
Template for course reports at the Faculty of Education and Society at Malmö University

Revised 2020-05-24

The course report is an important instrument for the development of courses and programmes, as well as for guaranteeing student influence in this work. The *Decision on the model for systematic education-related quality work at the Faculty of Education and Society* (UTB 3.1-2017/410) indicates that course reports constitute the basis for the programme boards' efforts to systematically monitor the quality of the programme as a whole.

The *Course evaluation process at the Faculty of Education and Society* (UTB 3..2.2-2018/479) specifies what applies for the course report, including feedback to students.

The course report should include background information/key figures and a summary of the students' course evaluations, as well as analysis and an action plan together with any suggestions for revision of the course syllabus.

The course report is to be published in connection with other information about the course.

Background information

Course name: Children's Rights

Semester: Spring term 2022

Ladok code: BU123E

Course coordinator: Hanna Sjögren & Jessica Eng

Number of registered students: 20

Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 6

Implementation	Mark with an X
The previous course report is communicated in connection with the start of the course	X
Early dialogue on expectations for the course	X
Formative course evaluation	X
Summative course evaluation	X
Feedback to students	X

Forms of evaluation

Formative course evaluations were conducted informally throughout the course. The summative evaluation was conducted in the form of a web-based-questionnaire after the last seminar.

Summary of the students' course evaluations

Only a few students responded to the course evaluation (6 out of 20). Those who responded expressed some negative feedback about the course.

A total of 4 students answered that they to a small or very small extent thought that the working methods/learning activities had reinforced their learning and their ability to achieve the learning objectives. One student wrote "only reading lots of texts and talking about them does improve some knowledge" and another "For me personally I don't learn a lot with just discussing books we read." Other written feedback on this question was: "I thought the idea of students taking initiative and leading seminars was a good one and I enjoyed it. However, there weren't many working methods from the teachers, unfortunately"; and "I didn't appreciate that the lessons were completely organized by students, leaving a lot of blank spaces for discussions that didn't taught me anything new. Also the books chosen were a bit too long, since we had one week to read each of them."

Furthermore, 4 students answered that the course had met their expectation to a very small extent. One student wrote that they "misst [sic] more connections to the CRC and current issue [sic] in a more specific way." And another student wrote "Even if I knew that the Swedish university system often adopts self-management for studying and a lot of discussions, I didn't expect that this method would have been used in this absolute way, I would prefer if professors still taught in the seminars, since they have more knowledge and experience than students."

All responding students filled in that the course had given them opportunities to take responsibility for their own learning. Two students mentioned that they had appreciated "Being able to organize seminars by ourselves and the participation of Hanna and Jessica in these" and well as "The flexibility to organize my tasks myself and be my own time".

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team

We revised the curriculum in preparation for this semester by 1.) focusing more on contemporary perspectives on children's rights and 2.) by removing some old titles (Jenks 2005 and Heywood 2018) and adding some new ones. Otherwise we ran the course exactly the same way we did last time.

The student expressed that they were very happy with the course last time we ran it. This year, the evaluation result is strikingly different with some negative feedback, although we can't draw too many conclusions based on that only 30% of the students responded to the course evaluation. It might very well be the case that those most unhappy with the course decided to fill in the course evaluation. However, we feel that some of the problems we as teachers have observed during the course is reflected in the negative feedback: Our experience is that most students didn't read the literature in advance which makes the whole teaching design redundant. Although we instruct and point out how to read academic literature and full books, we feel that most students have been unsuccessful in this instance. Some of the seminars organized by the students didn't work out well as students asked leading questions to each other and had only shallowly read the literature. Our observations, together with the students' evaluation, leave room for improvement of the teaching and learning activities.

It is worth pointing out that this is a very different conclusion compared to last semester when we concluded that the changes made based on the previous evaluation in spring 2021 were successful. Students were more active last semester and they also took more responsibility for their own learning.

Analysis

Success factors: The students performed fine in terms of grades (4 students received A; 3 student received B; 4 student received C; 2 student received D; 3 student received E; 1 student failed).

Problems: The learning activities were too student-focused.

Action plan

We will add more lectures and structure to the teaching.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

N/A