
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: English Studies and Education: Language Development and Language Teaching

Semester: VT2023

Ladok code: EN417C

Course coordinator: Chrysogonus Siddha Malilang

Number of registered students: 48

Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 1

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	

Forms of evaluation

The formative evaluation was conducted as a dialogue in the middle of the course and the summative evaluation was conducted through an online survey in the last week of the course.

Summary of the students' course evaluations

In general, the students are satisfied with the course structure, the selection of course literature, the workload, and the forms of examination. However, there is a demand for more practical examples or workshops. Some students appreciated the mini-workshops in the course as those sessions help internalizing the knowledge more.

In terms of teaching, the students find that some of the teachers managed to demystify big theories and made them more relatable,

The students also express the need for clearer instructions.

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team

In general, we found that the course runs better this year compared to the previous years. We have managed to manoeuvre the complicated collection of learning objectives and the amount of materials we have to cover. The shift to portfolio based exam also works better as students could have more time to work on their papers instead of the traditional five hours sit-in exams covering 10-week materials.

Attendance has been very low throughout the terms so a lot of the students who never attended the seminars found it difficult to follow the discussion and examination.

Analysis

We found that the course has run better from the previous years, especially with the modification of materials to be closer to the VFU and students' future teaching practice. Some of the seminars need to be further adapted and located closer to the practice. Students (who attend the seminars) are relatively active and engaged. However, the problem of continuously having someone new as the third teacher every year continues. This causes the disjointed information, especially on examination and the instruction.

Action plan

We plan to continue streamlining the materials, including trying to find better books that can cover the richness of this course. This should help the students to concentrate as they do not need to juggle between different materials.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

We plan to officiate the portfolio exam.