

Emneevalueringssrapport / course evaluation report ISV

Lastet ned: 3. februar 2026 kl. 11:36

Svar-ID: 40363958

Lvert: 03.02.26 10:12

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 *

Jonathan William Kuyper

Semester

Høsten 2025

Velg kursnivå *

Masterkurs

*

Bolk 3

Emnekode *

STV4227

Emnenavn

International Politics: Key Debates

Emnerapport

1. Studentenes tilbakemeldinger *

Oppsummer de viktigste tilbakemeldingene fra studentene.

This course has 10 lectures on International Relations. It is structured by concepts rather than theories. It contains a portfolio model of examination (5 submissions - 1 per week with peer review) and a term paper (3500-5000 words on a topic of their own choosing). I give 7 of the lectures, and there were guest lectures from Hallvard (states and sovereignty), Tore (bargaining and conflict), and Yves (secretariats and public policy).

Over 30 students completed the course. I assigned two student contact points, but the only feedback I received was about peer review (see below). As such, I did a questionnaire (after their submission and before grades came back - same for STV4105). Only 11 students completed it, so there is a lot of bias in the results. The lectures were on the average-low side in terms of attendance, but the grades/term papers were strong.

The questionnaire had seven questions. 3 were on a 1-10 scale (1 being not useful, 10 being very useful) and 4 were open ended.

The scaled questions were:

Q1: How useful did you find the lectures?

Q2: How useful did you find the readings?

Q3: How useful was the portfolio model in helping to prepare for the term paper?

The open-ended questions were:

Q4: Were any of the lectures more useful than others? Should there have been more interactive activities?

Q5: Roughly how many readings did you do for each lecture?

Q6: Do you have any additional feedback on the portfolio model?

Q7: Do you have any overall feedback about the course?

Q1 scored 7.55

Q2 scored 7.36

Q3 scored 8.18

This is not as strong as I would like. I am pleased to see that the portfolio model was well-received but the lectures and readings need some work.

It is a bit hard to parse out the scaled results from the open-ended questions. Q4 suggests that most students liked the lectures, especially Yves'. There were a couple of comments suggesting that lectures should be tied more closely to their term papers, but I am not entirely sure how to implement that. One student asked for discussion topics in advance, which I will do in future (though there is a trade-off to this - discussion questions in advance will allow students to prepare, but it also means that the skill of 'thinking on your feet' will be less developed).

On Q5, there was a lot of variation in how many readings students did. This is to be expected, and one student noted again that they would like more connection between material and their term paper, but I am unsure how to do this.

Q6 showed that the portfolio model worked, though there is some variation in responses here, too. The portfolio model consists of 5 750-1000 word submissions roughly tracking the term paper: first is a description of a case and what makes it puzzling, then an AI review of the literature alongside a critique of the AI summary, next a theory submission, then a methods submission, and finally a full introduction. No student said it was too much work, though several said that they would have liked feedback on the submissions from me. I am not sure how feasible this is, but it is worth considering.

Q7 suggests that students are overall happy with the course, and several asked for more space for group discussions.

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](#).

Overall, I am relatively happy with how the course went. The portfolio model worked better than expected (though it was my first time doing this model, so there are a few kinks to work out - for instance, I gave them five days to do the peer-review, but it is very hard to keep on top of all the dates and submissions).

In terms of learning outcomes and evaluation, the portfolio model exercise consisted of doing a literature review of their topic with UiO's AI platform, and then critiquing it. This worked well. Students found the AI models were very accurate, but several found quite substantive problems with returned results. I am optimistic that this helped many students see the need to be critical of AI using their own judgement in analysis.

The terms papers were strong this year, and I suspect that the portfolio model had a lot to do with this. As always, there is a tension with the course and the term paper - students that want to write on topics related to material later in the course are perhaps slightly disadvantaged compared to those who write on an earlier topic, but I am a) unsure how to fix this, and b) whether it is a disadvantage as the portfolio model allows them to begin writing and then use the related lecture as a 'check' on how their thoughts are unfolding.

3. Justeringer siden forrige gjennomføring *

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

The main change was the introduction of the portfolio model. In previous years, I had a compulsory presentation of a reading in class, but with 30+ students, it meant 4 presentations a lecture and took up too much time.

The portfolio model worked well, and will remain.

4. Forslag til videreutvikling "Action points" *

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

The course will not run in 2026, so there are no immediate action points. The topics covered in the course work well, though with staff change overs and different staff having many hours in surplus, it was a bit hard to find lectures (meaning I gave a lecture on alliances and contests, and Tore Wig nicely stepped in). It is of course good to have several guest lectures as we have lots of variation in knowledge, but it does also raise the transaction costs of finding people each year.

The portfolio model went well, and I am likely to adopt it in other courses. I need to work out whether it is possible for me to give feedback on the submissions alongside peer review - this will take a lot of hours, but it is worth considering.

5. Behov for oppfølging gjennom programrådet *

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

N/A.