

# Emneevalueringssrapport / course evaluation report ISV

Lastet ned: 3. februar 2026 kl. 11:45

Svar-ID: 40362694

Lvert: 03.02.26 09:29

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 \*

STV4105

Emnenavn

Democracy: From Theory to Practice

Emnerapport

## 1. Studentenes tilbakemeldinger \*

Oppsummer de viktigste tilbakemeldingene fra studentene.

This course consists of 10 lectures on democratic theory, with each lecture going through the history of the concept under discussion, the key literature, and empirical implications. There is an oral activity (15-20 minutes on their term paper topic) and a term paper (3500-5000 words).

This year I ran a survey after the course to gather feedback. I appointed two student contact points, but neither had received direct feedback from other students. Only 8 students of the 14 that completed the course submitted a response.

There were four questions on a 1-10 scale, and two open ended questions.

The four scaled questions were:

- 1) How useful did you find the lectures?
- 2) How useful did you find the readings?
- 3) How useful was the oral compulsory activity in helping to prepare and outline thoughts?
- 4) Did you receive enough help with the term paper?

The two open questions were:

- 5) How many readings did you do for each lecture (roughly)?
- 6) What worked well in the course, and what should be improved?

The scaled questions were 1-10, with 1 being 'not helpful' and 10 being 'very helpful'.

Q1 scored 8.38

Q2 scored 7.75

Q3 scored 9.63

Q4 scored 9.38

Q5 suggested that most students did at least one, and up to four readings for each lecture. Several students noted that once their term paper topic was decided, their incentive to do readings decreased. One student made the interesting point that they enjoyed that the lectures were still fruitful for them even if they had not done all the readings.

Q6 received a wide-range of comments. One thought the discussions were useful, but the link to course material was harder to follow as discussions unfolded. Students enjoyed Hallvard's lecture on republicanism, and as always, students suggested even more material they would like to see on the syllabus.

## 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 happy with how the course played out. It was an engaged group of students, and final grades were reflective of this.

The learning outcomes were met in the sense that all students passed and it was clear to see some analytical development as the course unfolded.

Discussions did some time run too long, though it is always hard to cut off discussions if I think they are being productive. But it was the case that in some lectures I did not finish all my slides as a result of longer discussions, so I should work to structure the discussions more.

The oral activity certainly worked well for almost all students. It primes the students for the term paper and acts as a catch to make sure that students can answer questions in real time. I asked one question for each student about how their topic related to another part of the course to ensure that they were thinking beyond just their term paper.

## 3. Justeringer siden forrige gjennomføring \*

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

No major changes were made since last year in terms of examination (other than the oral exam became a compulsory activity). I changed two lectures - a lecture on democracy and consent theory was replaced by a lecture on democratic systems theory, and the free speech lecture was replaced by a lecture on epistemic democracy. The former was a useful change, while the latter should be changed again.

## 4. Forslag til videreutvikling "Action points" \*

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

As above, I will change the content of lecture 9. In addition, I will update the syllabi. The 'usefulness of readings' scored a 7.75, which is on the low side. Though this also could be due to the fact that the lecture discussions did not track the readings exactly (though there is always a balance between letting students follow discussion points by themselves and nudging them toward a topic).

Finally, one student said the oral activity should come earlier. As it stands, it comes at the end of week 4 (after the 8th lecture). This means students writing on the content from lecture 9 and 10 have not had the lecture yet. Moving it earlier would mean even more students would not have had their lecture topic so I am hesitant to do this. I don't think it can be moved later, either, as students need at least 10 days between the oral activity and the term paper submission to incorporate feedback. I could of course run the oral activity on a rolling basis. This is somewhat inefficient, but I will consider it for next year. Any suggestions on this point would be gratefully received as oral activities are becoming more important.

## 5. Behov for oppfølging gjennom programrådet \*

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

Not about this course specifically, but it would be useful if this submission page had the option to upload a document (then I could upload the full course evaluation from the students).