

AoL-report - MMA

- **Measuring point:** Bachelor project June 2020
- **Number of students to be measured:** 52
- **Number of measures:** 30

Learning goals	Above expected level		Expected level		Below expected level		Improvements decided by the study board
	<i>Target:</i>		80 %		5 %		
	%	N	%	N	%	N	
A. The problem statement contains a clearly defined research question	40%	12	53%	16	7%	2	Recommendation from AoL committee: None (but see comments below) Improvements decided by the study board None
Group	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	
Individually	38%	11	55%	16	7%	2	
B. The student demonstrates an understanding of relevant socio-anthropological, market and/or managerial theory pertaining to the research problem	53%	16	33%	10	13%	4	Recommendation from AoL committee: We believe this discrepancy between expected levels and measured outcome to be a consequence of differing interpretations of the scale ("above", "below", etc.). See comments below. Hence, we see no action necessary. Improvements decided by the study board None
Group	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	
Individually	52%	15	34%	10	14%	4	
C. The student is capable of designing and executing an empirical fieldwork using ethnographic and other relevant methods	43%	13	57%	17	0%	0	Recommendation from AoL committee: None Improvements decided by the study board None
Group	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	

Individually	45%	13	55%	16	0%	0	
D. The student can analyze the empirical data using the theoretical and conceptual tools at her/his disposal and can the student also contextualize the findings in relation to larger socio-historical contexts	40%	12	50%	15	10%	3	Recommendation from AoL committee: None – again we will refer to the comments below
Group	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	Improvements decided by the study board None
Individually	38%	11	52%	15	10%	3	
E. The student can give a clear and well-structured presentation of the project	60%	18	40%	12	0%	0	Recommendation from AoL committee: None
Group	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	Improvements decided by the study board None
Individually	59%	17	41%	12	0%	0	
F. The student is capable of engaging in a qualified, clear and comprehensive dialogue about the project, discussing its implications, strengths and weaknesses	57%	17	40%	12	3%	1	Recommendation from AoL committee: None
Group	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	Improvements decided by the study board None
Individually	55%	16	41%	12	3%	1	

COMMENTS to the AoL report

We would like to point out a discrepancy between the scale used in this AoL context and the general 7 point grading scale that influences the way in which the results can and should be interpreted. When, for example, 13 % of the students perform "below expectations" in the learning goal "*an understanding of relevant socio-anthropological, market and/or managerial theory pertaining to the research problem*", we believe this is due to the fact, that the supervisors reporting have judged this part of the bachelor thesis as being below the grade 7 (while other parts may or may not have been better), since "7" expresses the performance the supervisor will expect from an average student. The goal of maximum 5 % "below expectations" is in my view unattainable based on this interpretation (all grades of 4 and below combined) – if almost everyone gets "7" or above, we have set the expected level too low.

We believe this interpretation to be supported by the fact that the "above expected level" percentage is consistently considerably higher than the 15 % target level, reflecting the number of student performances on the various parameters estimated at the grades "10" or "12".

We are of course not targeting an average performance from the students – the grading scale is absolute, so the bias towards the high end can be explained through both the general quality of the student intake on MMA (with so far ever increasing average grades for quota 1 intake) and the extra efforts provided by students and supervisors in terms of the 5th semester field work and the ensuing bachelor project compared to the ordinary examinations. Very few students fail the bachelor projects, and – if I remember correctly – all of the projects handed in during this summer examination received a passing grade. In that sense, they were all above the expected level. The reported figures must be interpreted with this in mind.

As a conclusion, we would like to encourage a specification of the "qualifiers" of the target levels or a revision of the target levels, since they otherwise seem to be (or at least are interpreted as) at odds with the general understanding of the 7 point grading scale. For the sake of ease and consistency, we think the AoL should be able to communicate or correspond well with the existing grading scale. If "below expected level" means "failing" and above expected level means "12", specify it. Then you will presumably get figures closer to the specified target levels.

Odense 23.11. 2020

Søren Askegaard & Dorthe Brogård Kristensen

Studienævnets bemærkninger (møde 8. december 2020)

MMA

I AoL-rapporten for MMA er kategorierne anderledes formuleret.

Studienævnet vurderer at læringsmålene er opfyldt i en tilfredsstillende grad. Der anbefales derfor ingen ændringer eller handlingsplaner.

Studienævnet bemærker dog at måleenheden og målværdierne kan forbedres.