

## COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

### Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: FK102L	Scope (hp): 30
Course title: Peace and Conflict Studies II	
Course coordinator: Kristian Steiner	Number of registered students: 48 (enligt Canvas)
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT25	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. SGFRE Programme course term 2 + independent course	

### Forms of evaluation and feedback (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional)	Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):
<b>Summative course evaluation (obligatory)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Only via Canvas <input type="checkbox"/> Canvas and other form <input type="checkbox"/> Only other form (written and/or oral)	<b>Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation:</b>  <b>21</b>

### Student's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

<p><b>Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:</b></p> <p><b>1. To what extent do you feel the course's examination forms have given you the opportunity to show how well you have achieved the intended learning outcomes?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Det övergripande studentintrycket ligger på 4-5 på en 6-gradig skala</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The seminars in the first module would have been better if they had been firstly been better navigated so that everyone would have had the opportunity to speak for each question and one person who likes to answer extensively could have been stopped for others to have the chance to answer as well. It was quite unnecessary that we could only choose a writing partner from these seminar groups and not from the whole class because of the unbalanced motivations in the groups.</li> <li>○ The graded seminars in the theory module had too many students in each group. The lit review was very difficult and while it does fit the theory module I feel like more support should have been given in order to conduct it successfully. Methods exam was a bit confusing, but still ok. Project work was very obvious and I think it was a great way to finish the semester off.</li> <li>○ The seminars of the second module were not helpful, but all the other assessment methods were. What even was this? Please, consider discussions in smaller groups, oral exams or even sit in exams if needed.</li> <li>○ I think for effort should be focused on class time so that there is more comprehension. The exams indicate a persons ability to write this kind of exam</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---

and also their comprehension but I wish there was more focus on genuine comprehension than on exams - because the exams are the primary method of education in this course... more assignments similar to the exams would also be an improvement.

## 2. To what extent do you feel the course's working methods/learning activities have been a support in your learning to achieve the intended learning outcomes?

- **Det övergripande svaret är oklart, betyg från 1-6.**
  - Very little, the methods were clearly not aimed at education but instead repetition of ideas.
  - The first and second modules felt a bit scattered. The lectures of the first Module sometimes didn't even connect to the grade seminars, although I appreciated the practical approach. The seminar groups were also really unbalanced, because other seminar groups were more engaged with the discussions and were well prepared while in my seminar group more than half of the group didn't even participate and even stated that they didn't prepare because they don't care. The seminars in the second Module were extremely repetitive and felt unnecessary for the groups that had already decided on their methodology and theoretical framework.
  - At the same time the rest of the class that didn't even decide on a research question also didn't take away much from the seminars.
    - graded seminars with no real use.
    - a methods module in a \*peculiar\* place (would have been much better off in the beginning of the semester)
    - why was the libsearsch workshop at the end??
    - Waaay too little information in regards to what a literature review is and what is expected.
  - Methods course was a bit repetitive but very useful for learning. The lectures regarding theories were fine. I preferred Steiners ones in the beginning of the semester, because he had a reasonable amount of readings that were related to a seminar.
  - Supervision for the project work was good, Åberg was really helpful but he did not have the proper instructions for the task before the first supervision which he should have been provided for.
  - The methods had a good variety and will be useful in the future but sometimes as for the Literature review, the instructions were not sufficient. Told us that we will learn on the way which was quite challenging if you had never written one before

## 3 To what extent do you feel the course's examination forms have given you the opportunity to show how well you have achieved the intended learning outcomes?

- **Det övergripande studentintrycket ligger på 4-5 på en 6-gradig skala**
- **Comments**
  - The seminars in the first module would have been better if they had been firstly been better navigated so that everyone would have had the opportunity to speak for each question and one person who likes to answer extensively could have been stopped for others to have the chance to answer as well. It was quite unnecessary that we could only choose a writing partner from these seminar groups and not from the whole class because of the unbalanced motivations in the groups.

- The graded seminars in the theory module had too many students in each group. The lit review was very difficult and while it does fit the theory module I feel like more support should have been given in order to conduct it successfully. Methods exam was a bit confusing, but still ok. Project work was very obvious and I think it was a great way to finish the semester off.
- The seminars of the second module were not helpful, but all the other assessment methods were. What even was this?
- Please, consider discussions in smaller groups, oral exams or even sit in exams if needed.
- I think for effort should be focused on class time so that there is more comprehension. The exams indicate a persons ability to write this kind of exam and also their comprehension but I wish there was more focus on genuine comprehension than on exams - because the exams are the primary method of education in this course... more assignments similar to the exams would also be an improvement.

## 4 To what extent do you feel the course has met your expectations in general?

- **Det övergripande studentintrycket ligger på 4-5 på en 6-gradig skala**

- Comments

- I had high expectations for this course because I appreciate group work and seminars, but in looking back it was really disorganized and not well guided/balanced.
- Not at all. Where would I even use this?
- Some seminars touches upon interesting subjects, but we never actually engage with the subjects. The project work is a fun idea in theory, but we would need more support.
- Also, the reactions to AI? That stress was too much to have to deal with on top of everything else. Please talk with more teachers from GPS and see how they deal with it.
- I heard a lot about the Swedish education system so my expectations were high (perhaps too high) but the very little class time and few assignments (all of which are tests) made me loose a lot of faith in this system. This course requires more class time even if it is not with a supervisor but scheduled class time with a structure or syllabus that students can follow. I understand if there is no budget for the teachers to be there, but i think a vast improvement would be a classroom that had 5 hours a week dedicated student on student learning that followed a plan written out by teachers. This could include discussion and comparison of notes or the teachers personal thoughts on specific parts of the texts.
- The course was great but wish to have more explanation on how to write literature review, methodology report and mini-thesis.
- More supervision would be nice and less seminars that feels like fillers. If there should be seminars, make them more practical like workshops as that would be more useful rather than discussing articles.
- Unfortunately, this semester did not live up to my expectations, especially following the well conducted first semester. The first module in particular was very strange, too many theories made it impossible to truly understand all of them. Instead maybe focus on 3-4 theories in general to deep dive into, learn about leading scholars within them and properly know how to place them in PACS related areas. The lit review was way too nig of a task with the small amount of learning we got before, and the sintructions were unclear to many. I had to redo my entire work after the 10 min shared supervision because I had not understood it correctly, which I usually do. The method module was fine, and the project work as well.

## 5 To what extent has the course given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning?

- **Det övergripande studentintrycket ligger på 4-6 på en 6-gradig skala**
- Comments
  - Most of the things I learnt this semester was based on the responsibility of me, particularly in the lit review and in the project work.
  - Felt like that was ALL it was...
  - 90% of the time we had to find everything ourselves. Please support us more! Guide us!
  - This course could be taught entirely online, without even virtual classes just uploading the class presentation. I don't think that is how the course is best taught but the outcomes are entirely in the hands of students. As a student you could skip every lecture and still do well on the final exam.
  - Sometimes it wasn't an opportunity but more so an obligation, we had to learn and research things ourselves with no help from the professors when we should've received it

## 6 What has been especially good about the course?

- The modules were rather interesting
- Having the ability to choose topics that interest us to research
- The enemy images course was a strong point. Kristian Steiner is incredibly educated on the material and his passion for the work comes through in those lectures and classes.
- The seminars when we talk about a certain conflict, without needing to read a book or to reference
- I love the topics and the type of exams that we have, if they would not be in pairs but alone
- It was fun that we got to choose what we wanted to write our essays about, then you actually get to write about something you are interested in.
- I found Module 3 on the UN especially interesting and the possibility to attend many seminars equally enriching!
- The hands-on guidance through the process of writing a thesis, taking away the scary factor
- I appreciated the engaging approach of the seminars and the group/partner work. I especially appreciated Kristian Steiner's and Katrine Gotfredsen's well-structured and clearly organized lectures. Stephen Marr's lectures were interesting but at times hard to follow without a presentation or whiteboard notes.
- Having seminars to build the methods part of our project work
- Honestly, the seminars with Steiner. So much more open to talking with students, taking criticism, and you really feel heard. Some good subjects of seminars.
- Methods module is obviously not that fun but Steiner did a great job explaining and was very structured which I like a lot, he also provided great support for learning with power points etc. Åberg was a great supervisor and I learnt a lot writing the project work.
- The three sessions with our dedicated Supervisor
- Examination methods and also has allowed us to focus on topics we ourselves find interesting
- Module 3: Project work. Working and writing independently is something what can definitely help me moving forward. What helped me as well was the opposition seminar. Expressing ideas and sharing them together was really beneficial. Supervisions held within this work were good as well.
- the lectures were helpful to understand the course literature, the seminars were interesting and helpful to actively apply the literature and to prepare for the project work
- Interesting reading list, but the unfortunate fact is the pace. Same with PACs 1, interesting reading, but you don't have enough time to immerse yourself in the information.

## 7 What can be developed in the course? Please give some concrete suggestions/ideas

- More Time for reading.
- Same as PACs 1.
- Keeping students better informed. The information about courses/ lectures and exams wasn't easy to find. In my opinion the university page should be developed to be more user friendly and transparent.
- Change the entire first part of the semester. If it is called "PACS theories", maybe teach us a few that we then learn to apply to conflicts or areas or detect the different theories in the contemporary world. Make the exam more PACS related, change the seminars to either be longer or have smaller groups/presentations. I liked the Yemen seminar but it was very out of place, maybe make a larger project of it or make the other seminars more like that one. If you keep the lit review, PLEASE give more opportunities for supervision as in the project work. We had no lectures in over a month and the only support we got was an hour that we shared with six other students. The instructions were not clear and I know many people who fell into the same trap as me because of a lack of understanding what the actual task was. Also, writing about old scholars does not feel very much PACS. In general I feel like this semester was very thrown together without much consideration on the actual outcome of it. I sadly don't feel like I learned a lot during the few classes we had, and there is SO MUCH to learn about our field!! I really liked the first semester so maybe make at least one course more specific on one PACS subject to make it more interesting.
- There can be a greater variety of example topics especially at the end of the course. Maybe also move the course to semester 3 or 4 (swapping with semester 3 would be appropriate in my opinion)
- Overall the course was good, maybe have more interactive seminars applying literature or doing small assignments.
- A bit more instructions on the literature review and same with the project work. Was a bit difficult to start.
- Maybe shorter seminars and more time to do the project work
- More communication between the professors in order to give clearer instructions for assignments
- I believe that while the Modules seem informative and complete there has to be a rethinking in 1. The way of teaching them, especially in the second semester's Module 1 (Seminar part) and 3 (Methods). The seminars here are informative to a certain degree but I feel like they are very difficultly graded with the premises of the course. In the same module, I did not feel like we addressed the genocide in Gaza the right way, nor with enough time. While this is a complicated conflict and the latter is not supposed to cover the entirety of the module, if it is addressed, it must be done well. The literature provided for this seminar was one sided, pro-Israel, and did not include any Palestinian perspectives. 2. There has to be a rethinking around the conversations and emails sent to students about AI. While the use of AI has seemed to be a problem in our course, not all students can be part of the delaying of grades, emails pressing to expose one's classmates etc. It has to be handled differently, and dare I say with a degree of interest in its potential and mutual understanding of what this platform is, and offers.
- I heard a lot about the Swedish education system so my expectations were high (perhaps too high) but the very little class time and few assignments (all of which are tests) made me lose a lot of faith in this system. This course requires more class time even if it is not with a supervisor but scheduled class time with a structure or syllabus that students can follow. I understand if there is no budget for the teachers to be there, but I think a vast improvement would be a classroom that had 5 (2-3 days of 2 hours) hours a week dedicated student on student learning that followed a plan written out by teachers. This could include discussion and comparison of notes or the teachers' personal thoughts on

specific parts of the texts. This would increase in classroom time and promote productive group studies. Perhaps the formal creation of study groups at the beginning of the year could also be helpful that include a plan written by teachers to follow and discussion questions; then a weekly write up about what was learned and who attended.

- The seminar groups need to be better navigated to give everyone equal opportunities to speak, and if our grade for the whole semester depends on the partner work we should have the opportunity to choose out of the whole class and not just the seminar group. The lecture on how to navigate the library and find the right sources for our research should have happened before our Literature Review! The usage of AI should have been brought up in the beginning of the semester. As this whole semester depended on group work the issue of one group member using AI and the other choosing not to should have been brought up without students needing to report anonymously! This is clearly unacceptable and lead to us needing to check all the writing of our partners with an AI detector. The as the professor themselves phrased it “Authoritarian” approach they followed is really unnecessary considering we are being taught about the abuse of power by the same professor. Even if this seemed ironic at first the approach of “no exceptions will be made” and not taking criticism seriously as well as giving no good explanation for the grading/ sometimes even rude wording heavily impacted our experience in this course.
- Clearer instruction for exams and a proper explanation of what is expected - additionally I think there should be a deeper explanation on the theories and methods as it was not very clear
- More help how to write a mini-thesis. In the Methodology was where the question was narrowed down, so everything that was written in the literature review was not useful as the question had been changed so much.
- Structure of the module. At the beginning, we had theory and before the methods were introduced to us, we should have our topic for the project work assigned. If this order was inverted, we would not have to change it a lot. Communication regarding assignment requirements from some professors, especially Dr. Marr and literature review. The instructions were not so clear, it turned us to attend re-takes. In my opinion, it would not have to happen in such amount if the communication was clear. Seminars could help with that too.
- No pair exams ! Especially in the first year when there is a lot of people that do not take it seriously and don't care about dropping out. That results in them not caring for group projects which is unfair to honest students and of course other problem in pair exams is use of AI
- Different forms of examinations. More oral. 2. More support, Pleaseee. 3. Re-structure the placement of modules. 4. Make some of Steiner's seminars into fewer more concise seminars. 5. Learn how to deal with AI and students who use it. This caused a lot of stress. Talk with other faculty members. 6. Listen to the students. We know what we need. 7. Some teachers/teacher\* seem more focused on “filtering out” as many students as possible from the course, instead of actually teaching. Please, being authoritarian and strict is not something to brag about. We're here to learn something, not being beaten at. Some of us pay to be here, have that in mind.
- For the projects with a supervisor or scheduled meetings with said supervisor, i think it would benefit the students if there were more meetings between the student and supervisor
- Focusing less on readings and references but more on debates and our point of view. Why do we have to refer to other authors. Plus the teachers need to be more responsible, because they accused me of cheating for no reason.

## Teacher's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

### Summary of the teacher's views:

- Mycket av den dåliga kritiken beror på resursbrist.
- Kanske en inledande övergripande föreläsning för delkurs 1 vore bra.

### **Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)**

The underlying analysis and the action plan should be based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from teachers in the course and the knowledge development in the research field. If identified problems are left without action, this should be motivated.

**The following changes are planned in the short and long term:**

WHAT should be done, WHO should do it and WHEN should it be done?

- I (Kristian Steiner) will report the students' evaluations to the teachers at the next faculty meeting.
- Regarding my own module, I will implement some changes.
  - One of the most important changes is to reduce the number of seminars while doubling their length. This will allow all students to participate and will address the criticism that the seminars were "repetitive."

Remember to orally feedback the results of the course evaluation to

- the students who have completed the course evaluation
- the students of the next course round, i.e. the next time the course is given