

**TEMPLATE – ANNUAL REPORT
FOR USE FOR THE SUPERVISORS OF THE EXAMINERS**

The Law Faculty is free to concretise and add information to the template. The supervisor of the examiners is responsible for the report which is to be sent to the Law Faculty. The Law Faculty is responsible to give further details of the formal treatment of the report, including copies.

1. Background information

1.1. Course(s), group of course(s), study programs or subjects the report is valid for

M.Phil degree in Theory and Practice of Human Rights

1.2. Period of time the supervisor of the examiners is appointed for

Academic years 2011-12 through 2013-14

2. The evaluation process

2.1. Which parts of the evaluation process have you as supervisor for the examiners been invited to comment upon or describe?

If the supervisor of the examiners has been evaluating student's individual examinations, please indicate to which degree and for which subject(s).

I have been asked to comment on the quality of the programme mentioned above, through an assessment of the examination of five exam scripts in the two following modules:

- HUMR5190 Research Methodology and Thesis Development (essays)
- HUMR5701 Human Rights and Development: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Theory and Practices (in two parts: one time-limited essay (60% of mark); and one examination paper (4 hours exam), counting 40% of mark.

2.2. Principles for any possible selection of students individual examinations regarding grading

- **HUMR5190** is a pass/fail course, and all exam scripts sent to reviewer have received 'pass' mark
- **HUMR5701** exam scripts have been selected on the basis of demonstrating the full range or marks (A-D), with one essay each receiving the mark of A, B and D, and two essays receiving C.

2.3. Meetings with the Department/institute (number of meetings, number of participants, main themes).

None

2.4. Other comments

I was provided with essays, 'take-home' examinations, and regular examination scripts. There is some confusion as to the course numbering. According to information sent to me, I was supposed to review HUMR5190; while much of the related materials are labeled HUMR5191. Furthermore, one script for this course (candidate 8011) only contained every other page (2,4,6 etc.), and I could therefore not read the full response.

3. Evaluation of the grading of individual performances of the students and the form of evaluation in question.

The unnumbered points below are meant to be a guidance for the content of the evaluation, and not as main headlines.

3.1. Evaluation of the examination questions - how do you feel the exam questions have been regarding:

- Learning goals

Godkjent av rektor 08.06.05 etter Studiekomiteens anbefaling

The exam questions clearly reflected the overall teaching and learning goals of the module, giving the students ample ability to demonstrate their overall understanding of the relationship between development and human rights, and also to put this into a wider perspective of e.g. poverty.

- Teaching (content)

Not able to comment on this.

- Syllabus and reading lists

The syllabus and reading lists are comprehensive and up to date. This is according to what I would expect for a specialised course on this level.

- Teaching and learning forms

Lectures and seminars are common teaching methods on this level, and should function well to prepare the students for the exam questions given.

- Information given to students regarding the grading of exams

The information given (as far as I have been informed) seems adequate. One query could be asked regarding the requirements for word count in an examination. How do the students know how many words they have written (taking time out to count seems futile)? And second, what happens if they do not comply with these word counts?

- The process behind the work out with the exam questions

I do not have information about this.

3.2. Evaluation of the examination form, the examination process, the grading and the level regarding:

- Intention of the study

This is my second year as external reviewer of the programme, and I appreciate having been sent different elements of the assessment methods to get a better view of the programme as a whole. It seems to me that the assessment methods used in the programme are varied, and that they therefore play to different strengths of the students. I consider this as a hall mark of a high quality programme.

- Use of the grading scale, including the level of the student's performances; does the examination and grading reflect an adequate level compared to similar studies

From the samples that were sent to me, it seems that the grading scale is used efficiently. There is consistency amongst the grades and the content of the individual pieces of work.

- Impartial and professional evaluation of the student's knowledge and skills

This seems perfectly fine to me. I was in agreement with the level of marking of the individual pieces of work, and comments made by examiners were pertinent.

- Information given to the students about the examination

I do not have information about feed-back given to the students on the work submitted.

- The evaluation process in general

The evaluation process seems to be rigorous, to high standards, and comparable to similar programmes I have been involved with in the UK (Oxford and Lancaster).

4. Explanation of the meetings that has been done with the Department/institute during the evaluation process

No meetings have taken place

4.1. What advice (if any) has the supervisor of the examiners been addressing the Department/the institute during the evaluation process

None

4.2. Other

None

**5. Recommendations for the Department/institute's further work :
How was the feedback to the Department/institute regarding the evaluation from the supervisor of the examiners and his/hers recommendations/contributions to/measures in order to improve:**

5.1. The evaluation

The evaluation seems to be rigorous and should continue in its present form.

5.2. The standard of the study

- Cohesion, structure and content

From the elements I have assessed this year and last year, the cohesion seems to function well. From the information about the structure and content of the programme, there seems to be a good mix of compulsory foundational modules with optional modules that can cater to each student's personal interests while retaining a coherent programme.

- How the subjects function within the frame of the program

Please see comment above.

- Main judgement of the study (standard, actuality etc.)

The programme serves current needs of students interested in international human rights, and gives a good foundation for research on high academic level.

Further comments :

Having now considered different elements of the programme over two years, I am confident that the programme is of high quality, that the students are taught to high levels and that their research skills improve through the programme.

I appreciate that my comments on last year's evaluation have been acted upon and that the information I requested then was sent to me this year. This has enabled me to carry out a better informed evaluation.

(Could I suggest that spell check is used on this form, as there are a number of typos in the questions.)

Lancaster, 20 February 2012

Professor Sigrun Skogly