

INTER2000 in a nutshell

The course aims to improve students' ability to develop, substantiate, reflect on, and evaluate advisory memos directed to national or international decision makers in international politics.

The grade is to be based on two written memos (accounting for 40% each, a total of 80% of the grade) and two written comments on memos written by others (a total of 20% of the grade).

The formal requirement for getting a grade is presence at 70% of the the seminar events but students are strongly expected to attend each and every event. Should compelling reasons prohibit presence, the seminar leader must be informed as soon as possible. The seminar leader will log presence and absence.

Lectures

Our three lectures primes students for memo writing in three ways.

- The first uses core elements negotiations theory to bring out certain dilemmas that participants in an advisory expert team must take into consideration when developing the advice.
- The second offers a string of lessons and reflections on memo writing based on the teachers' extensive practical experience as either providers or recipients, or both, of expert advice.
- The third will use two example memos, written by INTER2000 students an earlier year on a case that is not on this year's list, as basis for concrete discussion of how to develop and evaluate an advisory memo. Students are expected to have read the case study, the example memos, and the evaluations before the lecture.

Seminars

Each student is to sign up for one of the five seminar. The course leadership will divide each seminar into 3-4 groups, called Expert Advisory Teams and assign to each student Lead-Author responsibility for two memos, each responding to an assignment relating to a case study that will be discussed on one of the seminar events. The Lead Author is to submit the memo on both Inspira and Canvas.

For each of the 3-4 memos to be presented and discussed at a seminar event, the seminar leader will nominate a Lead Opponent responsible for the first 5-minute round of discussion of strong and weaker parts of the memo, offering advice on how to improve it. Students will not know in advance when they will be selected for the Lead-Opponent role and so must

always prepare for it. The Lead Opponent is to submit written comments, drawing also on other inputs made during the seminar event, on both Inspira and Canvas.

Examination

The exam thus comprises four submissions on Inspira – two memos and two written comments.

All members of an Expert Advisory Team will contribute to the contents of the memo but the submitted memo will affect the grade of the Lead Author only. A memo contains an advisory part and a reflective part. The advisory part is the most important of the two, responding to a specific advisory assignment within the larger case examined at the seminar event. The reflective part is to address what more generic phenomenon the decision is a case of, and to what extent and how theory (general or specific) from the field of international relations have been particularly helpful in supporting the development of the advice. The word limit for each memo is 2500 in total; the expected length of its reflective part is 500–700 words.

The word limit for each written comment is 500.

On technical requirements of the memo, consult the Examination link of the course web page.

Deadlines

The deadline for submission on Inspira and Canvas by the Lead Author is 14.00 on the Friday prior to the presentation, whatever the week day of the seminar.

The deadline for submission on Inspira and Canvas by the Lead Opponent is 24 hours after the seminar event (not counting weekends or holidays).

Generic evaluation criteria

A <i>Excellent</i>	B <i>Very good</i>	C <i>Good</i>	D <i>Satisfactory</i>	E <i>Sufficient</i>	F <i>Fail</i>
Advanced understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, very high scholarly independence, and excellent analytical skills	Very good understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, high scholarly independence and very good analytical skills	Good understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, scholarly independence and good analytical skills	Some understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, some scholarly independence and analytical skills	Uneven understanding of the topic, including key concepts and perspectives, limited scholarly independence and analytical skills	Insufficient knowledge of the curriculum. Does not satisfy minimum requirements to learning outcome

