpet av denne økta?

By asking questions related to his literature survey and his understanding of the topic, I aim at identifying the main topics that need further clarification.

8. Ønske om spesielt fokus når det gjelder respons?

Student-supervisor conversation

B. EGENVURDERING AV UNDERVISNINGEN

Gi en vurdering av undervisningsøkta i forhold til det som var planlagt, se skjema ”Forberedelser til kollegaveiledning”.

1. Beskrivelse av undervisningsøkta

Supervision consisted of an one-hour meeting to discuss progress achieved with the assigned work, and followed up exchanges and further suggestions via e-mail.

2. Tidsbruk i forhold til plan?

We used one hour for a meeting, and the student sent two drafts of his work as he progressed with the assignment.

3. Hva gikk bra?

The student received feedback on literature survey and questions related to the topic were answered to a level compatible with his education.

4. Hva kan forbedres?

This was my first experience supervising first-year student semester assignments. It was not completely clear to me what was expected from the supervisor and nor from the student in terms of essay requirements and supervision time. I believe that I have a better overview of the tasks now, and could more directly point towards areas of improvement in a next opportunity.

5. Viktige poenger og ønsker for vurderingssamtalen med min kollega

Session structure; Language appropriateness; Scientific content; Enthusiasm

C. VURDERING AV KOLLEGAS UNDERVISNING

1. Oppsummering av det som skjedde i undervisningsøkta. Stikkord for beskrivelsen: hensikt, læringsmål, metoder, ressursbruk, kommunikasjon mellom lærer og studenter.

Semesteroppgaven er ett arbeid, en tekst, som skall demonstrere at studenten kan skrive en vitenskapelig tekst innenfor biologi basert på litteraturstudier eller et praktisk gjennomført eksperiment i laboratoriet. Vider skall oppgaven demonstrere at studenten kan anvende søkeverktøy, tilgjengelige kilder for biologisk informasjon og kildereferering korrekt i henhold til etikk og regler for plagiat. Studenten har fått tilsendt litt litteratur og fått respons på disposisjon 10 dager siden. Nå har han sendt ett utkast til semesteroppgaven som Andre og Vegar diskuterer i veiledningsmøtet.

Strukturen av sessionen var god, men det hadde vært fint om Session structure; Language appropriateness; Scientific content; Enthusiasm

2. Forholdet mellom plan og det som skjedde?

Møtet var godt planlagt og strukturert og forløp i henhold til planen. Det var en forholdsvis let veiledningsoppgave da studenten allerede hadde levert ett nesten ferdig produkt av høy standard. Vegard brenner før faget og stiller mange spørsmål og initierer diskusjon.

3. Hva gikk bra?

André hadde en god dialog med studenten. Atmosfæren var avslappende og veileder holdt seg lit tilbake med resultatet at studenten tok en aktiv rolle og stilte mange konkrete spørsmål om litteratur, struktur på teksten og vokabular. André hadde en rolig utstråling og et angenemt kroppsspråk og holdt øyekontakt med studenten. Dette er en «A» student som er meget intressert i faget og som leverer langt utover det so forventes på første semestret i bachelor for biologi nemlig ett 10 siders essay som oppsummerer klimaendringene i Barentshavets økosystem på engelsk. At teksten var på engelsk og at Vegar snakker flytende engelsk gjorde det også naturlig og ønskelig å bruke engelsk under veiledningen. André bør være forberedt til å ta noe veiledning på norsk på bachelor nivået og det skall gå bra da André nå snakker norsk nesten flytende.

4. Hva kan forbedres?

Jeg anbefaler at en alltid har en utskrift av spesifikasjonene som er gitt i forelesningen om semesteroppgaven (omfang, innhold, struktur, referanse, font, marger m.m.) og på Fronter. Det gjør det lett å løse konkrete problemstillinger og detaljer i møtet. Veiledningsmøtet kunde ha vært litt strammere I tidsbruken og kanskje vært ferdig på 45minutter. Samtidig er det både givende og morsomt å tilbringe tid med en så dyktig student. Hvis en har mange semesteroppgaver å veilede kan det være tidsbesparende og effektivt å innkalle alle studentene som velger å skrive om et tema knyttet til «Marine ressurser» i en felles veiledningstime. En slik tilnærming ville også stimulere elevene til å diskutere sine tekster seg imellom og øke gjensidig læring.

Skjema for å lette arbeidet: **COLLEAGUE EVALUATION FORM**

A. FORBEREDELSE TIL KOLLEGAVEILEDNING

En kopi av dette skjemaet bør gis til din kollega for samtalen før observasjonen.

Lærerens navn: Melania Borit

Observatørens navn: Michaela Aschan

Dato: 11.11.2009

Sted: NFH, BFE, UIT

Kurs: FSK-3006 (topic: Qualitative data analysis)

Studentgruppe: IFM 2008

Antall deltakere: 8

Lengde på observasjon: 2 hours (45 minutes teaching, 15 minutes break)

Undervisningsmetode: lecture

1. Hensikten med økta/hvem er den beregnet på?

Objectives to be achieved by students in the present lecture:

- understand the interaction between quantitative and qualitative data in research
- understand the steps of qualitative analysis
- understand the within-case / cross-cases terminology
- understand the importance of data display
- be aware of different qualitative methods

2. Resultat som planlegges oppnådd i løpet av denne timen/disse timene

Students should be aware of the specific methods of analysing qualitative data. Also students should understand the importance of the display in the data analysis.

3. Studentene/de lærende – gi en kort beskrivelse av hva du vet om dem

The participating students are second year master students in International Fisheries Management. They come from different countries (e.g. Russia, Norway, South Africa, Namibia, Bangladesh etc.) and their educational background is very diverse (e.g. economics, coastal planning and management, environmental studies etc.). However, there isn't a big difference in age among them. I do not know the breadth of their qualitative data analysis knowledge. However, based on their performances in FSK-3006 until now and on my previous experiences with this student group in general, I assume is similar and not too advanced.

4. Begrunnelse for valg av undervisningsmetode (Se didaktisk relasjonsmodell.)

The lecture teaching type was chosen because it fits best the above mentioned objectives of the teaching session. The participants, Objectives, Framefactors, Content, Working method and Evaluation were assessed based on the didactic relations model developed by Bjørndal and Lieberg (1978).

5. Plan for økta med innhold og tidsangivelser

A PPT presentation covering 3 main qualitative methods was prepared. However, LFA and SWOT slides will be presented only the time will allow it. The PPT in itself has many slides, but lots of them are just examples of displays, therefore, I think I will have the time to finish the presentation in due duration. According to the time I have, I might skip some of the slides, as I want also to present a very practical example of using the information given by this lecture: my own master thesis preparation.

I will not provide the students with a print-out of the presentation and I will not upload it on Fronter either, as they have to read the book if they want to make use of the information I'll give during the lecture.

6. Muligheter for studentene til å delta og for å komme med tilbakemeldinger

The lecture method involves the control of teacher in a high degree. However, students will be encouraged to give their own examples and interpretations based on their former knowledge etc. The teacher is meant to be a facilitator in the students' understanding of qualitative data analysis.

7. Vurdering: Hvordan kan jeg som underviser identifisere hva studentene har lært i løpet av denne økta?

The summarising phase will give me insight of their understanding together with the examples they will provide during the lecture.

8. Ønske om spesielt fokus når det gjelder respons?

I'll especially focus on them providing examples.

B. EGENVURDERING AV UNDERVISNINGEN

Gi en vurdering av undervisningsøkta i forhold til det som var planlagt, se skjema ”Forberedelser til kollegaveiledning”.

Lærerens navn: Melania Borit

Observatørens navn: Michaela Aschan

Dato: 11.11.2009

Sted: NFH, BFE, UIT

Kurs: FSK-3006 (topic: Qualitative data analysis)

Studentgruppe: IFM 2008

Antall deltakere:

Lengde på observasjon: 2 hours (45 minutes teaching, 15 minutes break)

Undervisningsmetode: lecture

1. Beskrivelse av undervisningsøkta

The objective of the lecture was to make the students understand the interaction between quantitative and qualitative data in research, the steps of qualitative analysis, the within-case / cross-cases terminology, the importance of data display and different qualitative methods. This area of knowledge was nicely covered within two hours, and references for further studies were given by Melania.

The lectures went very well with good interaction between students and lecturer.

2. Tidsbruk i forhold til plan?

The lecture went by far as planned. The ambitious number of 42 slides made Melania cut some of the slides while lecturing. That was a good choice as there was time for discussions. In the end some 10-15 minutes were left and this time could have been used for some practical exercise e.g. demonstrating the use of an matrix, putting up a conceptual model or demonstrating the use of the SWOT analysis. Some of the slides could have been explained more in detail (e.g. slide 7 and 9) as there was time and it would have increased the understanding of the audience.

3. Hva gikk bra?

Melania lectured in a structured and informative way, leaving time for questions and discussions. The interactive part worked very well. The use of Melanias own master thesis to demonstrate the use of qualitative methods in practice was pedagogically effective. She managed to give a good

overview of a complex and waste subject within the two lectures (45min) provided.

4. Hva kan forbedres?

Many slides were copies from the book recommended for further studies, which was good as such, but the font size was much too small and thereby not readable (e.g. slides 11,15, 20, 21, 27). All slides not readable should be deleted from the presentation. If the magnification is not possible, copies of the most important tables and graphs may be distributed. Even if the lecturer tells that the details (e.g. sentences in a table) are not important, it is very frustrating not to see the text. There was some time extra and I think as mentioned before that the best use of these 10 minutes would have been a small exercise (see above for details).

5. Viktige poenger og ønsker for vurderingssamtalen med min kollega

Melania has a very nice attitude towards the students. She is friendly, accurate and informative, but does not allow expansive private discussions during lectures and keeps the students on the track. Melania dwells into the details when needed, and is patient in repeating things students have not understood. The atmosphere in the class is good and relaxed.

C. VURDERING AV KOLLEGAS UNDERVISNING

Oppsummering av det som skjedde i undervisningsøkta. Stikkord for beskrivelsen: hensikt, læringsmål, metoder, ressursbruk, kommunikasjon mellom lærer og studenter.

Lærerens navn: Melania Borit

Observatørens navn: Michaela Aschan

Dato: 11.11.2009

Sted: NFH, BFE, UIT

Kurs: FSK-3006 (topic: Qualitative data analysis)

Studentgruppe: IFM 2008

Antall deltakere:

Lengde på observasjon: 2 hours (45 minutes teaching, 15 minutes break)

Undervisningsmetode: lecture

1. Forholdet mellom plan og det som skjedde?

2. Hva gikk bra?

3. Hva kan forbedres?

A. FORBEREDELSE TIL KOLLEGAVEILEDNING

En kopi av dette skjemaet bør gis til din kollega for samtalen før observasjonen.

Lærerens navn: Melania Borit

Observatørens navn: Michaela Aschan

Dato: 03.11.2009

Sted: NFH, BFE, UIT

Kurs: FSK-3006 (topic: Logistic regression)

Studentgruppe: IFM 2008

Antall deltakere: 7

Lengde på observasjon: 3 hours (45 minutes teaching, 15 minutes break)

Undervisningsmetode: PC-lab

1. Hensikten med økta/hvem er den beregnet på?

Objectives to be achieved by students in the present PC-lab:

- understand the basics of logistic regression and difference from linear regression;
- make a clear statement about the results of a test;
- improve ability to make illustrative charts;
- develop skills to use a statistical package (SYSTAT11 and/or 12).

2. Resultat som planlegges oppnådd i løpet av denne timen/disse timene

Each student has to solve the given exercises using Excel and Systat. I'll make sure that the performances are individual in order to ensure the accomplishment of the proposed objectives.

3. Studentene/de lærende – gi en kort beskrivelse av hva du vet om dem

The participating students are second year master students in International Fisheries Management. They come from different countries (e.g. Russia, Norway, South Africa, Namibia, Bangladesh etc.) and their educational background is very diverse (e.g. economics, coastal planning and management, environmental studies etc.). However, there isn't a big difference in age among them and their Excel and Systat skills are fairly similar. Nevertheless, there are a couple of students more advanced than others and a couple of them behind the group average. Also, their knowledge of statistical notions is very much alike.

4. Begrunnelse for valg av undervisningsmetode (Se didaktisk relasjonsmodell.)

The PC-lab teaching type was chosen because it fits best the above mentioned objectives of the teaching session. The participants, Objectives, Framefactors, Content, Working method and Evaluation were assessed based on the didactic relations model developed by Bjørndal and Lieberg (1978).

5. Plan for økta med innhold og tidsangivelser

Three exercises dealing with logistic regression were prepared. The exercises increase in difficulty from the first one to the third one. EXCEL AND Systat are necessary to solve the exercises. According to the on spot evaluation of the situation, it will be decided if the time and the class allow covering all the content of the three exercises. If the class is very slow, parts of the second exercise will be skipped. If the class is very rapid, an in depth interpretation of the exercises' results will be made.

6. Muligheter for studentene til å delta og for å komme med tilbakemeldinger

The PC-lab teaching method involves the control of teacher in a high degree. However, students will be encouraged to give their own examples, to discover their way through the used software, to interpret results based on their former knowledge etc. The teacher is meant to be a facilitator in the students' learning of logistic regression.

7. Vurdering: Hvordan kan jeg som underviser identifisere hva studentene har lært i løpet av denne økta?

The last part of the third exercise will indicate what students have learned, as it is intended to be almost entirely solved and interpreted with their input. Also, the summarising phase will give me insight of their understanding.

8. Ønske om spesielt fokus når det gjelder respons?

I'll especially focus on their wording of the answers (scientific language should be used) and on their interpretation of the results (they should follow a clear and logic track).

B. EGENVURDERING AV UNDERVISNINGEN

Gi en vurdering av undervisningsøkta i forhold til det som var planlagt, se skjema ”Forberedelser til kollegaveiledning”.

1. Beskrivelse av undervisningsøkta

Due to technical problems with Systat 12 and to the fact that the class was a little bit slow in managing the software, the second exercise was not solved, but only theoretically explained. Otherwise, the PC-lab activity was conducted as planned.

2. Tidsbruk i forhold til plan?

The three hours of teaching were used according to the plan.

3. Hva gikk bra?

- The students' group response and engagement.

4. Hva kan forbedres?

- My own theoretical knowledge in statistics.
- Improvement of examples, in order to cover more disciplines.

5. Viktige poenger og ønsker for vurderingssamtalen med min kollega

- How is perceived my attitude towards students?
- How was the atmosphere in the class?
- Were explanations proper?

C. VURDERING AV KOLLEGAS UNDERVISNING

Oppsummering av det som skjedde i undervisningsøkta. Stikkord for beskrivelsen: hensikt, læringsmål, metoder, ressursbruk, kommunikasjon mellom lærer og studenter.

2. Forholdet mellom plan og det som skjedde?

The lecture was by far conducted in accordance with the plan. However, Melania met problems as she found out that Systat12 was out of order and the students had to re-log in to Systat11. The programme was re installed during the lunch brake but turned out to have a bug. These problems with the software Melania handled very well. She seemed very confident as she easily switched to other solutions by using Systat 11. Due to these problems she had to explain how the second exercise was supposed to be conducted.

3. Hva gikk bra?

Despite the technical problems Melania managed to get through three exercises as planned. All students followed and were able to conduct the analysis in Systat11.

Melania had good contact with the students and managed to keep them focused and active by asking them to interpret the results of the analysis. The interpretation of results was done several times and I believe that the students really understood how to read the output of the analysis.

Melania was clear and helpful in supervising the students when expressing themselves in a scientific language.

There was a good atmosphere in class and Melania gave the impression of being confident and competent and thereby had the necessary respect in the group of students. This is especially admirable as the students were her co-students just a year ago.

4. Hva kan forbedres?

A theoretical introduction to logistic regression and a description of how it differs from the linear regression as background for the students should be presented in the beginning of the lecture to ensure that all students understand what they are about to do. This could easily be done on the blackboard or some material could be provided in advance.

Before starting with the logistic regression the students should get the opportunity to know and understand the data set. Some of the students seemed a little uncertain about what they were analysing.

The note of caution in using logistic regression could have been stressed more.

Technical advice: Always insist on students sitting close to you. Try to speak a little louder. Agree about brakes between lectures and adjust the timing so that you do not have to brake in the middle of an exercise (as you did).