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Course Prerequisites (if any)

None.

Course Description

This course examines the rise and influence of ‘transnational network diplomacy’ (TND) and global public policy-making. TND is an umbrella term for a variety of emerging diplomacy actors that go beyond the rigid hierarchies of state-to-state diplomacy, but rather encompass a variety of state and non-state actors (such as transnational civil society groups,
international experts, philanthropic of educational foundations, think tanks) as well as influential individuals (including policy entrepreneurs or ‘celebrity diplomats’) that influence state-based diplomatic processes and outcomes. The course not only examines the functioning, strengths and weaknesses of transnational network diplomacy and its evolution, but also places it in the wider context of collaborative diplomatic approaches to global public policy-making.

**Course Learning Objectives (CLO)**

**In terms of knowledge:**
- Demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical underpinnings of network diplomacy and global public policy-making
- Demonstrate knowledge of the practice of and actors in transnational network diplomacy and global public policy-making across different policy areas
- Demonstrate knowledge of the challenges, strengths and weaknesses of transnational network diplomacy

**In terms of skills:**
- reflect critically and intervene (in writing) in current academic and policy-relevant debates
- critically present and discuss the course literature
- present research findings to an audience
- act as discussant on a research paper

**In terms of attitudes, students should develop in this course:**
- approach critically both contextual and conceptual questions surrounding the network diplomacy and transnational policy-making
- understand and engage critically with competing explanations of contemporary events
- value and respect alternative views and perspectives

**LINK BETWEEN PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES, COURSE OBJECTIVES, TEACHING METHODS, ASSIGNMENTS AND FEEDBACK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Course Learning Objectives addressing the Programme Objectives (testable learning objectives)</th>
<th>Methods used to Teach Course Objectives and numbers/types of assignments used to test these learning objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Knowledge of major Theories and Core Concepts of</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of the theoretical underpinnings of network diplomacy and global public policy-making</td>
<td>Lectures and Seminars (especially weeks 1-4);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Course Learning objectives addressing the Programme Objectives (testable learning objectives)</td>
<td>Methods used to Teach Course Objectives and numbers/types of assignments used to test these learning objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations (IR) and their practical application to historical and contemporary policy issues, debates and controversies from a Western and global perspective</td>
<td>theoretical underpinnings of network diplomacy and global public policy-making</td>
<td>(Feedback on) written assignment and student presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Knowledge of core actors, organizations and players at the national, regional and global level – both in the state and non-state actor realm</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of the practice of and actors in transnational network diplomacy and global public policy-making across different policy areas</td>
<td>Lectures and Seminars (especially weeks 5-8); (Feedback on) written assignment and student presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Knowledge of major processes, developments and dynamics related to conflicts and the promotion of peace and security</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of the practice of and actors in transnational network diplomacy and global public policy-making across different policy areas</td>
<td>Lectures and Seminars (especially weeks 9-14); (Feedback on) written assignment and student presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. Ability to apply acquired understanding to concrete ‘real-life’ issues and challenges in the areas of global peace, security and strategy</td>
<td>reflect critically and intervene (in writing) in current academic and policy-relevant debates</td>
<td>(Feedback on) written assignment and student presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Ability to develop and apply ideas and arguments emanating from interdisciplinary theory, concepts and paradigms in the formulation of academic and/or policy-relevant analyses</td>
<td>reflect critically and intervene (in writing) in current academic and policy-relevant debates critically present and discuss the course literature</td>
<td>(Feedback on) written assignment and student presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. Develop and apply critical thinking skills and a critical mindset to the synthesis and evaluation of competing perspectives and theories of peace, security and strategic studies</td>
<td>reflect critically and intervene (in writing) in current academic and policy-relevant debates critically present and discuss the course literature</td>
<td>Seminar discussions (Feedback on) written assignment (Feedback on) student presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Ability to evaluate the ethical dimension and societal implications of key approaches,</td>
<td>reflect critically and intervene (in writing) in current academic and</td>
<td>Seminar discussions (especially week 9-14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Course Learning objectives addressing the Programme Objectives (testable learning objectives)</td>
<td>Methods used to Teach Course Objectives and numbers/types of assignments used to test these learning objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies and paradigms related to peace, security and strategic issues</td>
<td>policy-relevant debates critically present and discuss the course literature</td>
<td>written assignment and student presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Ability to develop and communicate arguments, recommendations and research results in a convincing, precise and effective manner in <strong>written form</strong></td>
<td>reflect critically and intervene (in writing) in current academic and policy-relevant debates</td>
<td>(Feedback on) written assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Ability to develop and communicate arguments, recommendations and research results in a convincing, precise and effective manner through the <strong>spoken word</strong></td>
<td>critically present and discuss the course literature present research findings to an audience act as discussant on a research paper</td>
<td>Seminar discussions (Feedback on) student presentations, student discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. An attitude of open-mindedness, academic integrity, critical and self-critical reflection with a view to continuously contribute to rigorous analysis and academic debates</td>
<td>approach critically both contextual and conceptual questions surrounding the network diplomacy and transnational policy-making understand and engage critically with competing explanations of contemporary events value and respect alternative views and perspectives</td>
<td>Seminar discussion (Feedback on) student presentations, student discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Independence of thought and an autonomous approach to studying, research as and acquisition of new knowledge and skills</td>
<td>approach critically both contextual and conceptual questions surrounding the network diplomacy and transnational policy-making understand and engage critically with competing explanations of contemporary events</td>
<td>Seminar discussion (Feedback on) student presentations, student discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1. Ability to work effectively in a team with a commitment to supporting the community of learners through mutual support and leadership</td>
<td>act as discussant on a research paper</td>
<td>(Feedback on) student discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3. Intercultural awareness and sensitivity to different cultures, backgrounds and perspectives</td>
<td>value and respect alternative views and perspectives</td>
<td>Seminar discussions (Feedback on) student presentations, student discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Course Materials (please note that you can find the readings for each week and session in the Course Schedule section below):

The course material consists of powerpoint presentations, lecture notes and readings from the textbook. Powerpoint presentations will be made available after the respective classes have taken place. A week-by-week overview of the course readings can be found in the section below.

The syllabus, powerpoint presentations and important messages will be uploaded to the Vesalius portal ‘Canvas’. Students are expected to visit this site regularly to keep abreast of course evolutions. The professor is expected to upload relevant material in a timely manner.

Course material marked as ‘suggested readings’ and ‘additional sources’ is helpful for research and to gain an increased understanding but is not mandatory. This material can be found online or will be made available upon individual request.

Textbooks:


Recommended References books:

Active Learning and Intensive ‘Reading around the Subject’: Additional Sources, Recommended Journals and Websites:

Learning should be an active and self-motivated experience. Students who passively listen to lectures, copy someone else’s notes, and limit their readings to required chapters are unlikely to develop their critical thinking and expand their personal knowledge system. At the exam, these students often fail to demonstrate a critical approach. Students are strongly recommended to have an updated understanding of developments related to this course and related to their wider Programme. Active and engaged learning will turn out to be enriching to the overall course and class discussions. Students are invited to deepen their understanding of both theoretical and current issues from a variety of sources. Please find a list of suggestions compassing the entire course below. You are encouraged to read and browse in the leading journals of your discipline.

Leading Journals in IR

| International Affairs; International Interaction; Foreign Policy Analysis; Foreign Policy; International Security; European Journal of International Relations; International Organization; Review of International Studies; Cooperation and Conflict; Security Dialogue; International Relations of the Asia Pacific; International Studies Quarterly; International Relations of the Asia Pacific; International Studies Quarterly; International Security; International Studies Review; Global Governance; Security Studies; Journal of Common Market Studies; World Politics; Contemporary Security Policies; European Security; World Politics; Millennium: Journal of International Studies |

Other journals:


Work Load Calculation for this Course:

This course counts for 6 ECTS, which translates into 150 – 180 hours for the entire semester for this course. This means that you are expected to spend roughly 10 hours per week on this course. This includes 2 hours of lectures or seminars per week and 7 hours ‘out of class’ time spent on preparatory readings, studying time for exams as well as time spent on preparing your assignments. Please see below the estimated breakdown of your workload for this course.

Time spent in class: 2 hours per week / 30 hours per semester
Time allocated for course readings: 3 hours per week / 45 hours per semester
Time allocated for preparing Assignments 1: 60
Time allocated for preparing Assignment 2: 20
Time allocated for preparing Assignment 3: 10
Time allocated for preparing Assignment 4: 10
Number of reading pages per week: 50
Total hours for this Course: 160

Course Schedule (Overview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title of the session and major deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>Introduction to the course – politics, policy and polity beyond the state (MR, SK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>Networks, advocacy and power (SK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>Diplomacy in the 21st century (MR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>04.03</td>
<td>The new policy cycle (MR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>Institutionalized civil society – the case of the European Economic and Social Committee (Guest Lecture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>Global civil society (SK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (SK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8</td>
<td>01.04</td>
<td>New forms of diplomacy: Cities, think tanks, foundations and multinational corporations (MR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W9</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>Migration Governance (SK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W10</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>Global Health Governance – the role of the International Committee of the Red Cross (Guest Lecture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W11</td>
<td>06.05</td>
<td>Environmental Governance (MR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>Education and Science – Written essay due (SK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>Governing beyond the State – Comprehensive Security (MR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td>27.05</td>
<td>Legitimate and accountable? (SK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W15</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>Simulated conference (SK, MR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Session-by-Session Course Outline
Week 1 - Introduction to the course - Politics, policy and polity beyond the state (11.02)

Compulsory readings:

Recommended readings:

Week 2, Networks, advocacy and power (18.02)

Compulsory readings:

Recommended readings:


**Week 3 –Diplomacy in the 21st Century (25.03)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


**Week 4 – The new policy cycle (04.03)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


**Week 5 – Institutionalized civil society: the case of European Economic and Social Committee (11.03)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


Week 6 – Global Civil Society (18.03)

Compulsory readings:


Recommended readings:


**Week 7 – Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organizations (25.03)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 8 – New forms of diplomacy: Cities, think tanks, foundations and multinational corporations (01.04)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


**Week 9 – Migration Governance (22.04)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended Readings:**


---

**Week 10 – Global Health Governance: the role of the International Committee of the Red Cross (29.04)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended Readings:**


**Week 11 – Environmental Governance (06.05)**

**Compulsory readings:**


European Commission. Website on “EU climate action and the European Green Deal” https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/eu-climate-action_en#:~:text=The%20EU%20is%20fighting%20climate,at%20least%2055%25%20by%202030.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Website: https://www.ipcc.ch/

**Recommended readings:**


**Week 12 – Education and Science (13.05)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


**Week 13 – Governing beyond the State – Comprehensive Security (20.05)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


**Week 14 – Legitimate and Accountable? (27.05)**

**Compulsory readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


**Course Assessment: Assignments Overview**

The students will be evaluated on the basis of their performance as follows:

- Research Paper 50%
- Seminar Presentation 25%
- Conference Presentation 15%
- Conference Discussion 10%
- TOTAL 100%

**Grading Scale of Vesalius College**

Vesalius College grading policy follows the American system of letter grades, which correspond to a point scale from 0 – 100. **All assignments (including exams) must be graded on the scale of 0-100.** To comply with the Flemish Educational norms, professors should on request also provide the conversion of the grade on the Flemish scale of 0-20. The conversion table below outlines the grade equivalents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter grade</th>
<th>Scale of 100 (VeCo Grading Scale)</th>
<th>Scale of 20 (Flemish System)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>85-100</td>
<td>17.0-20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>81-84</td>
<td>16.1-16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>77-80</td>
<td>15.3-16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73-76</td>
<td>14.5-15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>69-72</td>
<td>13.7-14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>66-68</td>
<td>13.1-13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>12.3-13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Activities, Grading Criteria and Deadlines:

Research Paper (50% final grade) – due 13 May.

You are required to write a 4000-word paper (bibliography included) that a) analyses the main strategies adopted by a given actor in a given global policy domain and b) proposes up to five policy suggestions to advance its policy preferences in an international or domestic context through transnational diplomatic activities. You must submit your paper on Canvas by W12 (May 13). Use an informative file name (for example, “Kim POL4XXG research paper”) when you upload it on Canvas and make sure that your name is on the first page as well. The piece should contain at least 7 academic references. You must obtain prior written approval of the topic for this paper by W4 (failure to do so will reduce the grade for this assignment 10 percentage points). For approval of the topic, email to Stephan.Klose@vub.be by W4.

The paper will be composed by four main parts and structured as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>In the introduction you identify your research question and explain the significance of your project. Briefly describe how your research relates and adds to the existing literature. Provide a short preview of your main arguments and methodology. Briefly outline the structure of your paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part two – Literature review and Methodology</strong></td>
<td>In the literature review you outline in greater detail, and critically assess, the existing literature on your chosen topic. Explain how your research project adds to the literature and describe the significance of your project. Introduce the key concepts/theory which inform your analysis and motivate your choice. Provide a description of your methodology and motivate your methodological choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part three – Analysis of relevant trends</strong></td>
<td>Collect empirical data and analyse how your selected actor (e.g. a think tank, an NGO) advances its policy preferences in a particular global policy domain (e.g. environmental governance). Building on your data, you may use your analysis to draw out, for instance, your actor’s network-building/advocacy/policy strategy (or a given component of it, e.g. negotiation strategy, campaigning, honest brokerage). Drawing on your analysis, assess the effectiveness/weaknesses/problems of the actor’s actions. Make sure that your analysis addresses your research question, and is consistent with your methodological and conceptual choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 4 – Policy suggestions and</strong></td>
<td>Drawing on your analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the actor’s selected strategy, formulate up to five policy recommendations in order to strengthen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
concluding remarks

Briefly recap the key arguments of your analysis, and critically reflect the originality and most relevant aspects of your paper. Reflect on the paper’s limitations and identify avenues for future research.

Seminar Presentation (25% final grade)

Each of you will give a seminar presentation (max 15 minutes, using power point) in which you introduce and critically reflect on two course readings. This presentation will be followed by a short group discussion (max 15 minutes) which you will moderate, and for which you should prepare at least two questions. The presentation should (1) briefly introduce the main arguments of the two texts, (2) put the texts in context (of the wider literature), and (3) reflect on the texts’ strengths and weaknesses. The questions you select for the discussion should (1) be closely tied to the theme of the lecture/ reviewed articles, and (2) be suited for debate (not too technical, narrow or trivial). Please email your power point slides one day in advance of your presentation to Stephan.Klose@vub.be.

Conference Presentation (15% final grade)

In W15 you will present the main findings of your paper at the Global Policy Forum, a simulated roundtable of experts on global governance. You will formally act as a policy analyst speaking about ways to optimize the network-building/advocacy/policy strategy of a relevant IO, transnational actor or state in a given policy field. The presentation will be max 8 minutes, followed by the discussant’s remarks (7 minutes) and a Q&A session (5 minutes). You will need to share your research findings with your discussant by W14 (at the latest). In your presentation, be sure to provide a clear overview of your (1) research ambition, (2) your research questions, (3) your chosen conceptual/theoretical framework, (4) your methodological choices, (5) your findings, and (6) the limitations and (potential) contributions of your work to the literature.

Conference Discussion (10% final grade)

In W15 you will also act as the discussant for one of the presentations. In your discussion, for which you do not need to prepare slides, you will provide feedback to the presenter based on the research paper and conference presentation. In your feedback, try to briefly point out the, in your mind, main strengths and weaknesses of the presented research project and offer suggestions for how to improve the project further. The discussion should last no longer than 7 minutes. The presenter will send you the research paper at least one week ahead of the conference.

Rubrics: Transparent Grading Criteria For Each Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Paper</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>The research question</td>
<td>The introduction gives</td>
<td>Good ability to identify</td>
<td>Clear and concise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n Research Question / Statement / (20)</td>
<td>suffi cient information on the research question, the topic and the outline. A combination of flaws hinders the author’s argument.</td>
<td>a research question and to pose a relevant research question. Some redundancies. The outline is overall good and background information is relevant.</td>
<td>research question / Succinct outline of structure of the paper and main argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing, understanding and applying theories (25)</td>
<td>Theories are simply mentioned. Weak engagement with the course material. Severe conceptual or theoretical oversimplification.</td>
<td>Sufficient engagement with theoretical arguments; not all information provided is relevant to the analysis or the research question. The literature review shows basic critical engagement.</td>
<td>Overall, the literature review is well conceived. Some minor imprecision in the selection of the literature and the conceptual choice; Some flaws in the selection of the theoretical toolkit; fairly good critical abilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis / Discussion (25)</td>
<td>The analysis shows major pitfalls; Inability to apply theoretical frameworks to empirical cases. Information provided is insufficient; the analysis is superficial.</td>
<td>Sufficient ability to review relevant facts for the analysis. Core statements are not always supported by reference or evidence; not all information is relevant. Basic critical engagement.</td>
<td>Good critical analysis, supported by good information and data; some flaws in the use of data and reference in support of one’s argument; Minor flaws in the argumentative line and the application of theories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure (10)</td>
<td>Loose structure; failure to provide most relevant information. Serious mismatch between theory and analysis.</td>
<td>Some flaws in the structure of the paper; not all information is relevant; mismatch between theoretical and analytical frameworks.</td>
<td>Overall, the paper is well-structured. Some minor flaws in the organization hinder the strength of the argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion (10)</td>
<td>The conclusions mainly repeat previous sections; no critical evaluation or reflection on main findings</td>
<td>The conclusions show some attempts to critically review the main findings</td>
<td>Succinct summary of key findings and answer to the research question; Critical and open-minded evaluation of core arguments and results. Offers policy implications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Aspects (10)</td>
<td>Incorrect expression/referencing system; Insufficient readings (less than 5)</td>
<td>Some flaws in the expression and the referencing systems; Sufficient number of sources (at least 5).</td>
<td>Overall correct use of language and referencing system; adequate number of sources (5-9 references).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correct use of language and referencing system; Appropriate Number of Sources (10 or more references)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seminar Presentation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Disorganized and unclear presentation. No or poor use of visual aids.</td>
<td>Sufficiently structured and focused presentation. Appropriate use of visual aids.</td>
<td>Well-structured and engaging presentation. Good time keeping and good use of visual aids.</td>
<td>Very well-structured and highly engaging presentation. Very good use of visual aids, excellent time keeping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with the</td>
<td>No or very superficial engagement with the audience. Leading questions</td>
<td>Comments or questions from the audience are addressed, but engagement with them is limited or superficial. The questions for the discussion are somewhat narrow, technical or trivial. There are few attempts to guide or organize the discussion.</td>
<td>Comments or questions from the audience are well-responded to and critically reflect on. The questions for the discussion are well formulated and well suited for debate. Good guidance of the debate, good time-keeping</td>
<td>Excellent engagement with comments and questions – great reflections on the relevance and context of comments from the audience. Questions are formulated with a clear ambition. Great organization of the debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>for the discussion are not provided or unsuitable for debate (e.g. off topic, very difficult to understand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The presentation does not identify relevant arguments. It provides no assessment of the article’s strengths and weaknesses, and offers no contextualization</td>
<td>The presentation touches on relevant arguments but does not provide a clear and well-structured overview of such arguments. The identification of strengths and weaknesses is mostly superficial</td>
<td>The presentation provides a good if at times flawed or incomplete overview of key arguments Its assessment of strengths and weaknesses showcases a good and critical understanding of the content.</td>
<td>The presentation provides an excellent overview of key arguments. It’s assessment of strengths and weaknesses shows a great ability to reflect critically on the merits of an academic text. It puts the reading into its larger context and offers a convincing rationale for the selection of the two readings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

---

### Conference Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Disorganized and unclear presentation. No or poor use of visual aids. Poor time keeping</td>
<td>Sufficiently structure and focused presentation. Appropriate use of visual aids.</td>
<td>Well-structured and engaging presentation. Good time keeping and good use of visual aids.</td>
<td>Very well-structured and highly engaging presentation. Very good use of visual aids, excellent time keeping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with the</td>
<td>No or very superficial engagement with the audience.</td>
<td>Comments or questions from the audience are addressed mostly superficially or very defensively.</td>
<td>Comments or questions from the audience are responded and reflected on adequately or respectfully.</td>
<td>Excellent engagement with comments and questions. Comments and questions are clearly and convincingly addressed and critically reflected on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content (35)</td>
<td>The presentation provides no or no clear understanding of the research project. The presentation is poorly structured and disorganized.</td>
<td>The presentation offers a good understanding of the research project but leaves out important information (e.g. research question, methods, findings)</td>
<td>The presentation provides a succinct and complete overview of the research project</td>
<td>The presentation provides an excellent overview the research project's ambitions, research question, theoretical framework, methodology and findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conference Discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation (20)</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized and unclear presentation. Poor time keeping</td>
<td>The discussion lacks a clear structure and good time keeping</td>
<td>Well-structured and well-articulated discussion. Good time keeping</td>
<td>Very well-structured and highly engaging discussion. Excellent time keeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content (80)</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The feedback provided is superficial or largely irrelevant.</td>
<td>The discussion lays out some strengths and weaknesses of the paper and offers some (if mostly trivial) suggestions</td>
<td>The discussion provides a good understanding of the paper's strengths and weaknesses. It offers some helpful suggestions for improving the paper.</td>
<td>The discussion provides an excellent understanding of and a critical and careful engagement with the paper. It offers excellent suggestions for how this work could be improved and points out the paper's limitations and (potential) contributions to the literature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | | | | |

**Vesalius College Attendance Policy**

As the College is committed to providing students with high-quality classes and ample opportunity for teacher-student interaction, it is imperative that students regularly attend class. As such, Vesalius College has a strict attendance policy.

Participation in class meetings is mandatory, except in case of a medical emergency (e.g. sickness). Students will need to provide evidence for missing class (doctor’s note). If evidence is provided, the missed class is considered as an excused class. If no evidence is provided immediately before or after the class, the missed class is counted as an absence.

Participation implies that students are on time: as a general rule, the College advises that students should be punctual in this regard, but it is up to the professor to decide whether to count late arrivals as absences, or not. If a student misses two classes in a row, his/her advisor will be notified.
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Late paper policy

Because all deadlines are communicated to students beforehand, and because this is a master level course, it is students’ responsibility to make sure they are able to finish the assignments on time. Therefore, assignments that are not handed in on time are subject to the following penalties. The only exception to this can be a medical issue, proven by a doctor’s note. These penalties are deducted after calculating the overall grade of the assignment.

- 1 day late (0-24 hours): 10% reduction of original grade;
- 2 days late (24-48 hours): 20% reduction of original grade;
- 3 days late (48-72 hours): 30% reduction of original grade;
- 4 days late (72-96 hours): 40% reduction of original grade;
- 5 days late (96-120 hours): 50% reduction of original grade.
- After five days, the assignment is no longer accepted, resulting in an automatic grade of F.

Academic Honesty Statement

Academic dishonesty is NOT tolerated in this course.

Academic honesty is not only an ethical issue but also the foundation of scholarship. Cheating and plagiarism (including self-plagiarism) are therefore serious breaches of academic integrity.

Following the College policy, cheating and plagiarism cases will be communicated in writing to the Associate Dean and submitted to the Student Conduct Committee for disciplinary action.

If you refer to someone else’s work, appropriate references and citations must be provided. Grammar, spelling and punctuation count, so use the tools necessary to correct before handing in assignments.
Please consult the Section “Avoiding Plagiarism” in the College Catalogue for further guidance.

**Turnitin**

All written assignments that graded and count for more than 10% towards the final course grade need to be submitted via the anti-plagiarism software Turnitin. You will receive from your professor a unique password and access code for your Class.

**Further readings**


Governance and Administration in Global Health Organizations: Considering the Legacies of the ‘Golden Era’ of Global Health Policy?, *Carmen Huckel Schneider*


Mathias Koenig-Archibugi, “Global Dimensions of Policy” *Global Policy* 1:1


Bob Jessop, ”Narratives of Crisis and Crisis Response: Perspectives from North and South” in Peter Utting et.al. The Global Crisis and Transformative Social Change (London: Palgrave Macmillan /UNRISD), Chapter 1

