NHH



Evaluation of master's courses, autumn 2019

A summary of the main findings

Endre Bjørndal, leader of the MØA programme Kjell Ove Røsok, leader of the MRR programme

All master courses are evaluated by the students every time they are taught. This gives us valuable feedback and helps the lecturers develop the quality of their courses further. As programme leaders, we are responsible for maintaining and developing the quality of education at the master's level at NHH, and the results from the course evaluation are important inputs in this work.

This report provides a summary of the findings from the evaluations carried out during the autumn semester of 2019. The evaluations are routinely followed up each semester by the programme leaders, together with the heads of the six academic departments, and action is taken when needed.

On the response rate

In the autumn semester of 2019, NHH offered 77 courses in MØA and MRR. On average, the students' response rate in the course evaluation was 22 %, almost the same as in the previous semester (S19: 20 %). For individual courses the response rates vary from 0 % to 76 %, with 43 courses having less than 20 % response rate (due to the low response rate, these 43 courses are not included in Figures 8-10 that show results at the course level). There is definitely room for improvement with respect to response rates. We encourage all students to participate in the evaluations, and lecturers should encourage their students to participate. Some lecturers allocate time for the course evaluation during the final lecture; a procedure that has a positive effect on the response rate.

On the number of courses and course size

Figure 1 shows that the number of master courses have decreased in the last three semesters. This reverses the continuous increase in the number of courses up to the spring semester of 2018. Figure 2 shows that the average size of courses has been fairly stable the last years. On average, autumn courses are somewhat larger than spring courses. However, behind these averages, there is considerable variation, with courses in the autumn semester of 2019 ranging from very few students to one course with almost 400 students, as seen from Figure 4. Figure 3 shows that the share of very small courses (less than 30 students) has declined continuously over the last 3 semesters, while the share of large courses (more than 100 students) has been stable or increasing. Figure 5 shows that there is considerable variation in average course size between individual MØA profiles and the MRR programme¹.



¹ For each profile, and for MRR, the figure shows the number of mandatory and elective courses, including courses shared between profiles, or between MØA and MRR.

On course satisfaction – MØA profiles and MRR programme

From the course evaluations, we focus on three variables – overall course satisfaction, relevance, and lecturer. Figure 6 gives the results for each MØA profile (major) and MRR for the autumn semester of 2019, while Figure 7 presents the development over time for MØA as a whole, for each MØA profile, and for MRR. Here are some key observations:

- For MØA as a whole, the average scores on all three variables are 4.0 or above -i.e., the students are satisfied or very satisfied.
- The score on relevance is above 4.0 for all MØA profiles.
- The lecturer score is at 4.0 or more for 8 out of 10 MØA profiles.
- The overall score is at 4.0 or more for 4 out of 10 MØA profiles.
- MRR scores above 4,0 for relevance and for lecturer, while the overall satisfaction score is just below 4,0.
- The evaluation scores for MØA as a whole have declined relative to the peak in the spring semester of 2019. Also MRR experienced a decline last semester. The decline happens across all profiles and MRR, as can be seen from Figure 7. School-wide issues like the ongoing building project and the controversies related to use of videos may explain some of the general decline.





Fig. 7 Course satisfaction over time

On course satisfaction – individual level

Figures 8 - 10 show the scores for the 34 individual courses with a response rate of at least 20 %. The figures reveal significant variation between courses ranging from 5.0 to, in one case, below 3.0. However, the majority of courses have satisfactory results on all three dimensions.

- 20 of 34 courses score between 4.0 and 5.0 on overall course satisfaction.
- 32 of 34 courses score between 4.0 and 5.0 on relevance.
- 27 of 34 courses score between 4.0 and 5.0 on lecturer.



Conclusions

- In general, students find the master courses to be relevant and useful. This is true for all profiles in MØA, for MRR, and for 94 % all of the individual courses with response rates of at least 20 %.
- For the evaluation of the lecturers, 8 out of 10 MØA profiles, as well as MRR, have a score of 4.0 or above, and the same is true for 79 % of individual courses with response rates of at least 20 %.
- Overall course satisfaction is rated at 4.0 or above for 4 out of 10 MØA profiles, as well as for 59 % of individual courses with response rates of at least 20 %.
- The MRR scores are similar to the total MØA scores. MRR continues to score high on relevance.
- There is a general decline in in evaluation scores along all dimensions for both MRR and MØA, from the previous semester (S19). School-wide issues like the ongoing building project and the controversies related to use of videos may explain some of the general decline.
- For courses with low scores on one or several of the variables, the evaluation is followed up in order to ensure that the quality improves. As programme leaders, and together with the academic coordinators for the various MØA profiles, we discuss such results with responsible leaders at the academic departments, to make sure that necessary changes are made.
- The average response rate is still very low, and for a large number of master's courses we do not have sufficient data to draw conclusions about their quality. We therefore urge all students to take part in the course evaluation in order to provide valuable feedback to the lecturers and responsible leaders.