

Grading guidelines MEVIT4620/3620 Scholars at Risk (SAR) Student Advocacy Seminar FALL 2023

Kindly refer to [MEVIT4620 – Scholars at Risk \(SAR\) Student Advocacy Seminar – Universitetet i Oslo \(uio.no\)](https://www.uio.no/eng/education/programmes/4620-3620-scholars-at-risk-sar-student-advocacy-seminar) for course descriptions and learning outcomes. The BA and MA course has the same learning outcomes and formal requirements. The only difference is the length of the obligatory individual reflection report. All students who have submitted the exam has completed the reflection report.

Please note the following:

The course is Pass/Fail. Please refer to the [grading guidelines from the Faculty of Humanities](#) where it is stated:

b) Dichotomous grading scale: *pass/fail*

When the dichotomous *pass/fail* grading scale is used, *pass* is given to anyone who satisfies the absolute requirements stated in the grading guidelines and course description. This means that the boundary between *pass* and *fail* is established with reference to quality standards that – on an independent basis – distinguish what can be approved and what cannot be approved, for example, as a basis for further study. The boundary between *pass* and *fail* shall not be linked to the boundary between some grades in the letter grading scale.

Thus, the examination of this course should consider quality standards that can be approved. Below is a description of what elements that can be considered in this course, based on the course content.

Examination is three parts: Group report (target 40 pages), impact assessment report (format and length at the discretion of the group, this report will be shared by SAR international) and finally a signed confirmation of authorship statement.

The group report is to be considered the main examination output, while the two others are supporting documents that need to be submitted to receive a pass grade.

Group work assignment - Final advocacy report

Group report (target 40 pages +/- 10%) is the main output of the course. During the course, and due to the nature of the course and workload where testing is part of the learning process, the impact/success of the campaign itself is not to be assessed on a pass/fail level. Rather it is the quality of the report and ability to describe and reflect on the group work that is key. Using the syllabus and/or placing work within the context of academic freedom principles should in particular be rewarded, as this goes to the core of the course content and learning outcome.

During the course the students have been given a suggested template for the group report (see below). While this is not a requirement, the elements could be considered when evaluating the report on the pass/fail basis.

To pass the course the report should contain at least basic descriptions that can link to all eight points listed below.

1. Short summary of report
2. Background – brief context information (course), SAR
3. Context: academic freedom and SAR
4. Your case
 1. Background of case
 2. Political context
 3. Other important information
5. Your advocacy campaign
 1. Your overall strategy/strategies and message - and why this and not something else?
 2. Planning (why this? Why this way?) – including risk assessment /considerations.
 3. Describe the campaign (Use examples (visual/pictures/screen shot of posts)
 4. Execution – e.g. What you did, where, when and for how long
 5. Impact
6. Analysis and reflection
 1. What worked – why?
 2. What did not work – why?
 3. Learning points
 4. Recommendations for further campaigns
7. Acknowledgements
8. References

Keep it as concrete as possible - visual examples and aids could be helpful. Remember this will be a «public» document.

Impact assessment report: Group work assignment on providing a public impact assessment report (2-4 pages or in multimedia format) based on the experience of the group and recommendations for further advocacy.

In evaluating the group assessment report the effectiveness of the report in providing context and evidence for impact/impact assessment should be considered. Relevant elements include:

1. Description of campaign (short)
2. Assessment of impact
3. Lessons learned
4. Do's and Don'ts
5. List of material created and that can be shared/used by others

This list has also been shared with the students.

Declaration of authorship signed by all group members:

The declaration of authorship should contain brief information on responsibilities and work of each individual member. The declaration should be used to evaluate and consider pass/fall of the course on an individual basis, and in relation to the content in the overall report.

Syllabus for the course:

1. Charles J. Stewart CAS, Craig Allen Smith. *Persuasion and social movements*. 6th ed. Waveland Press; 2012.
2. Mihr A, Schmitz HP. Human Rights Education (HRE) and Transnational Activism. *Human rights quarterly*. 2007;29(4):973–993. doi:10.1353/hrq.2007.0046
3. Keck ME, Sikkink K. Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics. *International social science journal*. 1999;51(159):89–101. doi:10.1111/1468-2451.00179
4. Schmitz HP, Dedmon JM, Bruno-van Vijfeijken T, Mahoney J. Democratizing advocacy?: How digital tools shape international non-governmental activism. *Journal of information technology & politics*. 2020;17(2):174–191. doi:10.1080/19331681.2019.1710643
5. Hall N, Schmitz HP, Dedmon JM. Transnational Advocacy and NGOs in the Digital Era: New Forms of Networked Power. *International studies quarterly*. 2020;64(1):159–167. doi:10.1093/isq/sqz052
6. Scholars at Risk's Academic Freedom Monitoring Project. Free to think. Scholars at Risk Network; 2023. <https://www.scholarsatrisk.org/resources/free-to-think-2022/>
7. Fuchs RF. Academic Freedom. Its Basic Philosophy, Function, and History. *Law and contemporary problems*. 1963;28(3):431–446. doi:10.2307/1190640
8. Peter Maassen DM. State of play of academic freedom in the EU Member States.; 2023. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2023/740231/EPRS_STU\(2023\)740231_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2023/740231/EPRS_STU(2023)740231_EN.pdf)
9. Butler J. Academic Freedom and the Critical Task of the University. *Globalizations*. 2017;14(6):857–861. doi:10.1080/14747731.2017.1325168
10. Karran T, Beiter K, Mallinson L. Academic freedom in Scandinavia: has the Nordic model survived? *Nordic journal of studies in educational policy*. 2023;9(1):4–19. doi:10.1080/20020317.2023.2180795
11. Skea C. Academic freedom and Netflix's «The Chair»: Implications for staff-student dialogue. *Educational philosophy and theory*. 2022;ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print):1–12. doi:10.1080/00131857.2022.2161891
12. Cheng EW, Lui E, Fu K wa. The power of digital activism for transnational advocacy: Leadership, engagement, and affordance. *New media & society*. Published online 2023. doi:10.1177/14614448231155376
13. Ihlen Ø, Raknes K, Somerville I, mfl. Framing “the public interest”: Comparing public lobbying campaigns in four European states. *Journal of public interest communications*. 2018;2(1):107–128. doi:10.32473/jpic.v2.i1.p107