



Seminar Assessment Report

Department of Political and Social Sciences

2024 - 2025 3RD TERM

SPS-WS-IMM-CO-24

Title:	Computational Text Analysis
Instructor(s):	Prof. Simon HIX & Prof. Ellen IMMERGUT
Other Instructor(s):	Mirko Wegemann (University of Münster), Eva Krejcova (MWF & IDHEAP - University of Lausanne). Teaching Assistant: Sara Dybeland (SPS)
Teaching Assistant(s):	
Supervising Prof(s):	N/A
	N/A

Participants:	12	Responses returned:	6	Return rate:	50%
----------------------	----	----------------------------	---	---------------------	-----

Q1. In overall terms I am satisfied with the seminar/course.

5. Very much	50%	3
4. Considerably	33%	2
3. Average	0%	0
2. Not very much	0%	0
1. Not at all	0%	0
No answer	17%	1
Total		6

Q2. The seminar was well organised and well prepared.

5. Very much	83%	5
4. Considerably	17%	1
3. Average	0%	0
2. Not very much	0%	0
1. Not at all	0%	0
No answer	0%	0
Total		6

Q3. The Instructor(s) were clear in their presentations and explanations.

5. Very much	100%	6
4. Considerably	0%	0
3. Average	0%	0
2. Not very much	0%	0
1. Not at all	0%	0
No answer	0%	0
Total		6

Q4. The instructor(s) teach with interest and enthusiasm

5. Very much	100%	6
4. Considerably	0%	0
3. Average	0%	0
2. Not very much	0%	0
1. Not at all	0%	0
No answer	0%	0
Total		6

Q5. Where appropriate, the Instructor(s) encourage class participation.

5. Very much	100%	6
4. Considerably	0%	0
3. Average	0%	0
2. Not very much	0%	0
1. Not at all	0%	0
No answer	0%	0
Total		6

Q6. Did this course overlap with any other courses (if not, leave blank)?

No data found - your filters may be too exclusive!

Q7. In your opinion, what topics and readings should have been reduced or omitted?

None

Q8. In your opinion, what topics and readings should have been included to this course?

I would like to know more about how to use hugging face to use available models, but I understand the time of limited to get into more details.

Q9. If lab session were included, how far did they improve the course (if not applicable, leave blank)

Extremely well. Though the lectures also included helpful practical introductions in R, I found it very helpful to practice on my own in a very step-by-step way in the lab.

Lab sessions and Sara were very helpful.

Very complementary; space to apply theory and insights from the substantive content to real research applications.

10. Do you have any suggestions how the teaching format and learning results for this course could be improved?

1. Maybe small take-home assignments (that would take max. 30 minutes)

Q11. Please provide your open comments and feedback in relation to individual instructors teaching the course, namely:

Prof. Simon HIX & Prof. Mirko Wegemann (University of Münster), Eva Krejcova (MWF & IDHEAP - Ellen IMMERGUT University of Lausanne). Teaching Assistant: Sara Dybeland (SPS)

Mirko was incredibly knowledgeable and competent! I was impressed with his ability to teach these complex methods in a very accessible way. He also allowed many opportunities for us to ask questions and be more involved in the course. His willingness to dedicate extra time to problem solving and individual concerns was very appreciated. The teaching was phenomenal.

Sara was outstanding as a TA and very open to our questions and input. I appreciated the work she put into preparing helpful lab exercises which broke the methods down step-by-step. I also felt that she had a strong methodological competence and desire to show us real-world applications of these research designs.

Eva was very organized and knowledgeable. It's only a pity we had just one course day with her, as I would have liked to learn more from her!

I was looking forward to this course, but I felt sick during the start of the week and could not attend most of the sessions.

Instructors were well-prepared and organized.

Mirko and Eva were both fantastic. Each was extremely well prepared, communicated extensively during and before the workshop, and above all were patient and enthusiastic about class participations.

Q12. Please provide your open comments and feedback about the course support provided by

No data found - your filters may be too exclusive!

No data found - your filters may be too exclusive!

Q 13. Please share your considerations regarding the following aspects: The course provided an inclusive and respectful environment where researchers of all backgrounds (gender, ethnicity, nationality, religion, political leanings etc) could meaningfully contribute to discussions. The bibliographical sources included the work of underrepresented voices in the academia. Course instructors encouraged the use of inclusive language.

Yes, although it is important to note that this course was largely practical, so the consideration of minority voices in the assigned readings was not a central or relevant aspect of the teaching / learning. Where relevant, inclusion was considered and promoted by the instructors themselves.

I appreciate that the instructor in the initial session made particular attention to raise the issue of inclusive language and respectful environment.

I agree with the first topic. I did not evaluate the bibliography according to the second topic. I can only say the readings are updated and relevant. In general, instructors were inclusive and respectful and encouraged participation.

Each of the three aspects was properly taken care of.

Both Mirko and Eve were considerate of all these aspects.

Q14. Do you have any further comments about this course?

Q14. Do you have any further comments about this course?

Very happy with it!