

Emneevalueringssrapport / course evaluation report ISV

Lastet ned: 2. februar 2026 kl. 14:42

Svar-ID: 39849079

Lvert: 22.12.25 13:28

Viktig informasjon før du leverer emneevalueringssrapporten:

Alle våre evalueringssrapporter publiseres på UiOs nettsidene etter at programrådet har godkjent dem, og er da tilgjengelige for allmennheten. Språkbruk må gjenspeile det.

Navn til emneansvarlig *

Olav Schram Stokke

Semester

Høsten 2025

Velg kursnivå *

Masterkurs

*

Bolk 3

Emnekode *

STV4256

Emnenavn

Global power shifts and international governance

Emnerapport

1. Studentenes tilbakemeldinger *

Oppsummer de viktigste tilbakemeldingene fra studentene.

I conducted a mid-term evaluation with the course contact, who conveyed the impression that fellow students were generally satisfied. On the last lecture, I circulated a web-based evaluation form which obtained a response rate at 60 percent of the 22 students who had fulfilled the compulsory assignments for taking the exam.

2. Helhetlig vurdering av emnet *

Gi din faglige vurdering av kvaliteten på emnet. Inkluder en refleksjon over læringsutbytte, undervisningsformer, særlig studentaktive undervisningsformer, og andre relevante temaer i lys av [instituttets strategiske mål for undervisning](#).

The responses from the student evaluation form indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the course – as this brief summary details:
Syllabus: 70 percent found the amount and level of difficulty either just right or somewhat heavy; and 77 percent described the learning outcome as either very large or large (the two best options out of five). I also received assessments broken down for each lecture, which will be useful when considering syllabus revision.
Lectures: 85 percent reported that the lectures helped them to understand difficult material to either a very large or a large extent, and 69 percent chose one of the same two option when asked whether lectures were engaging. As to learning outcomes, 85 percent reported large or very large learning outcome from the lectures seen as a whole. I also received assessments broken down for each, which will prove useful when revising them; I was pleased to see that for nearly half of the lectures, including the introductory and the summarizing ones, either all students or 92 percent of them described the learning outcome as very large og large. 77 percent did the same regarding my notes on the syllabus published on Canvas prior to each lecture. Somewhat less enthusiastic, yet clearly positive, was the student assessment of my lecture slides – which I had modified from my earlier standard in response to criticism received after previous courses: this semester I have made more use of full or near-complete sentences to improve their conduciveness for repetition. 54 percent found that I had succeeded to a large or very large extent – if we also include those who chose the medium option (neither large nor small learning outcome from the slides), the catch rate was 85 percent, clearly up from slides scores received in earlier semesters. So I will stick with the new approach.
Compulsory assignments: To sit for the exam, the students were obliged to submit two brief (1000-1500 words) project descriptions based on subjects covered in the lecture syllabus and two brief (350-500 words) peer reviews of the same project descriptions; the latter was the only feedback the students received. The level of satisfaction with this part of the course was also substantial: the proportion choosing one of the top-two options when assessing usefulness as training was 77 percent for the formulation of a research question, 77 percent for integrating the proposal in the academic literature, 77 percent also for sketching a research design, and again 77 percent for identifying relevant empirical data. The peer reviews were found to be somewhat less rewarding, still 54 percent opted for one of the top-two options, a proportion rising to 85 percent when including also the lukewarm medium score. All considered, I will retain this assignment, with the slight modification that their deadlines be somewhat more spread out over the course period.

3. Justeringer siden forrige gjennomføring *

Beskriv eventuelle justeringer som er gjort basert på tidligere evalueringer, samt endringer som er implementert i løpet av emnet.

This is a new MA course. But as noted, the lecture slides now have a different design from those I have typically made in recent semesters - and the design seems better.

4. Forslag til videreutvikling "Action points" *

List opp muligheter for videre utvikling av emnet til neste gjennomføring.

The syllabus has been revised, the compulsory assignments will be more spread out over the course period - otherwise the structure will be the same.

5. Behov for oppfølging gjennom programrådet *

List opp eventuelle behov for oppfølging gjennom programrådet som følge av evalueringen.

None