



Summary course evaluation report

Basic Information

Degree programme(s):	<u>MSc in Social Data Science</u>
Head of Studies:	Kristoffer Langkjær Albris
Period:	Academic year 2024-25

Response rates

Autumn	
Response rate, Autumn Semester courses	63%
Response rate, Autumn semester Master's Thesis	28%
Response rate, Autumn semester Academic Internship	39% ¹
Response rate, last year, Autumn Semester	Courses 66% Master's Thesis 55% Academic Internship 29%
Spring	
Response rate, Spring Semester courses	42%
Response rate, Spring semester Master's Thesis	48%
Response rate, Spring semester Academic Internship	N/A
Response rate, last year, Spring Semester	Courses 31% Master's Thesis 34% Academic Internship N/A

¹ Academic Internship 15 ECTS and 30 ECTS.

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.	0	0
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.	8 ²	5 ³
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?
All courses and other ECTS-awarding study activities in the academic year 2024-25 have been evaluated.
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 have the Study Board done to ensure the quality of the study activity?
Academic internship 15 and 30 ECTS for the spring 2025 semester have not been evaluated due to too few responses. This also applies to the co-curricular assignment for spring 2025, where 5 students have been invited to evaluate the course, but none of them did. We are discussing

² Evaluation of 4 courses, Master's Thesis, Academic Internship 15 ECTS, Academic Internship 30 ECTS, Co-curricular written assignment.

³ Evaluation of 4 courses and Master's Thesis,

principles for supervising internships and co-curricular assignments at the upcoming teacher meeting.
Does Head of Studies encourage lecturers to evaluate during teaching hours?
Yes, we have been very explicit about this in the most recent semesters, in order to increase the response rates from previous semesters.
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?
We continuously talk about that teachers and course coordinators should demonstrate how the course has been improved from year to year.
SAMF's target response rate is 50 % ⁴ . 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:
As stated, we have made an effort for teachers to set aside time during classes for evaluations. The Head of Studies has also been more explicit about talking about the importance of evaluations and information meetings with students, and during the introduction week.
Briefly comment on the trends and fluctuations in response rates:
Response rates are typically a bit lower in the spring semester compared to the fall semester. This year, the spring semester response rates for course have gone up from 31% in the previous year, to 42% in this year, which marks a noticeable difference.
Reflect on the distribution of teaching evaluations in the categories A, B and C:
All courses in both semesters that have been evaluated with a category, have received a category B. This reflects that all courses on the programme function relatively well. At the same time, there have been points of reflexion for all courses, where the evaluations have highlighted elements of the courses that can be improved. As part of conversations in the study board, these points will be addressed by the Head of Studies and the course coordinators on the programme in the coming academic year.
What positive experiences have been gained in the A category? Are there any of these experiences which can serve as inspiration for other courses?
Not applicable
Briefly comment on what characterize the evaluations of the B-rated courses. What works well in these courses, and what can be improved?
All courses in this category have a solid foundation though have also seen some turnover in the teacher team. With more stability in these teams, we are confident that they can be strengthened even more.

⁴ The target response rate applies to courses, bachelor's projects, master's theses, academic internship, and master's projects.

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
What competence development initiatives have been or will be implemented?
We are currently in the process of investigating how better to integrate AI and LLMs into teaching, which will be an ongoing effort. This is not necessarily directly related to the course evaluations. Changes to courses – especially exam formats – will be developed and implemented in the coming academic year, to be part of the study curriculum for the cohort starting in 2026.
Head of Studies is responsible for informing Head(s) of Department(s)/Center Director ⁵ 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 course ⁶ ?
The Head of Studies will inform the Director of SODAS, which is currently Ingo Zettler. In the fall of 2025, the HoS will meet with the Director to report on the evaluations.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.