



COURSE EVALUATION

This handout is a course evaluation for the following course:

Introduction to Public International Law from a Human Rights Perspective
HUMR 4100

Directions: Please answer all of the questions in this survey, adding as many additional comments as you wish. Do not write your name or any other identifying statements on this form—all evaluations are to remain entirely confidential.

Purpose: The purpose of this course evaluation is to attain specific input about the quality of the classes in this course. The instructors and administration will examine your opinions to improve any future offerings of this course.

Evaluation Scale: For questions asking you to give a rating between A and F, please circle the letter which you assign. The letter scale is equivalent to the UiO academic scale. A 'C' is average, no more or less than expected. A 'B' is better than average and an 'A' outstanding. A 'D' is worse than you expected while an 'E' is much worse, but not quite an 'F,' which is a rating for this survey of altogether useless.

The rating 'X' means 'not applicable' and is appropriate only when you have no basis for answering the question (e.g. you did not attend a class in which a question asks you to evaluate the instructor on that day).

THE OVERALL COURSE

Your overall evaluation of this course, considering all factors

A B C D E F
6 10 2 B

GENERAL COMMENTS

In this space, you can make any comments you wish about the course, in general.

Comment 1: Since there is very few with a legal background this course should be expanded.

Comment 2: Richard thank you for being friendly and sincere...keep being like that...Please organize visiting lecturers who would bring different perspective. Meeting Prof. Butenshøns was great, especially over the lunch.

Comment 3: I hope that there will be more written assignments to train the ability at student arguing or giving opinion especially in the human rights issues.

Comment 4: Need more time for cases, and exercises.

Comment 5: Just one suggestion that some teacher should speak slowly.

Comment 6: Richard Hustad was excellent at presenting lecturers and raising questions. The only suggestion I would have, in regards to the whole course, is the lecturers follow their topics more clearly, this was not always done. Also, due to the wealth of information presented in each lecture, it would be nice if the lecture notes (i.e. power point presentations) were printed and handed out (This was done sometimes, but not always).

Comment 7: I thought it was odd that there were so many instructors, and it might have been good to reduce the number so that there could be less repetition, the ability to go more in depth on some issues and the opportunity to develop more of a relationship with some of the instructors.

Comment 8: The course seemed a bit sporadic but overall was very interesting and enjoyable.

**COURSE EVALUATION****THE INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS IN THE COURSE****Richard Hustad Miller**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	X
Your overall evaluation of the instructor, considering all factors	10	7	1	1			B
Clarity of instruction in each class	7	9	2	1			B
Structure of each class	5	8	5	1			B
Relevance of each class to the course purpose	10	5	2	1			B
Usefulness of any handouts (in class or posted on web page)	12	4	3				A
Usefulness of any class illustrations (on white/chalk board or PowerPoint)	9	5	4				B
Ability to moderate student discussion in relation to class topic(s)	10	5	3	1			B
Ability to answer student questions	10	6	2				B
Declared openness to student questions and discussion	13	4		1			A
Actual opportunity for student questions and discussion	13	4		1			A
Apparent instructor preparation for each class	12	4	2	1			A
Promptness in which each class began	13	5	1				A
Timeliness of break in each class	8	7	3	1			B
Promptness in which each class ended	9	7	2	1			B
Availability outside of class hours	6	2	1				A
Desire to take another course from this instructor	11	5	1	2			A
Degree which you recommend this instructor to others	14	7	1	1			A

**Cecilie Hellestvet**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	X
Your overall evaluation of the instructor, considering all factors	9	8	1	1			B
Clarity of instruction in each class	9	9	1				B
Structure of each class	8	8	3				B
Relevance of each class to the course purpose	10	7	1	1			B
Usefulness of any handouts (in class or posted on web page)	10	5	1	1			B
Usefulness of any class illustrations (on white/chalk board or PowerPoint)	9	6	3		1		B
Ability to moderate student discussion in relation to class topic(s)	4	9	4		1		B
Ability to answer student questions	9	6	4	1			B
Declared openness to student questions and discussion	10	5	4				B
Actual opportunity for student questions and discussion	10	5	3		1		B
Apparent instructor preparation for each class	12	4	2				A
Promptness in which each class began	11	5	1	1		1	B
Timeliness of break in each class	4	6	6	2		1	C
Promptness in which each class ended	4	4	7	2		2	C
Availability outside of class hours	2	3	2				B
Desire to take another course from this instructor	11	6	1		1		B
Degree which you recommend this instructor to others	10	7	1		1		B



**COURSE EVALUATION**

**Gro Nystuen**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	X
Your overall evaluation of the instructor, considering all factors	8	9	1				B
Clarity of instruction in each class	10	7					A
Structure of each class	12	5					A
Relevance of each class to the course purpose	14	3					A
Usefulness of any handouts (in class or posted on web page)	9	4	1	1			B
Usefulness of any class illustrations (on white/chalk board or PowerPoint)	11	3	2		1		B
Ability to moderate student discussion in relation to class topic(s)	7	7	2				B
Ability to answer student questions	9	7					A
Declared openness to student questions and discussion	6	8	3				B
Actual opportunity for student questions and discussion	8	5	4				B
Apparent instructor preparation for each class	11	6					A
Promptness in which each class began	13	4					A
Timeliness of break in each class	10	7					A
Promptness in which each class ended	11	6					A
Availability outside of class hours	4	2	2				B
Desire to take another course from this instructor	10	6	1				A
Degree which you recommend this instructor to others	9	9					A

**Geir Ulfstein**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	X
Your overall evaluation of the instructor, considering all factors	8	8	2				B
Clarity of instruction in each class	8	7	2	1			B
Structure of each class	11	7	1				A
Relevance of each class to the course purpose	9	9					A
Usefulness of any handouts (in class or posted on web page)	7	5	2				B
Usefulness of any class illustrations (on white/chalk board or PowerPoint)	10	5	2		1		B
Ability to moderate student discussion in relation to class topic(s)	6	8	3				B
Ability to answer student questions	7	10	1				B
Declared openness to student questions and discussion	8	7	2				B
Actual opportunity for student questions and discussion	6	9	3				B
Apparent instructor preparation for each class	9	7		1			B
Promptness in which each class began	12	5	1				A
Timeliness of break in each class	12	4	2				A
Promptness in which each class ended	7	8	2				B
Availability outside of class hours	4	5	1	1			B
Desire to take another course from this instructor	8	7	2	1			B
Degree which you recommend this instructor to others	9	6	3				B



**COURSE EVALUATION**

**SELF EVALUATION OF YOUR PERFORMANCE IN THE COURSE**

Hours you estimate you used to prepare for each class?	>4=5	4=6	3=3	2=4		
Your participation in class	A=4	B=4	C=5	D=4	E=1	
Of the eight, two-hour classes, how many did you attend?	All=14	7=3	6=1			
Your attempts to interact with instructor(s) outside of class		B=10	C=3	D=2	E=1	F=1
Degree to which you feel this evaluation reflects your opinions	A=4	B=11	C=2	D=1		

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (continue on a separate sheet, if necessary)**

Comment 1: Personal “power” and dynamic means a lot in my personal evaluation.

Comment 2: Would be great if the Centre organized course trip to the cabin or somewhere. It would helped to get to know whole class. I have not talked with many of my classmates. I don’t have chance to. It is annoying...Please help! We need unofficial setting where all would attend and would not have a “chance” to leave...

Comment 3: Would like to have more structural material with relevant examples and a clear guideline as for questions and discussions with students during classes; more example on countries all over the world and not accent on the USA (law, politics, etc.)

Comment 4: As an introductory course it would have been fantastic to hear about possible internships (for non-Norwegian speakers) here in Oslo.

Comment 5: I think that there should be a section evaluating the course, the course syllabus and the interaction of the two. In the case of PIL, I felt that Cassese was enormously interesting, very detailed, very informative, but then wasn’t sufficiently discussed in a structured way during the course.

I didn’t feel that the class content necessarily pertained directly to the reading. None of the recommended reading was even mentioned or referred to.

If this hadn’t been a pass/fail course, I would have been completely bewildered by whether to focus on the class content (which was general and introductory) or the incredibly specific and detailed Cassese content which could fill countless exams, papers, etc.

I liked the class assignments and thought they were relevant and useful.

Comment 6: It is a helpful when a clearly outlined lecture is presented. It would be helpful to know a general idea of what is being presented in each lecture and what we, as students, should do outside of class to further our knowledge of the important points. Such as “if you would like to know more, look here \_\_\_\_\_” or “You should understand all these terms. If you don’t look them up here \_\_\_\_\_”

Comment 7: Please speak more slowly and clearly!