

ANNUAL REPORT 2012 SUPERVISION OF THE EXAMINERS

1. Background information

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

JUR5440 EU Substantive Law

JUR 5411 Petroleum Law

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

Three years

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?

Individual examinations in EU Substantive Law (JUR5440) and Petroleum Law (JUR 5411) at the Maritime Law Master Programme. Master degree.

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

The examinations selected represent the grades A to D.

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

No meetings have taken place. E-mail and mail have been used in the communication with the Department/Institute.

2.4. Other comments

No.

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

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

Learning goals: Regarding both courses the examination questions relate to the learning outcomes of the courses. All questions concern central parts of the courses. However, the nature of the questions differ between the courses. The EU Substantive Law examination include a number of questions where the students are asked to solve practical cases. The questions in the Petroleum Law examination are of a purely theoretical nature. From a pedagogical point of view the EU Substantive Law examination appears as much broader since it measures not only the theoretical knowledge of the students but also their ability to make use of that knowledge.

Teaching and learning forms: The teaching at the Petroleum Law course consists of a number of lectures only, while the teaching at the EU Substantive Law consists of both lectures and seminars. From a pedagogical point of the EU Substantive Law seems to be more developed compared to the Petroleum Law course. The students are not only informed by the teacher but do also get opportunities to discuss the subject from a practical point of view at seminars.

Information given to students regarding the grading of exams: The information to the students seems good. Most students are probably very familiar with the ECTS system for grading.

The process behind the work out with the exam questions: I have no information about this. Regarding Petroleum Law the examination appears as rather traditional and it is obvious that it only measures one aspect of the students' skills, i.e. theoretical knowledge of the subject.

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

Intention of the study: The intention of the study has been to evaluate the examination process with regard to the master courses EU Substantive Law and Petroleum Insurance. A part of the work has consisted of checking the quality of the evaluation of the students' performance at the exams.

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: I find that the grading in both EU Substantive Law and Petroleum Law corresponds to the quality of the individual performance of the candidates. The examiners have done a good work in this respect, in particular the examiners at the EU Substantive Law course. Looking at the EU Substantive Law examination the reasoning of students who have been graded an A clearly appear to be of a higher quality than the reasoning of the students who have been graded an C or D. The top students are not only presenting an answer to the questions but are also analysing the sources of law as a part of their answer.

Impartial and professional evaluation of the student's knowledge and skills. With regard to the exams I have studied, it is quite clear that the grading has been carried out in an impartial and professional way. As mentioned above the grading corresponds to the quality of the individual performance of the candidates and in itself this indicates a high degree of impartiality and professionalism of the examiners.

Information given to the students about the examination. The basic function of an examination is to check and grade the abilities of an individual student. In this respect it is important that it is possible for the students to see what parts of the answer that have been awarded. There should also be a model answer with which it would be possible for the students to compare their own answer. Otherwise it would be difficult for the students to understand why they have been awarded a certain grade and/or to lodge a complaint regarding an awarded grade.

However, from a pedagogical the examination should also serve as a learning tool. This can be done in the form of individual comments on the content of the answer of a student. This appears as important, especially if a student is awarded a rather low grade. The comments can be of great value for the student, in future studies of the subject. For a student who is awarded the grade F this seems more or less necessary because of the fact that he or she will have to study to the re-exam. None of the examinations I have been provided with contain any comments made by the examiners at all. This appears as a missed opportunity to give the students feed back.

The evaluation process in general. I find that the grading is carried out in an impartial and professional way. The grades awarded correspond to the quality of the students' performances. However, the examination process can be improved with regard to certain aspects:

- 1) The examination in Petroleum Law should include questions of a practical nature (cases) in order to check not only the students' theoretical knowledge, but also their ability to make use of their knowledge.
- 2) Both in EU Substantive Law and Petroleum Law the students should receive more information about what parts of the answers have been awarded and comments on their answers. This would strengthen the students' position with regard to the possibility to appeal against the grading of the individual answers. The examination would also serve not only as a checkpoint, but also as pedagogical instrument, i.e. as a part of the teaching at the course.

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

No meetings with the Department/Institute have so far taken place.

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

See my previous report.

4.2. Other

5. Recommendations for the Department/institute's further work :

In general I find the standard of the examination very good.

Regarding my recommendations for the future work, see above 3.2 on the evaluation process in general.