

---

## Mall för kursrapporter vid Fakulteten för lärande och samhälle vid Malmö universitet

Reviderad 2020-05-24

---

Kursrapporten är ett viktigt instrument för utvecklandet av kurser och utbildningar samt för att säkerställa studenternas inflytande i detta arbete. I *Beslut om modell för systematiskt utbildningsnära kvalitetsarbete vid LS* (UTB 3.1-2017/410) framgår det att kursrapporter utgör underlag för programnämndernas arbete med att systematiskt följa upp kvaliteten i programmet i dess helhet.

I beslutet *Kursutvärderingsprocessen vid Fakulteten för lärande och samhälle* (UTB 3..2.2-2018/479) framgår vad som gäller för kursrapport inklusive återkoppling till studenter.

Kursrapporten ska innehålla bakgrundsinformation/nyckeltal, en sammanfattning av studenternas kursvärderingar samt analys och åtgärdsplan tillsammans med eventuella förslag på revidering av kursplanen.

Kursrapporten publiceras i anslutning till annan information om kursen.

### Bakgrundsinformation

Kursens namn: **ENGELSKA OCH LÄRANDE: SPRÅK OCH SKRIVANDE: AKADEMISKT SKRIVANDE MODULE**

Termin: **HT:2022**

Ladokkod: **EN415C/EN430C**

Kursansvarig: **Damian Finnegan**

Antal registrerade studenter: **87**

Antal studenter som besvarat den summativa kursvärderingen: **22/87**

Genomförande	Sätt X
Föregående kursrapport är kommunicerad i samband med kursstart	X
Tidig dialog om förväntningar på kursen	X
Formativ kursvärdering	X
Summativ kursvärdering	X
Återkoppling till studenterna	X

## Utvärderingsformer

- Anonymous digital Google Forms survey containing 7 questions. Questions 1-4 had a 1-5 point scale, with 1 meaning strongly negative and 5 meaning strongly positive. Questions 5-7 were open questions allowing for extensive commentary.
- The 7 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.

### Sammanfattning av studenternas kursvärderingar

- In a Google Forms evaluation of this course module, we received responses from a total of 26 student respondents (30%).
- For questions related to learning activities supporting learning outcomes, 23/26 responses scored highly positive (3-5 on the scale).
- For questions related to the clarity and informativeness of the instructors' lectures, there were notable highly positive scores, with 24/26 of respondents scoring the scale 3-5 .
  - 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, thus preparing them for the realities of being future educators, where formative and summative feedback plays a central role in their professional work. 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 25/26 of the respondents scoring 4-5 on the scale.
- *Elements to address in the future:*
  - *Instructor feedback on student draft writing has been given on four occasions through the process. This has be greatly appreciated and valued by respondents. However, 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 relavent peer feedback.*

### Sammanfattning av lärarlagets utvärdering

On the whole, many students generally performed well in this course. However, the performance is somewhat lower than from previous courses. This is something we are unable to explain at the moment. But we surmise it might be a result of many students coming directly to university students from secondary school education and/or connected to COVID-19, where students may have gotten used to digital teaching. Moreover, a new instructor on the course may have benefitted fom better orientation of the course content and activities.

That said, in all 6 writing assignments and all three peer review assignments, good work on the part of the students was revealed.

### Analys

- The student response was rather small (26 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, but some (2) found it to be average (learning towards negative) 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. However, little was said from these 2 students to pinpoint what problems there might be.

### **Åtgärdsplan**

- 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.

### **Förslag till revidering av kursplan**

- 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 each year. Instructors will continue give feedback on the middle draft of the students' writing, thus providing more expert feedback.