

## COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

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

Course LADOK code: MR106L	Scope (hp): 30
Course title: Human Rights III	
Course coordinator: Jon Wittrock	Number of registered students: 45
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT24	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. Independent <i>and</i> programme course within SGMRE Human Rights	

### 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): Student representative(s) Unfortunately there was only one representative this term
Summative course evaluation (obligatory) <input type="checkbox"/> Only via Canvas <input type="checkbox"/> Canvas and other form <input type="checkbox"/> Only other form (written and/or oral)	Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation: <b>12</b>

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

<p><b>Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As is often the case, the number of respondents was quite low, and it is difficult to draw conclusions with confidence.</li> <li>Mandatory questions (mean value for answers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 (4.3)</li> <li>2 (3.8)</li> <li>3 (4.6)</li> <li>4 (4.2)</li> <li>5 (5.0)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Positive aspects mentioned by respondents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social science lectures</li> <li>Methods lectures</li> <li>Thesis supervision/supervisors</li> <li>The programme coordinator responding to emails quickly and being helpful</li> <li>The university buildings, and the online canvas system</li> </ul> </li> <li>Negative aspects mentioned by respondents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too few method lectures, too little supervision, too little emphasis on law and legal methods, and a lack of legal scholars for thesis supervision</li> <li>Difficulty in access to master's programmes in other universities that demand political science credits</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--

Perceived discrepancies in the quality of supervision between supervisors, and differences in what supervisors say and what grading teachers say  
Inconsistency in grading between teachers  
That students oppose other students at the thesis seminars  
Some teachers grading harshly  
The restrictive word limit for the thesis

- *(add/remove points as needed)*

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

#### **Summary of the teacher's views:**

- Students correctly observe that there is a need to strengthen the legal aspects of the programme; as programme coordinator, I can only concur.
- It is difficult to coordinate the supervision and thesis writing process in general, since the programme lacks the hours of permanent staff to fully take on these tasks; thus, temporary supervisors are employed, often with very short notice.
- There is a need for more discussion between all teachers involved in supervision and grading to further coordinate this process and the criteria involved.
- *(add/remove points as needed)*

### **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 am handing over the position of programme coordinator to another teacher, so these are recommendations for my successor but also for the department:
- 1) For the department: hire an additional legal scholar. I have advocated for this for years. We need to strengthen this aspect of the programme. If there is no possibility of a permanent position, gain access to someone on a semi-permanent basis, so we can at least consistently offer legal methods teaching and supervision. The head of department has been notified, and is working to address this issue.
- 2) Hire an additional permanent teacher to be involved in supervision and grading (could be the same position as referenced in point 1, above) of theses, and make sure to coordinate this process further. A meeting of all teachers involved in the programme to discuss the issue of coordination has already been announced, in agreement with the incoming programme coordinator.
- 3) The issue of political science credits has been discussed in the KPN (which includes the incoming programme coordinator).
- By way of conclusion, there are structural problems involved with a lack of teaching hours and regular access to certain competencies within the programme. There is also an apparent need for more coordination in supervision and grading. All of these issues have been communicated, and a process to address them has been initiated, in dialogue with the head of the department, and the incoming programme coordinator.
- *(add/remove points as needed)*

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

