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: Theory of Science and Academic Writing
Semester: HT: 2022
Ladok code:EL613E
Course coordinator: Damian Finnegan
Number of registered students: 14
Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation:

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
- Anonymous digital Google Forms survey containing 14 questions. Questions 1-9 had a 1-6 point scale, with 1 meaning strongly negative and 6 meaning strongly positive. Questions 10-14 were open questions allowing for extensive commentary.
- The 14 questions targeted the following: achievement of learning outcomes, support from learning activities towards outcomes, opportunity to take responsibility for own learning, success of own work and approach to work, improvement for own approach, clarity and informativeness of instructor lectures, clarity and informativeness of instructor feedback, overall workload, main strengths of the module, suggested improvements for the module, and other comments.

Summary of the students' course evaluations

- In a Google Forms evaluation of this course module, we received responses from a total of 5 student respondents (30%).
- For questions related to learning activities supporting learning outcomes, 4/5 responses scored highly positive (5-6 on the scale).
- For questions related to the clarity and informativeness of the instructors' lectures, there were notable highly positive scores, with 5/5 of respondents scoring the scale 3-6
.
    - Supporting commentary for ratings revealed that many of the responding students highly appreciated the organization, planning, and clarity of lectures.
    - *Successful elements*: good organization, clarity of lectures, learning that writing is composed of various stages in a process, within which feedback from both peers and instructors are viewed as important elements. Moreover, respondents highly valued that they learned to critique each other's work in a constructive way. In addition, they appreciated the professionalism of instructors, value of new knowledge, good lectures, good learning activities, clear expectations, chances to practice and learn.
- For questions related to opportunity to take responsibility for own learning, the response was biased toward highly positive, with 5/5 of the respondents scoring 4-6 on the scale.
- *Elements to address in the future*:
    - *Instructor feedback on student draft writing has been given on three occasions through the process. This has be greatly appreciated and valued by most respondents. Yet, some criticism of instructor feedback has been given: not all instructors seemed thoroughly familiar with the course reading material. Moreover, it should noted that peer feedback (given on three occasions) is deemed as poor for some of the students. Therefore, we intend to spend more time familiarizing students with what constitutes given effective and relevant peer feedback.*

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team

- Overall, the students performed very well on the course. The art of taking effective annotations to conduct an accurate and balanced synopsis of course material was seen as positive. Students could then make efficient analysis of shared themes, allowing them to add their own independent thinking of the discourse. In short, student were able to present in formal writing well-crafted texts regarding the discourses surrounding the topic theory of science. That said, all future course instructors must be very familiar with the course reading material in order to give efficient and timely feedback.

Analysis

- The student response was rather small (5 responses/30 percent) and thus cannot be taken as representative. It was very positive in regard to organization, clarity of lectures, learning academic writing in a new way, professionalism of instructors, value of new knowledge, good lectures, good learning activities, clear expectations, chances to practice and learn. The vast majority of the respondents praised our approach in regard to learning outcomes, the clarity and informativeness of the instructors' lectures,

and meeting course expectations. The course largely met student expectations, and that the students largely felt that they met the learning outcomes. t

Action plan

- Given that this is a traditionally "board-work" oriented course, which involves a good deal of interaction between instructor and students in the classroom, we feel that the course was largely successful. Still, we must be sure that new instructors on the course are given more detailed orientation on course content and activities.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

The basic approach to teaching academic writing as a process will not be altered. Our rationale is based on highly positive student evaluations of the course.