
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: Language teaching in theory and practice II

Semester: VT23

Ladok code: EL616E

Course coordinator: Anna Wärnsby

Number of registered students: 9

Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 2

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

Forms of evaluation

Describe the method(s) and implementation for both the formative and the summative course evaluation.

We talked formatively during the course about teacher and student expectations and student wishes for particular content or learning activities. At the end of the course, a summative course evaluation form was shared with the students, who were then admonished to fill it in.

Summary of the students' course evaluations

The students' views are objectively summarised here based on the various course evaluations for the course (see above). Individuals may not be named in the course report.

During the course, the students were satisfied with the course and had no suggestions for further activities. The two students who participated in the summative evaluation after the course has ended were also very positive. In particular, they agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements:

“Level of my skills/knowledge has increased considerably upon the completion of the course.
The course contributed greatly to my skills/knowledge.
I gained new perspectives on the content area of the course.
Learning objectives were clear.
Course content stimulated my interest.
Course content was organised and well planned.
Course workload was appropriate.
Course was organised to allow all students to participate fully.
Course literature was useful, clear and provided access to new knowledge and new perspectives.
Examination form contributed to learning and allowed me to demonstrate my acquired knowledge.
Course Canvas-site was informative and clearly organized.”

While one of the students strongly agreed that the feedback was timely, clear and balanced formative and summative elements, the other agreed only to a certain degree.

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team

The views of the teaching team regarding the content, learning activities and summative assessment of the course are summarised here.

The course was run for the first time and with great enthusiasm. The course activities were designed to match the advanced MA level and were planned to involve a lot of hands-on discussions based on student work assigned for each seminar. While 7 of the 9 students were present during the first seminar, only 1 to 4 students were present during the subsequent seminars. Only 1 student was present, and always prepared, in all the seminars. During the seminars, I was unable to get at the reason for such low attendance and engagement with the course as the students were generally as positive in class as were the 2 students who filled in the summative course evaluation. Because of the course design for active learning that presupposed student critical engagement with the course materials, several of the students who skipped classes were only able to pass the examination on the second or third try. A couple students have still not passed the examination.

Analysis

The analysis is based on a summary of the students' and teachers' individual and joint course evaluations. Both success factors and problems are identified.

From the students' evaluations and my own reflections about the course and its design, I am inclined to maintain the design with focus on active learning and will continue imprinting on students the importance of classroom attendance and engagement.

Action plan

The short-term and long-term changes that are to be implemented are specified here, along with a timeline. If no action is planned to address a specified problem, this decision must be justified.

Having tested and evaluated the course design empirically, I will be able to more convincingly convey to students the expected learning culture in the course both through the course guide and orally.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

Suggestions for possible revisions to the syllabus are proposed here, supported by the above evaluation and the action plan.

None.