

Rapport fra «Evaluation of SV9104 - Research Ethics, Spring 2022»

Innhentede svar pr. 31. mars 2022 10:40

- Leverte svar: **22**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvar

Course evaluation 2022

Thank you for giving us your honest feedback! We ask for specific, focused, and respectful feedback.

The results from the evaluation are used to improve the course and they will be discussed in the Programme Council for the PhD Programme.

Learning outcome

To what extent...

Svar fordelt på antall

	Very large	Large	Neither large nor small	Small	Very small
..have you gotten knowledge about general ethical problems in research? *	8	12	1	1	0
...have you been more aware of ethical aspects of your own research?	6	8	5	2	1
..was the course well-organised? *	10	10	2	0	0
..was the lectures informative? *	7	11	2	1	1
..was the group exercises useful? *	8	8	3	2	1

Svar fordelt på prosent

	Very large	Large	Neither large nor small	Small	Very small
..have you gotten knowledge about general ethical problems in research? *	36,4 %	54,5 %	4,5 %	4,5 %	0 %
...have you been more aware of ethical aspects of your own research?	27,3 %	36,4 %	22,7 %	9,1 %	4,5 %
..was the course well-organised? *	45,5 %	45,5 %	9,1 %	0 %	0 %
..was the lectures informative? *	31,8 %	50 %	9,1 %	4,5 %	4,5 %
..was the group exercises useful? *	36,4 %	36,4 %	13,6 %	9,1 %	4,5 %

Feel free to elaborate.

- It was very useful to discuss with researchers from other fields than my own. However, it would've been useful with more focus on qualitative methods.
- excellent course
- I think it would be nice with a "abbreviations crash course" first just so everyone understand the difference between NDS, REK, etc. Now it was briefly mentioned by Vidar(?) but I think a more in depth discussion about the role of the different organs would be nice. Like when do you need REK-approval, when is it enough with approval from the internal ethics committee (e.g. at PSI)... I still don't have a clear idea about this.
- Well-organised and interesting course. Well-curated syllabus and honestly impressed by the organisers' ability to facilitate transdisciplinary conversations. Also very insightful presentations by invited externals.
- The first group exercise was a bit confusing and our group did not catch very well what we were supposed to do. Other than that this was great!
- I enjoyed the lectures and especially when the professors made a point about how research ethics also may become a "problem" with respect to e.g. funding; and thereafter how they solved the issue.
- The group exercises helped broadening my perspectives. I think the course was brilliantly composed.
- I expected the other students' texts to be easy to notice in canvas (under gjøremål/kunngjøring), so I did not find them in time to prepare.
- In my opinion the group exercises should be focused on our own work and ethical assessments we need to take within our projects. I would have liked to work broader within the exercises, and not focus on one specific topic. But I would also like to say that the group exercises were well organized! I attended another PhD-course at UiO that was horribly organised, so cudos for that. We always knew what to do and where to meet.

To what extent...

Svar fordelt på antall

	Very large	Large	Neither large nor small	Small	Very small
..was the mandatory preparation useful (uploading two or three questions relevant to your research project in Canvas) and the following discussion in groups? *	6	9	4	2	1

Svar fordelt på prosent

	Very	Large	Neither	Small	Very
--	------	-------	---------	-------	------

	large		large nor small		small
..was the mandatory preparation useful (uploading two or three questions relevant to your research project in Canvas) and the following discussion in groups? *	27,3 %	40,9 %	18,2 %	9,1 %	4,5 %

Feel free to elaborate.

- The preparation was ok. But in regards to the use of canvas; it would be nice to get an email about "welcome to the course. Remember to submit the ethics assessment." I think a lot of people weren't aware of the assignment until the reminder email the day before it was due.
- It was very rewarding to discuss ethical issues from very different traditions and tracks. We had a good exchange of knowledge, perspectives and how we evaluate different ethical dilemmas. However, in the assignment it would be useful if you emphasized more that everyone should have ethical dilemmas or questions in the document they uploaded. Some of the text were just descriptions of the project.
- The exercise was somewhat useful in terms of thinking of my own project. The groups were too large and allocated time too short to venture into discussions on each of the group members' projects.
- Mandatory exercises forces the students to conduct the assignments (as with me), so I became better prepared after having been forced to read and reflect how research ethics applies to my project.
- My lack of competence in Canvas obstructed me from finding the texts from the others, hence I was a little ill-prepared. Never the less, the oral presentations in the group, and the following discussions, was very interesting.
- I liked it! Wish we would have gotten more time to discuss this in groups, this was far more useful than the group examination. As I mentioned earlier, this could have been developed further and replaced the group exercises that focused on one topic.

Examination

To what extent was the examination (group presentation) capable of testing the learning outcomes? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
Very large	2	9,1 %
Large	13	59,1 %
Neither large nor small	5	22,7 %
Small	0	0 %
Very small	2	9,1 %

Please elaborate, or give us advice on the examination form.

- I'm not a group work person and I think most of the time was unproductive and spent getting to know each other and describing our projects to the others. Making the presentation and actually discussing ethics was maybe just 25% of the time. I think smaller groups might be helpful here. For instance max. 4 people per group and then different groups can have the same topic. Might be interesting to see different groups discuss the same topic in different ways. With smaller groups, each participant can also contribute more as the more shy and quiet people get "overkjørt" by the more extroverted "loud" people. While writing I realise the time for presentation might be a bit short if there are more groups, but then maybe split the group in 2...?
- Surprisingly interesting, actually, also to listen to co-student's presentations
- The groups were quite large which made it a bit complicated at times. The way some groups ended with an ethical dilemma to present to the rest was a good way of solving it. Maybe that could be one of the deliverables from the groups. Or that one group could be "the opponent" of another group and actively take the role of bringing the debate back to the larger group. Other than that this session was very good and interesting.
- The groups should have been smaller in order to facilitate for easier cooperation and output of the exercise. The questions could have been more sharply formulated. A suggestion could be to have us reflect in groups on abstracts (such as Heidi Haugen did in her presentation).
- I felt that the choice of examination was suitable, and as this was a group presentation it also forced us to discuss and reflect different topic with respect to different projects, and as such get a more thorough understanding of how one ought to consider the topic.
- I think this was a good and effective way of ensuring active participation, without loading us with extra burdens before and after the course (as opposed to the philosophy of social sciences course). I think you should continue both the course and the examination form exactly this way.
- I did not learn a lot from the examination. It felt like something that just needed to "get done". If it was more related to our work and differences across disciplines it would have felt more relevant.

Curriculum

How did you find the amount and difficulty level of the curriculum?

Svar fordelt på antall

	should be increased considerably	should be increased somewhat	appropriate	should be reduced somewhat	should be reduced considerably
The amount of curriculum *	0	1	17	3	1
The difficulty level of the curriculum *	1	1	19	1	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	should be increased considerably	should be increased somewhat	appropriate	should be reduced somewhat	should be reduced considerably
The amount of curriculum *	0 %	4,5 %	77,3 %	13,6 %	4,5 %
The difficulty level of the curriculum *	4,5 %	4,5 %	86,4 %	4,5 %	0 %

Do you have any comments regarding the curriculum?

- Should be more applied to practical questions facing PhDs
- The academic texts in the curriculum could be referenced more during lectures.

- I think the amount is ok. But the difficulty could be more balanced. I feel like I didn't learn anything. The discussions were ok, but kind of "obvious". Maybe it would be nice to try to write up an ethics application to e.g. REK or learn more about what is needed for ethical approval, when it's necessary, who to apply to for what, etc.
- Some of the readings were useful (i.e. the NESH guidelines), but others (such as Webb Keane's book) was more difficult to understand the usefulness of. Not necessarily the difficulty level of the readings, but rather the focus in the readings.
- Ethical life was "good to think with" and the handbook on the guidelines (norsk) was useful.
- Far too much curriculum, almost none of it was necessary to read to follow the lectures. Afterwards it felt like a waste of time to have spent so much time reading and preparing. Also, none of the members in my group had read any of it. So it did not really help our discussion or presentation work.

How do you rate your own participation in the course from 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent)?

- 8
- 5
- 7
- 8
- 5
- 7
- 7
- 7
- 9
- 9
- 8
- 9
- 7
- 8
- 6
- 7
- 9
- 6
- 8
- 7
- 8
- 6

What could you have done differently?

- I could've participated more in plenary discussions in class. I sometimes found this difficult as I struggled relating to some discussions which seemed quite psychology specific.
- I could've had a more positive attitude.
- I could have been better prepared, e.g. read more.
- Taken more actively part in the discussion, take charge in the group discussion to make more progress and bring more interesting debates up for the group, challenge some of the issues that were raised.
- I could have mingled a bit more, and learned more about the projects of my fellow students.
- I should have made a larger effort to try to find the other group members written presentations.
- Well, my language skills is not up to speed to group discussions.
- A broader focus in the groups exercises so that we don't only focus on one specific topic, but learn more across disciplines etc. The group examination and exercises should focus on our own work and differences across projects, that would be more useful.

Do you have general comments on the course or specific proposals for improvement?

- Very good !
- Keep it as is!
- I really like the course organisers! They are both very motivated and engaging and I think it was very nice that they were from different departments and backgrounds.
- Maybe assemble working groups for the exam presentation based on the questions in the mandatory preparation. Can be there was an idea behind the way it was structured, but it felt a tiny bit demotivating to spend so much time preparing for a presentation that is not of direct relevance to one's one project.
- This was a very good and interesting course. Both professors are excellent communicators and bring their field into the ethical course in interesting ways, draw on their own experiences and challenge what the students brought up.
- I highly value the academic side of the course, it helps me think more critically about my own research. If there's anything I'd recommend, it'd be that we mix up groups. I found these PhD courses a great way to get to know people and socialise, especially after 2 year long of Covid. Thus, giving us the chance to work with different people for different tasks will maximise that opportunity to know other PhD fellows.
- Skilled lecturers, managed to engage the students.
- Tusen takk. It was an eye opening course!
- The lecturers have been great! More variety of examples across disciplines would increase the learning outcomes.
- Great course leaders and interesting discussions. Although most of the class comes from a background in psychology, how ethical considerations apply to other disciplines could have been further explored.
- I was not expecting this course to be interesting, but I really, really liked it. Very interesting discussions and great lectures! Thank you!
- In parallel to forcing students to work through mandatory exercises, I found the topic discussed by Professor Silje Endresen Reme (how she and her group had such large problems with REK, and how they did solve the problem, through establishing their own ethics group), very interesting. And this was also informative/useful as their solution is something we as students may utilize in case we do not get approval of studies through REK.
- See the different comments above. All in all: Great course!
- Maybe make the course non-mandatory or try to include all fields at the faculty and split people up accordingly. I didn't really find any of the content applicable to my own research, and thus mainly perceived the course as a mandatory exercise that cost me two days without getting a lot of use out of it. I think the course was very useful to the people present who work in psychology or anthropology but I couldn't really relate my own work to it.

Thank you for your feedback!