

# Emneevaluering / course evaluation ISV

Lastet ned: 31. januar 2025 kl. 20:57

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Svar-ID: 34673786 | Levert: 28.01.25 11:05 |
|-------------------|------------------------|

Navn / name \*

Navn til emneansvarlig

Yves Steinebach

Semester

Høsten 2024

Velg kursnivå \*

Masterkurs

\*

Bolk 3

Emnekode / course code \*

STV4428B

Emnenavn / Course title

Theories of public policy and the policy process

### Learning outcomes in the course

The objective of STV4428B is to provide students with knowledge and skills derived from important public policy theories. In terms of knowledge, the students showed a solid understanding of the political science theories that explain who and what influences public policy choices and design. They grasped how these theories can be employed to navigate the various steps in the decision-making process, from agenda setting to the execution of political decisions. They developed insights into the complex interplay between national and international dynamics that shape policy-making and its implementation. Additionally, they became aware of the diverse challenges associated with implementing political decisions. On the skills front, most students demonstrated their ability to analyze the factors causing policy change and decisions. They could form reasoned opinions on the strengths and weaknesses of central explanatory approaches in studying public policy. Furthermore, students showed the capacity to carry out independent and clear written analyses of the causes (drivers) and consequences of specific political outputs or outcomes.

### Teaching methods and organization

The course was facilitated by Yves Steinebach, Jens Jungblut, and Jon Valgermo. Yves led four sessions, Jens conducted three, and Jon directed one. The introductory sessions was given collaboratively by Jens and Yves, and the seminar session, in which students presented their term paper ideas and drafts were conducted by all three.

Each session was structured to include both theoretical texts and two application texts, allowing for a comprehensive and practical understanding of the concepts. The main teaching method was input from the course leaders backed up by a PowerPoint presentation. In addition, various educational tools were utilized throughout the course, including group work. For instance, group discussion was encouraged on the theme of framing strategies for different issues. Additionally, an implementation game was incorporated into the course, intended to showcase to the students that the possibility of successful policy implementation, on aggregate, is often lower than anticipated.

### Learning environment and students' effort

Overall, the course saw a satisfactory attendance rate. While the students' attendance decreased over time, the attendance was always sufficient to facilitate discussion and group work in the course.

### Student's feedback

Students expressed being "really, really, really happy" with the course, particularly appreciating its structured approach, selected texts, and the clear distinction between theoretical concepts and their practical applications. Moreover, they liked the overall atmosphere in the course. Furthermore, they highlighted their appreciation for the course leaders' efforts in pointing out potential theories and data sources that could be utilized in their master theses. Despite the positive feedback, students indicated a desire for more guidance on writing a term paper, suggesting the addition of a second seminar to focus on this topic. Additionally, some readings for the final session were missing from Leganto. Opinions on the effectiveness of group discussions were mixed.

### Overall assessment and further development

Overall, we consider the course to have been highly successful, as students gained substantial knowledge in public policy. Moreover, it appears we successfully sparked significant interest among students in public policy research.

An additional aspect to consider is that last year, students were critical of the seminar session's design and scope. Most notably, they expressed concerns over insufficient time allocated to discussing each paper, which they felt offered little assistance in writing their term papers. This year, we responded to this feedback by dividing the seminar into three parallel groups. Despite requests for one additional seminar session, the seminar and the feedback received were generally very positive. It thus seems that our changes were effective in addressing the critique we received last year.

### Emneevalueringen bør inneholde:

#### 1. Vurdering av emnet

- Læringsutbytte i emnet
- Undervisningsformer og organisering
- Andre relevante temaer som læringsmiljø, studentenes arbeidsinnsats og eventuelt vurderingsformer

#### 2. Studentens tilbakemelding

- Oppsummering av studentenes viktigste tilbakemeldinger

#### 3. Helhetlig vurdering og videreutvikling

- En samlet vurdering av kvaliteten på emnet
- Justeringer som er foretatt som følge av evalueringen.
- Muligheter for videreutvikling av emnet

### The course evaluation should include:

#### 1. Assessment of the course

- Learning outcomes in the course
- Teaching methods and organization
- Other relevant topics such as the learning environment, students' effort and possibly forms of assessment

#### 2. Student's feedback

- Summary of students' most important feedback

#### 3. Overall assessment and further development

- An overall assessment of the quality of the course
- Adjustments made as a result of the evaluation.
- Opportunities for further development of the course