

Emneevaluering / course evaluation ISV

Besvarelse: 27612837

Navn / name

Tore Wig

Emnekode / course code

STV4232

Semester

V23

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

I evalueringen av kurset ble det identifisert flere sterke sider og potensielle områder for forbedring, basert på studenttilbakemeldingene.

Studentene vurderte generelt forelesningene som utmerkede, og verdsatte det høye informasjonsinnholdet i PowerPoint-presentasjonene.

På den annen side uttrykte studentene at noen av forelesningene kunne være litt vanskelige å følge, med en tendens til å være litt ustrukturert. Dette gjaldt særlig forelesningene om institusjoner og krig.

En gjennomgående kommentar var at forelesningene generelt kanskje la for mye vekt på artiklene i pensum, og studentene ville gjerne ha mer nytt innhold. Studentene følte også at det var et overskudd av pensumstoff, og foreslo å flytte noe av dette til "anbefalt lesing". Det var også noen bekymringer for det sterke kvantitative fokuset i kurset, med et ønske om en mer balansert tilnærming med mer kvalitative studier, selv om studentene satte stor pris på fokuset på historiske

caser og kvalitative studier i forelesningene.

Hjemmeoppgaven ble ansett som vellykket, men forslagene inkluderte innføring av en muntlig komponent og mer kontinuerlig arbeid og revisjon. I tillegg ble det uttrykt et ønske om mer "seminar" støtte for å hjelpe studentene med skriveprosessen, samt en "workshop" for hjemmeoppgavene. Dette kan vanskelig gjennomføres i tråd med de nye retningslinjene for ChatGPT etc.

Eksamen ble vurdert som vellykket, med studenter som uttrykte at den reflekterte pensum godt, og ikke bare fokuserte på svært spesifikke spørsmål. Tilbakemeldingene på eksamen ble også sett på som gode.

Diskusjonselen i forelesningene ble generelt sett på som positivt, selv om noen studenter ønsket mer av dette. Det ble også notert at det var en god balanse mellom spontane aktiviteter og diskusjoner.

Et annet forslag var å gjøre studentpresentasjoner obligatoriske, men å tillate at studentene selv kan velge hva de ønsker å presentere.

Basert på denne tilbakemeldingen, er det klart at kurset er sterkt på mange områder, men det er også noen områder for forbedring. Denne tilbakemeldingen vil være nyttig for å videreutvikle og forbedre kurset i fremtiden.

Besvarelse: 27659279

Navn / name

Politisk filosofi

Emnekode / course code

STV2110

Semester

Vår 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Pensum er lange utdrag av Aristoteles, Politikk, Hobbes, Leviathan, Locke, Second Treatise, Rousseau, Samfunnspakten, Kant, Grunnlegging av moralens matfysikk og Nietzsche, Moralens genealogi. Teksten ble gjennomgått. Detaljert forelesningsnotat var tilgjengelige (på Canvas) flere dager før hver forelesning. Lyddopptak med tilhørende tekst ble lagt ut umiddelbart etter forelesningen. Studentenes aktivitet under forelesningene tydet på at mange hadde forberedt seg godt. Seminarene var en selvstendig del av emnet. Studentene leverte en tekst over selvvalgt tema. Emnekontakten melder om stor tilfredshet med seminarundervisningen.

Pensum vil bli noe endret neste gang emnet gis. Emnekontakten og andre studenter har etterlyst bidrag fra henholdsvis kvinnelige filosofer og filosofer fra ikke-vestlige land. Dette vil den emneansvarlige følge opp. Det kan også være aktuelt å endre opplegget for seminarene på ett punkt. Hittil har studentene stått helt fritt ved valg av filosofisk tema for innleveringen. Neste gang vil det muligens være et krav at temaet har tilknytning til emnets pensum, slik at arbeidet i seminarene i (enda) større grad bidrar til forståelsen av pensumlitteraturen.

Besvarelse: 27292459

Navn / name

Jens Jungblut

Emnekode / course code

STV2420

Semester

Vår 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Overall, the course worked well. Students seem to be very happy with the lectures and especially with the use of cases / examples from "the real world" in teaching. Given that this is a theory course, it is not surprising that students initially thought the topic is a bit more distant for them, but based on the feedback from the students it seems the lectures managed to bring the topic closer to the students. Also the pensum worked well and students seem to be happy with the way the pensum was picked up in the lectures.

The seminars created some more problems. Already during the midterm evaluation there were some comments from students regarding the way feedback was given by one of the seminar leaders. This has been discussed with the seminar leader but some of the issue seem to have remained problematic. Overall, student feedback suggests that it would be good to give seminar leaders clearer guidelines on how to deliver the seminars and also on how to give feedback to students as well as establish early-on what is expected from students in the seminars. The timing of the first obligatory activity (essay 1) should also be reconsidered and moved a bit later in the semester. Finally, one issue during the course was that students did not get access to the 7th floor where the lectures took place.

Besvarelse: 27394167

Navn / name

Philipp Broniecki

Emnekode / course code

STV2500

Semester

Spring 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

The course went very well overall. The structure provided a basic toolkit for analyzing legislative decision-making early which was applied to specific examples and extended throughout. The amount of readings worked and because of the quizzes the textbook was read and because of the relevance for the essays, the assigned articles were read. The seminars went well also but we felt that we would need more of them. It would be better to have one dedicated seminar on writing early in the course and then at least one seminar per essay (five weeks with seminars minimum and at least two groups per week, i.e., min. 10 seminars). Attendance fluctuated and it seemed to be lower when we did not cover content that was needed for one of the essays.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

The overall feedback for this course was very good. The student contact gave positive feedback for the following points.

The structure of the course made sense. The quizzes and essays related well to the content of the course and encouraged learning. The readings – a textbook and two articles – gave a general overview over the topic as well as good depth on specific aspects. In addition, the relation to current events was good, specifically the 45 minutes lecture of the Swedish ambassador to Norway on the EU Presidency, and the lectures on democratic backsliding and the Green Deal. The volume and content of the feedback given on the essays was very well received.

There was little to critique. However, it was brought up that artificial intelligence could undermine the fairness of the essay assignments. The one-week deadline for the essay submission was short. For the third essay, additional optional questions to answer were added shortly before the essay was assigned. It would be better if all essay questions had been published at the start of the course. Finally, lecturer Broniecki was late for one seminar and late with the feedback to one of the essays.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

While there is no need for major changes, we have a few suggestions for improvement. First, we could consider making attendance both in lectures and seminars mandatory to improve the proportion of students who are present overall. We, the course convenors, felt that those lectures that were directly relevant for the mandatory assignments were better attended than other lectures. Second, recording lectures and seminars would be helpful for those students who cannot attend. We were asked on several occasions whether recording is a possibility. We would not like to record lectures/seminars, however, if attendance is not mandatory. Third, a podcast type 10 minutes summary of the lectures could be a great resource to add to the course.

Besvarelse: 26915866

Navn / name

Kristoffer Kolltveit

Emnekode / course code

STV2510

Semester

Vår 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Evalueringskjema

Emnekode: STV2510

Emnetittel: Norsk politikk – aktører, institusjoner og prosesser

Språk: Norsk

Egenevalueringen emne-ansvarlig:

Kurset var organisert med ti forelesinger og fem seminarer. Peter Egge Langsæther, Maiken Røed, Signy Vabo, Guri Rosén og jeg har alle forelest i kurset. Maiken Røed og Tor Syrstad har hatt seminarene. Pensum var noe endret fra 2023, og bør vurderes fortløpende. Forelesningene fungerte etter vårt syn meget godt. Også i år var det en aktiv og interessert gjeng. Ifølge seminarlederne har seminarene også fungert fint. Innleveringen teller ikke på karakteren (er bare kvalifiserende), så det er alltid noen studenter som da ikke legger inn like mye innsats. Seminarlederne understreket overfor studentene at det kunne være krevende å få godkjent, så samlet sett

var kvaliteten god på de innleverte tekstene. Eksamen ble hjemmeeksamen hvor studentene kunne velge to av tre essay-oppgaver for besvarelse.

Jeg hadde et kort møte med emnekontaktene midtveis. Student-evaluering er mangelfull ettersom ingen av de oppnevnte emnekontaktene dukket opp på evalueringsmøtet.

Forslag til forbedringer:

Det er ikke behov for større endringer. På seminarene er det allerede lagt inn et muntlig presentasjons-element, jf. utfordringene fra ChatGPT. Pensum bør oppdateres med en artikkel med litt nyere data på statens styring av kommunene. Vi kan vurdere om oppgaven som krav, bør inneholde en selvstendig, empirisk analyse med medietekster eller enkel statistikk.

Besvarelse: 27618550

Navn / name

janne haaland Matlary

Emnekode / course code

stv4242B

Semester

vår 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Emnerapport stv 4242B

Emnet var sist gitt i 2017, altså 5 år siden. Det var den gang utviklet primært av professor Tormod Heier, Forsvarets Stabsskole, sammen med forsker Anders Kjølberg. Jeg og professor Øyvind Østerud kom inn i emnet som interne ved ISV med to forelesninger hver. Vi fire holdt altså emnet tidligere.

Siden Ukraina-krigen bringer inn ekstraordinært fokus på og endringer i den norske forsvarspolitikken foreslo jeg at emnet skulle gis igjen i år. Tormod Heier og jeg gjorde de nødvendige endringer mht pensum og forelesninger, og fikk med oss Øyvind Østerud igjen. Vi brukte bl a store deler av en bok som ikke var kommet ut på emnets undervisningstidspunkt, Krigen i Ukraina, Fagbokforlaget, 2023, som utkom i mai i år. Forlaget laget en pdf kun for studentene våre. Tormod Heier hadde også denne gangen de fleste forelesningene, men dette vil måtte endres på dersom emnet skal gis igjen da det er en kostnad for ISV.

Emnet ble undervist på norsk, som er naturlig, gitt tematikken. Det var 28 studenter som tok eksamen, som besto av semesteroppgave og skoleeksamen hvorav første teller 40% og siste 60%. (dette vil måtte endres pga KI).

Det var jevnt over gode resultater, og flere meget gode semesteroppgaver.

Studentrepresentantens tilbakemelding fra klassen var gode, men det ble bemerket at Heier ikke bruker ppts og at dette gjør det vanskelig å følge og repetere, noe jeg er klart enig i. Å bruke ppts bør være normen, spesielt når emner ikke tas opp digitalt.

Klassen var godt fornøyd med pensum og forelesningene bortsett fra dette.

Besvarelse: 27434824

Navn / name

Håvard Strand

Emnekode / course code

STV1020

Semester

V23

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemelding fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig:

Kurset er i all hovedsak på rett vei. Omleggingen ifb. innføringen av STV1010 har løftet kurset og undervisningen kraftig. Fokuset på kausalitet har gitt mening og retning til kurset, og har klart forbedret det faglige utbyttet.

Bestillingen fra undervisningsleder var å gjøre kurset mer enhetlig, særlig ved å sørge for koherent læringsutbytte fra forelesninger og ulike seminargrupper. Seminargruppelederne har hatt faste møter foran hver seminarrunde for å samkjøre undervisningen, noe som har hatt en positiv effekt uten å nødvendigvis løse problemet.

Vi merker oss at oppmøtet på både forelesninger seminarundervisningen har vært variabel. Mens forelesningene finnes som opptak, er det ikke noe organisert alternativ for seminarene. Dårlig oppmøte rammer også de gjenværende studentene som får en dårligere opplevelse.

Endringen av hjemmeoppgaven virker å ha gitt økt læringsutbytte. Vi la til en R-komponent i hjemmeoppgaven, noe som gjør R-prøven overflødig, og frigjør ressurser som kan brukes til mer læringsrettet innsats. Endringen av R-seminarene fra små med en seminarleder til store med to seminarledere virker å ha en delt effekt. Noen tilbakemeldinger tyder på at ordningen med to seminarledere har gitt bedre læring, mens andre trekker fram at større grupper fører til mindre

trygghet.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering:

Studentevalueringen er basert på et spørreskjema som i det alt vesentlige ble besvart på siste forelesning og tre møter med emnekontaktene. Studentene virker å være relativt godt fornøyd med læringsutbyttet fra kurset. Den største enkeltutfordringen er tidspunktet for forelesningene (tirsdag 08.15.), men også andre utfordringer trekkes fram.

Studentene har gjennomgående brukt for mye tid på å mestre R og for lite tid på å mestre substansen i kurset. R-arbeidsbøkene har i liten grad blitt brukt. R-undervisningen oppleves av noen som løsrevet fra helheten i kurset. Flere trekker fram ulikt læringsutbytte fra ulike seminargrupper. Emnekontaktene trekker fram en følelse av skam og usikkerhet knyttet til seminargruppene, og spesielt til en opplevd forventning om kunnskaper og forkunnskaper som man ikke føler er tilstrekkelige.

Forslag til forbedringer:

Se eget notat for detaljer:

1. En lang seminargruppeserie istedenfor to
2. Utfasing av R-prøven
3. Mer fokus på anvendelse av R for å svare på substans-spørsmål
4. Oppdatering av læringsmålene.

Besvarelse: 27541096

Navn / name

Øyvind Stiansen

Emnekode / course code

STV2020

Semester

Spring 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Course Evaluation Report

Course Code: STV2020

Course Title: Social Science Data Analysis and Programming

Language: English

Course Convenor's Evaluation of the Course:

- Overall, the course worked quite well. In general, the students seemed happy with the course and the home assignments and term papers indicate that most students learned a lot!
- The mix of lecturing and hands-on exercises during the lectures in which students can try the code themselves seemed to work well for making students engage with the materials.
- For the seminars, we had a mix between individual feedback on the term paper projects and working on exercises applying the skills from the lectures. Our impression was that the latter format worked better than the former.
- Compared to the 2022 version of the course, the 2023 version emphasized basic data wrangling

skills and visualization more (at the expense of more advance topics, e.g. on remote sensing). Our impression is that this worked well and helped raise the general R skills of students completing the course.

- Philipp Broniecki did a heroic job in reading and providing feedback on all the home assignments three times! It would have been difficult to get all the students through without Philipp having the time, flexibility, and patience for this part of the teaching.
- The deadline for approving students' mandatory activities was set just days after the final submission (leaving us with very little time to read and approve the submission) and in Easter week. It would be useful to adjust such deadlines to the actual activities in the course.

Summary of Feedback from Student Contact Point:

- The lectures were fast-paced, leading to some students feeling overwhelmed and falling behind. Moreover, there were significant differences in the students' competence levels within the class. These differences made it challenging for the lecturers to find the right pace and right difficulty level for the covered materials. However, there is a general consensus among the students that the course is appropriately challenging.
- Students who did not have prior experience with the course prerequisite (1020) faced challenges. It might be useful to stress the need for prerequisite knowledge even more.
- The first lecture included a review of prerequisite knowledge, which was very useful.
- There was too little time between Felix's lectures and the final hand-in, leaving little time for students working on GIS in their homework to receive feedback.
- The topics of webscraping and text-as-data were covered at a fast pace (compared to data wrangling and visualization), causing some difficulties for the students.
- Coding exercising in the seminars work well and it would have been useful with even more exercises. Similarly, the inclusion of shorter exercises during the lectures helped slow down the pace and reinforce learning.
- Occasionally, it was unclear whether students were expected to code during the lectures or simply follow along.
- Both the github pages and the lecture slides were very useful for reviewing and clarifying concepts.
- Relying on a single family of packages (tidyverse) was appreciated.
- It is unfortunate that the machine learning course cannot be included as part of a political science 80-group (since the course is organized by Sociology).
- The seminar groups should not be larger. It is important to have opportunities for individual feedback.
- The term paper is very relevant for the future work on the BA thesis. This was mentioned in the first lecture, but maybe the connection could have been made even more explicit?

Suggestions for improvements:

- It would be useful to indicate a suggested progression for the 40-group in data science. Ideally,

students should take STV2020 before progressing to the other more specialized/advanced courses. STV2020 should be a course that builds the foundations, e.g. for STV2022, but if some students have already taken STV2022 they are likely to already have taught themselves much of the materials covered in STV2020. If adapting too much to these students, the course would be too challenging for students who only worked with R in STV1020. This suggested progression probably shouldn't be mandatory (we don't want to turn anyone away) but indicating the ideal progression to the students would probably make things work a bit better.

- There should be even more hands-on exercises during the lectures and seminars in future iterations of the course.
- The html. format presented some challenges for many students due to the way Quarto handles embedded content. It might be easier to suggest PDF output and the tinytex package in the future.

Besvarelse: 27537906

Navn / name

Felix Haass & Carl Henrik Knutsen

Emnekode / course code

STV2350

Semester

Spring 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Course-code: STV2350

Course title: Autocratic Politics

****Course convener's evaluation of the course: ****

In our view the following things worked well:

- The inclusion of several instructors across all levels (PhD, Postdoc, Associate/full professors) as lecturers in the course continues to work well. Having experts on a topic teach the respective lectures clearly improved the overall quality of individual lectures.
- A strong focus on the curriculum with an emphasis on reading comprehension also continues to be an asset. A reason why this is worked is, we believe, that focused the seminars (and seminar exercises) strongly on reading comprehension and discussion of the readings.
- Several of the lecturers also successfully tied course lectures to current events, such as the Russian war against Ukraine, which helped to relate the relevance of course contents to students.

****Summary of student evaluation:****

The student contact point positively mentioned the following topics:

- The layout and the structure of the course are good. The order of topics was perceived as logical
- Thematic order is good and topics were well chosen
- The seminar sizes are good and allow for engaged discussion
- Having one seminar every two weeks works well

Things that could be improved:

- While students generally appreciated the focus in the seminars on discussing readings, some students note that the downside of that focus is that the seminars leave less room for discussing term papers & getting feedback on term papers.
- Some of the lectures could use more country/historical examples, since some of the topics are relatively technical
- Providing video recordings of the lectures

****Suggestions for improvements:****

- Given the change in exam structure, we will drop the main term paper at the end of the course and change the main exam to a school exam. This should mitigate the issue of having little to no time in the seminars to discuss the term paper
- We will instead have the students write short reaction papers (pass/fail) that will help them to engage with the readings even more and prepare for the final exam

Besvarelse: 26660299

Navn / name

Introduction to Game-theoretic Models of War

Emnekode / course code

stv1266

Semester

Spring 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Klassekontakten nevnte følgende momenter på den positive siden

- God undervisningsform
- God anledning til å stille spørsmål
- Positivt at foreleser stiller spørsmål til auditoriet
- Mange oppgaver, noe som gir studentene god anledning til å prøve ut sin egen forståelse av stoffet
- Bra med eksempler fra virkeligheten
- Gode quizer – nesten alle studentene deltok

På følgende punkter finnes det et forbedringspotensial:

- Studentene har varierende kunnskapsnivå. Det bør kanskje legges mer innsats i å få med de svakeste studentene. På den annen side: Dette kan gå ut over læringen til de andre studentene. Så her finnes det motstridende hensyn.
- Det er utfordrende å lære studentene matte. Det bør vurderes å opprette et eget emne i matte for statsvitenskapsstudenter.
- De første to forelesningene inneholdt litt få eksempler.

Besvarelse: 27677515

Navn / name

Guri Rosén

Emnekode / course code

STV4445B

Semester

V2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemelding fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Egenevaluering emneansvarlig:

Våren 2023 ble eksamensordningen endret til litteraturgjennomgang. En skisse skulle presenteres midtveis i bolken. Hensikten med litteraturgjennomgang som eksamensform var todelt. For det første at studentene begynner å lese kurslitteraturen tidlig og jobber målrettet med dette. For det andre at de lærer hvordan de gjennomgår og vurderer vitenskapelig litteratur og presenterer vitenskapelig kunnskap på en strukturert, tilgjengelig, nøyaktig og interessant måte.

Det ble satt av godt med tid i de første forelesningene til å diskutere eksamensformen og svare på spørsmål. Studentene fikk også utdelt et detaljert notat som gikk gjennom elementene i en litteraturgjennomgang. Litteraturgjennomgang kan muligens være en krevende eksamensform, som fordrer at studentene starter tidlig og jobber jevnt og godt med tematikken de har valgt seg. Det var svært få studenter til stede på forelesning, og dermed noe vanskelig å vurdere hvordan eksamensformen fungerte. Det foreslås ingen endringer i eksamensform for våren 2024.

Det lave antallet studenter bidro til mange gode diskusjoner, men samtidig vil det være utfordrende dersom ikke flere ønsker å ta kurset. Forslag til endringer knytter seg derfor til innholdet i, og

beskrivelsen av, emnet.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering:

Emnekontakten beskrev emnet som smått, men godt. Jevnt over opplevde studentene at emnet dekket et bredt spekter av problemstillinger, var fornøyde med pensumlitteraturen, var godt organisert, med tett oppfølging fra underviserne. Det var noe usikkerhet rundt hva som forventes av en litteraturgjennomgang, men opplevelsen var at dette ble godt redegjort for i forelesning, seminar, og i notat. At én forelesning var satt av til innlegg fra praksisfeltet ble oppfattet som positivt. Det kom ikke frem konkrete forslag til endringer.

Forslag til forbedringer:

Beskrivelsen av emnet bør gjennomgås for å se om det er mulig å gjøre det mer attraktivt for et bredere sett av studenter. Dette omfatter også innretningen på emnet. Tradisjonelt har STV4445B fokusert på institusjonene på EU-nivå fra et organisasjonsteoretisk perspektiv. De siste gangene emnet har blitt gitt, har det tillegg fokusert på samspillet mellom Brussel og medlemstatene. Sistnevnte tematikk kan med fordel vektlegges enda tydeligere, også for å understreke arbeidslivsrelevansen i emnet. Samtidig er det mulig å legge større vekt den politisk dynamikken som former europeiske integrasjon, inkludert endringer på institusjonelt og systemisk nivå. Dette vil muligens også innebære en endring av navnet på emnet.

Litteraturgjennomgang bør fremheves tydeligere som en sentral komponent i emnet. Notatet som deles ut til studentene i starten av semesteret bør gjennomgås og oppdateres i tråd med erfaringene fra inneværende semester.

Besvarelse: 27731329

Navn / name

Olav Schram Stokke

Emnekode / course code

STV2250

Semester

Spring 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

This course includes 10 lectures and 5 seminars for each student. Whereas the last time given (2021) as many as 5 lecturers were involved, this time the course leader gave all lectures – implying greater consistency in structure. I plan to continue this format.

The midterm evaluation with the course contacts revealed general satisfaction with course but also a sense that the syllabus was a bit overwhelming. I therefore expanded the use of mentimeter-based repetition in the second half, a move that was given thumbs-up both in the end-of-term evaluation meeting with the course contacts and in the nettskjema-based student evaluation I conducted after the exam. Yet, the final assessment communicated by the course contact and in the student evaluation was that the syllabus was too ambitious in amount and in level of difficulty.

As regards amount, the number of pages was around 1000, which is standard for a 2000-level course. Given that the exam also includes a term paper, I will consider reducing it somewhat.

The student evaluation of the lectures was generally positive, including thumbs up for pre-lecture syllabus notes, mentimeter-based repetition and student discussion in small groups (summeminutter). Some felt that slides should contain more text and that the lectures should be structured more as a syllabus review – but I did make it clear at the first lecture that lectures would focus on certain parts of the syllabus, with a focus on drawing connections among contributions,

rather than going through the syllabus. I do not plan to change that policy.

The term papers from the seminars formed part of the exam, counting 40%. The student evaluation of the seminar leaders – Kaja, Leonor and Marina – were enthusiastic; all of them were praised for the constructive and well-prepared guidance they had provided.

The course is given every second spring semester. I will make some revision of the syllabus and change somewhat the order of the lectures so as to streamline it better with the new textbook used this year – which I and also the students found very good, clearly better than that used last time.

Besvarelse: 27464410

Navn / name

Øivind Bratberg

Emnekode / course code

STV3090

Semester

Vår 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

STV3090 har forløpt uten dramatisk dette semesteret, etter noen år med relativ unntakstilstand med pandemiundervisning og endringer i forelesningsopplegget. Inneværende semester har fungert godt i det store og hele. De innledende forelesningene i januar/februar ga retning og grunnutrustningen for forskningsspørsmål, arbeid med teori etc., og deretter har en intensiv seminarserie dekket prosjektutviklingen for hver enkelt. Inntrykket fra seminarlederne er et jevnt over godt læringsutbytte og studentinnsats.

Vi bruker endel tid på å skape god fagfellekultur i seminarene, og dette er noe som kan forsterkes ytterligere. Et enhetlig undervisningsopplegg i seminarene vil nok være til hjelp i så måte - det gir felles forventninger og krav for alle studenter uavhengig av gruppe. Ønsket om samme opplegg i alle grupper ble også fremmet av emnekontakt og er noe vi vil ta tak i ved neste runde av emnet; rådende praksis har vært noe tilpasning av presentasjoner, opponertrolle, kommentarer skriftlig/muntlig etc.

Emnekontakt fremmet også et ønske blant enkelte studenter om tema-spesifikke seminargrupper. Det vil være vanskelig å administrere og etter emneansvarlig vurdering også uheldig, gitt at BA-

oppgaven skal nå frem til generalister (og også leses og sensureres på allment statsvitenskapelig grunnlag). Det er imidlertid gode muligheter gjennom Canvas for å etablere grupper eller rom for utveksling mellom studenter som skriver oppgaver som trekker på samme tematikker, teorier eller metoder.

Besvarelse: 27673864

Navn / name

Marina Povitkina

Emnekode / course code

STV1300

Semester

Vår

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Course convener's evaluation of the course:

Overall, the course worked well. 317 students finished the exam out of 385 students who were signed up to the course at the time of the exam. About 150 students attended the lectures regularly.

There was a miscommunication regarding the exam language. The course page indicated that it was only possible to write exam answers in English, which caused discontent among students. We solved the issue mid-way through the course but by that time several students dropped out because of no possibility to submit exams answers in Norwegian. We therefore need to ensure that from now on the course webpage states that the exam can be written in English or any of the Scandinavian languages.

The course contains 12 lectures on diverse topics, which seemed to be confusing to students who were struggling to grasp the essence of comparative politics. I got this impression from course evaluations and questions during the lectures. Due to the high demand, I recorded an additional summary lecture, where I explained the red threads of the course.

The course involved study groups and study mentors who facilitated discussions in study groups. We are currently conducting an evaluation survey from students and study mentors to assess how it worked, but from our perspective and discussions with course representatives, this setup worked very well.

The course had a teaching assistant who helped with recordings, communication with students and arrangement of study groups and their help was necessary for a smooth running of the course. I recommend keeping the teaching assistant for the future iterations of the course, if resources permit.

This year we tried a new lecture solution to increase engagement – mentimeter Q&A slide available for students during the lectures, so that students can type their questions throughout the duration of the lecture. This worked well and I recommend keeping it for the future iterations of the course.

Summary of student evaluation:

Overall, we got positive evaluations about the course from the student representatives. They, however, reported that many students were overwhelmed by the amount of reading and that it was difficult to navigate the reading in terms of what is relevant for the exam. During the mid-term evaluations we received some requests from student representatives, such as providing previous years' exam answers with various grades, indicating which pages are more relevant to read in the chapters than others, investigating the possibility to write exam in Norwegian, etc. and we fulfilled most of them.

Most students also perceived that there was too much information during the lectures and that the lectures should focus on the most important parts of the course. I consider restructuring lectures next year to accommodate this concern.

Suggestions for improvements:

As the overall setup for the course worked well, major changes are not necessary. I, however, propose some minor changes. I suggest reducing technical content in the lectures to help students focus on the bigger picture. This will result in fewer lectures, but I suggest adding a lecture on state capacity that is currently missing from the course, to compensate. I also suggest removing some of the articles from the syllabus and replacing very technical reading at the start of the course (chapter 3 of CGG using game theory to explain politics) with less technical reading for a smoother start of the course, for example:

McCormick, John, Rod Hague, and Martin Harrop (2022). *Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction*. Bloomsbury Publishing. Chapters 1, 2, and 3.

Given a high demand this year, I also propose adding a summary lecture instead of the lecture on welfare state, parts of which will be covered in the new lecture on state capacity. The lecturer for the welfare state lecture will not be able to give the lecture next time the course is given, so it is a good time to test the addition.

Besvarelse: 27621656

Navn / name

Praksis

Emnekode / course code

STV4141

Semester

Kristoffer Kolltveit og Karrieresenteret

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Evalueringskjema

Emnekode: STV4141

Emnetittel: Praksis

Språk: Norsk

Egenevalueringen emne-ansvarlig:

Emnet består av 6 uker i praksis ute i vertsinstusjonene samt tre seminarer på Blindern: Ett samme dag som praksisperioden starter, ett midtveis og ett på praksisoppholdets siste dag. På oppstart- og avslutningsseminaret har Karrieresenteret et opplegg hvor studentene skal reflektere over egen læring. Studentene leverer en skriftlig rapport som redegjør for arbeid og læring i perioden. Det avholdes også en samtale mellom student, vertsinstusjon og instituttet. I tillegg til seminarene ble det i november avholdt et infomøte hvor vi fortalte om de ulike vertsinstusjonene og de formelle rammene rundt praksis.

Jeg foreslår å endre seminar-opplegget og den avsluttende samtalen. Det fungerer ikke lenger optimalt. Opplaget vil bli diskutert i et eget møte med Tora Skodvin og Monika Birkeland før sommeren.

Studentevaluering

Det ble utarbeidet et Nettskjema som 11 studenter har besvart (knappt 30 pst. svarandel). Under følger et kort sammendrag:

- 46 pst. mente i liten eller meget liten grad at seminaret i starten av praksisoppholdet var bevisstgjørende når det gjelder egne kunnskaper og ferdigheter.

- 40 pst mente i liten eller meget liten grad at seminaret midtveis var viktig for å diskutere hvordan praksisoppholdet fungerte.

- 55 pst. mente i liten eller meget liten grad at seminaret ved slutten av praksisoppholdet var bevisstgjørende når det gjelder egne kunnskaper og ferdigheter.

Tilbakemeldingene på det åpne spørsmålet om seminarene handler om at mange allerede er bevisste på temaene som tas opp, at seminarene er for lange, at det er behov for å kutte ned osv. Særlig midtveis-seminaret fremstår for noen som unyttig.

- 82 pst. mente i stor eller meget stor grad at oppholdet hos vertsinstitusjonen var bevisstgjørende når det gjelder egne kunnskaper og ferdigheter.

- 46 pst. mente i stor eller meget stor grad at den avsluttende samtalen (muntlig eksamen) var viktig for å diskutere hvordan praksisperioden hadde fungert.

- 82 pst. mente i stor eller meget stor grad at hele praksisemnet har vært viktig når det gjelder troen på egne kunnskaper og ferdigheter.

- 82 pst. mente i stor eller meget stor grad at grad praksisemnet har vært viktig når det gjelder troen på hvor man kan få jobb etter mastergraden.

Tilbakemeldingene på det åpne spørsmålet om praksisemnet generelt handler om at praksis er meget verdifullt for studentene. Men at instituttet bør vurdere både seminarene, praksisrapporten og hvordan muntlig avholdes.

Forslag til forbedringer:

Seminarene og muntlig bør legges om. Vi kommer tilbake med forslag til konkret opplegg til Programrådet

Besvarelse: 27484133

Navn / name

Solveig Hillesund

Emnekode / course code

PECOS4096

Semester

H22, V23

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

My overall impression is that despite relatively low attendance (about half of the students do not come to any of the events), the PECOS students really appreciate the activities offered, especially the writing workshops and PECOS shut up and write sessions. The suggestions for improvements below (point 1) are based on my own reflections and feedback from a student evaluation form and meeting with student contact (see summaries at the end of the document, point 2 and 3).

Note that there is no formal requirement to evaluate this course at this point. The report is based on a memo prepared for the new course convener (Melanie Sauter) who will be taking over this fall. It is submitted as an evaluation following a suggestion from the administration.

1. Potential improvements for fall 2023 – spring 2024:

- New components, as agreed with Elin Allern

o Writing lectures: Lynn Nygård on “the writing process in general”; Academic writing center on “how to write an excellent introduction and literature review”

o Data management plan: not mandatory (at least not this year) but we want to encourage them all

to make one and make sure they know how. Some of this is covered in the new design seminar, but in this course we want to follow up on it. Talk to Elin Allern about (i) how best to do this and (ii) where the work on improving the data management plan template stands.

- Other suggestions for activities

- o Lecture on how to write up the analysis (f.ex in March/April, with Jakob?)

- o More information on MA defense in the spring semester?

- o Intro lecture(s) in the fall and/or after Christmas? Practical info, motivation, how to structure a thesis etc. Most of this is probably covered in design seminar, but a reminder later on might be useful.

- o An additional writing workshop before Christmas? This year the students organized their own, and quite a few first-years also showed up and commented

- o A qualitative equivalent to the coffee and coding sessions? I.e., somewhere students using qualitative designs can come and discuss qualitative methods with someone other than their supervisor (in the spring semester).

- Components that will be dropped

- o NVivo; will be covered in Elin's data course

- Suggested revisions

- o More shut-up and write towards the end of the spring, perhaps separate PECOS sessions.

- o Open the software demonstrations for first-year students. Ask Joakim to advertise to them.

- Follow up more on the supervisor side?

- o At a minimum, send out an email about the activities the students are offered

- Practical suggestions

- o Start scheduling rooms and lecturers as early as possible; maybe talk to Jørg/Joakim about adding the course to the normal scheduling system.

- o Course convener should be added to the general PECOS email lists/canvas rooms

- o Improve 'advertising'. Especially in the beginning of the year (in start-up meeting or similar)?

- o Always make sure to have one qual and one quant member of staff in the writing workshops.

2. Feedback from student contact (28 April 2023):

- Overall positive; especially re. workshops and SUAW sessions

- For the people who do not show up for activities, the impression is that it is because they work, and weren't able to take time off for non-mandatory activities

- The timing of the activities generally worked well this year. Early February and mid-March might be the best time for workshops. (This year we did Feb and mid-April.)

- Re. writing course (not mentioned much in the evaluation forms): It was useful to have non-poli sci instructors (Academic writing centre). Very useful to get the practical tips and tricks for what to do to get started and when you are stuck.

o To make more people come, maybe this should be encouraged as part of a bigger package “you should really try to write one chapter before Christmas (usually intro/ lit review), and to help you with this, we have invited....” (see also suggestion about December workshop below)

- Other suggestions

o To get a ‘refresher’ after Christmas for some of the lecture topic from the design seminar would be useful (when the students have a clearer idea of what they are doing)

o Maybe a writing workshop before Christmas as well (the students organized their own this year), where people decide for themselves whether/what to submit. Perhaps divide into groups of 2 or 3 for discussion instead of presenting to the whole group.

o Shut up and write: more (PECOS-specific) sessions later in the last semester (March-May) (this year’s students are organizing their own rather than go to the ones with poli sci)

o A qualitative equivalent to coffee and coding would be great; i.e., a drop-in methods chat with a couple of members of staff who have experience with the most important qualitative methods (f.ex text analysis and process tracing / comparative). E.g. in February?

- General feedback

o People really appreciate the coffee and coding sessions

o Jeremy did a great job in design seminars, to help people build their projects gradually

o Melanie gave great advise in the February workshop

3. Responses to student evaluation form (late April):

- Summary

o 6 responses, not representative of whole class. Most of them attended several activities and plan to submit on time.

o Reasons not to attend: Mostly work and other scheduling conflicts

o Positive: Several students respond that the NVivo lectures, shut up and writes sessions, and writing workshops worked well. The data management sessions and writing course are also mentioned. They provide little detail on why these activities worked well, however.

o Negative: When asked what we can do better, students responded that they would like more workshops, with more time for each student and written feedback (preferably in advance). One responds that the data management sessions were “really confusing”. (Note that we also received a lot of negative feedback on the data management workshop held by the library last year.)

Besvarelse: 26994148

Navn / name

Øyvind Stiansen

Emnekode / course code

STV4222

Semester

Spring 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Course-code: STV4222

Course title: International and Comparative Judicial Politics

Language: English

Course convener's evaluation of the course:

Overall, the course worked very well. It seems from the student engagement in the lectures and from their responses to the assignments that we were able to introduce the field of judicial politics in a compelling and comprehensible manner and that we were able both to introduce key concepts and theories of judicial politics and connect them to current examples such as climate litigation, the Fosen-judgment in the Norwegian Supreme Court, attacks on judicial independence in Israel, etc. Most of the students showing up to the first lecture ended up completing the course and there was a reasonably high level of student participation/engagement in most of the lectures. The mix of examples from international and comparative judicial politics also worked well.

Summary of feedback from student contact-point:

- The student liaison was generally very happy about the course. He also noted that he had not received complaints from other students and that his generally impression was that most students were happy with the course. He further noted that there was both high attendance and high engagement during the lectures.
- The student liaison said that he appreciated how both of us (Øyvind and Daniel) were present at all the sessions and participated in the discussions/sometimes interrupted the other instructor's lecture. He said this facilitated participation also from the students and created a good atmosphere.
- The lectures were good with a good balance of theory/concepts, examples, figures and graphs to illustrate trends and patterns. Students appreciated tips on possible topics for MA theses spread out across the different lectures. However, some of the slides were a bit too dense with too many and too long bullet points.
- It would also have been useful to spend more time discussing the learning objectives for the course in the lectures.
- Sometimes the pace was also a bit too quick. It would have been useful to slow down and spend even more time on explaining and illustrating central concepts.
- The readings were good. Very motivating to have a very short reading (three pages) for the first lecture. Got the impression that the readings had been carefully selected.
- The student liaison liked working on the home assignments/portfolio exam. There was lots of variety in both the substance of home assignments and the analytical skills they tested, which was good.
- The home assignments were demanding and required a lot of work. In particular the first home assignment was a bit overwhelming. Most students had never read a judicial decision before and found it challenging. "Very cool to suddenly have to use statistics", but many students also found this very challenging. A possible alternative would be to interpret a regression model without having to estimate it in R?
- Would have been useful to have a minimum word count (in addition to the maximum). Writing 1500 words each week felt like a lot.
- The workload was relatively high, and some students faced a trade-off between working on the home assignments and finding the time to read the assigned literature.
- He definitely prefers a portfolio exam to the traditional school exam. He would recommend keeping this format (and to change it as little as possible to accommodate concerns about ChatGPT etc.).
- Would recommend keeping the first home assignment, but move it later in the course.
- Assignment 3 had a clear connection with STV4021, so maybe put something like this assignment in the first week?
- It worked well with peer feedback on the home assignments.

Suggestions for improvements:

The student liaison reported that many students found the first home assignment (which involved reading segments from two European Court of Human Rights judgments and link the disagreements to theories of judicial decision-making) a bit overwhelming and based on the discussion in the lecture many students shared this view. Similarly, many students found the second home assignment which involved estimating and discussing two linear regression models to be particularly challenging. While many students found both assignments challenging, they both seemed to have high pedagogical value. Having students read segments from judicial decisions made it easier to convey what disagreements between judges are about and how they are reflected in their written opinions. Demonstrating how regression analysis is useful outside the methods courses also seems important. In future iterations of the course, we would therefore want to have similar assignments, but try to improve the instructions and guidance for the students so that they are less overwhelming.

While we generally succeeded in linking theory and concepts with current examples, some of the more theoretical lectures (e.g. on the case-space model and on how the risk of override may constrain courts) were perhaps a bit too abstract and theoretical. We should work more on how we communicate this material for future iterations of the course.

Future iterations of the course would have to comply with the Department's new guidelines for take-home exams. Our preferred approach would be to add an oral component to the portfolio, perhaps by making the last assignment a poster presentation.

Besvarelse: 27582353

Navn / name

James Cameron

Emnekode / course code

PECO41111

Semester

Spring 2023

Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

Egenevalueringen emneansvarlig: Evaluer hvordan undervisningsopplegget fungerte. Vær konkret. Gjør spesielt rede for både det som fungerte godt, og det som ikke fungerte like godt.

Oppsummering av studentevaluering: Her fylles hovedpunktene fra tilbakemeling fra emnekontakt inn. Nevn hva som fungerte bra, hva som fungerte mindre bra, og kom gjerne med forslag til forbedringer.

Forslag til forbedringer: Gjør rede for hvordan emnet kan forbedres til neste gang det skal gis. Vurder i hvilken grad det er behov for større endringer.

The course evaluation should include:

Self-evaluation by the course convener: Evaluate how the course worked. Be specific. Describe both what worked well and what didn't work as well.

Summary of student evaluation: Here, the main points from feedback provided by the contact student(s) are included. Mention what worked well, what didn't work as well, and feel free to suggest improvements.

Suggestions for improvements: Explain how the course can be improved for the next time it is offered. Assess the extent to which there is a need for major changes.

Emnerapport / course report

Self-evaluation by the course convener:

The course went very well indeed. Students clearly grasped the key theoretical debates covered in the course material and applied them during the in-class discussions. They engaged enthusiastically in the participative activities, including the analysis of historical documents. Effective delivery of the course was also reflected in the quality of the submitted assessments and reading responses.

Policymaker participation from Marte Lauvhjell of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the class on cyber security was very much appreciated and the course should continue to engage the MFA -- particularly on contemporary topics such as cyber.

Summary of student evaluation:

The student representative was very positive regarding the course. They considered it well structured and the learning objectives clearly communicated. The lectures were delivered in an interesting and engaging manner. Expectations regarding the assessment were clear and the

assignments were graded in good time.

The representative suggested that the course could go further in incorporating critical approaches to security studies, for example by including readings that addressed how hierarchies of power shape international security cooperation.

Suggestions for improvements:

The new convener could evaluate the mix of theoretical readings, including the potential for incorporating critical approaches later on in the course.