
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: Education: History and Theories of Education

Semester: HT25

Ladok code: ET601E

Course coordinator: Johan Dahlbeck and Christian Norefalk

Number of registered students: 35

Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 9

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

The course has been evaluated through both oral and written assessments. The written assessment was based on six standardized questions (see below) and the oral assessment was conducted continuously in relation to the regular seminars.

Summary of the students' course evaluations

Evidently, the students are very pleased with the outcome of the course. They found it challenging and inspirational to dive deep into philosophy of education and to connect this with the history of philosophy and the philosophy of science. The students enjoyed the structure of the course, with a variety of activities, spanning from mini-lectures to assignments and group discussions. Most students expressed contentment with the oral examination. For the most part the students appreciated the readings and found the balancing between primary texts and textbooks helpful. Some students expressed concern with the way some of their fellow students dominated the discussions. In the summative question (question nr 6) concerning to what extent the students found that the course as a whole had met with their expectations (on a scale of 1-6, 1 being the lowest and 6 the highest), 11,1% answered 3, 11,1% answered 4, 22,2% answered 5, and 55,6% answered 6.

Below follows a selection of student statements about the various aspects of the course sorted according to the questions asked in the written evaluation.

1. What are your thoughts on the structure of the course (in terms of the weekly themes and progression from start to finish)?

Loved it, no notes.

Very progressive

Very good

Unique and good

It was very well-organized and structured. Personally, I have learned a clear understanding of how educational theories developed historically.

I found the structure of the course very clear and well-organized. The weekly themes followed a logical progression, which made it easier to see how the ideas developed from one week to the next.

the weekly modules is structured in a way that each one builds on the idea of the previous one. that helps to reinforce progression and understanding. There is a well-balanced distribution of reading.

I really enjoyed the structure of the course. Each theme looked at in progression and building off of each other.

I really enjoyed how each week was themed and the progression of themes. I have to say I REALLY enjoyed many of the weeks.

2. What are your thoughts on the structure of seminars (in terms of the balance between mini-lectures, joint group discussions and discussions in breakout groups)?

In my experience, the balance worked quite well. The short lectures gave useful background, while the group and breakout discussions allowed everyone to engage more deeply and share perspectives.

I think I enjoyed the classes that had a bit more of a lecture structure, as I felt some (not all) input from students had a tendency to go off topic, be a personal opinion not really based on the readings and took up a lot of time.

Discussion were helpful.

I enjoyed the structure overall. The mini-lectures were especially helpful, since i found the group discussions to be monopolized by a couple of people who were more interested in discussing their beliefs rather than the actual content of the weekly reading.

I appreciated the balance of lecture to breakout groups. I think that some of the joint group discussions get a little off topic, though, and could be pulled back in quicker.

It was great, I particularly appreciated the dialogue with my friends especially in group discussion it makes us to even know ourselves the more.

The structure of seminars helps sustain consistent engagement and supports deep learning.

Neutral

Excellent

3. What are your thoughts on the readings of the course?

Loved them. Learned a lot.

I liked many of them, of course reading Aristotle isn't the most interesting thing; but of course needed. I would have liked to have a more diverse view with more women and POC on the course, but I understand it being a history of philosophy course that most lit is white men.

Good

Enjoyable

I was really pleased with how the readings were paired! Some weeks were quite a bit heavier than others, but it was by no means unmanageable.

The readings are well selected and related to the weekly theme. The expose me to diverse perspective of Educational theory.

The literature's books were Very interesting and rich, they covered a wide range of perspectives and we are exposed to many philosophers with their own ideas on educational concept.

I think the readings were well-chosen and intellectually stimulating. They connected theory with real educational questions, which helped me reflect more critically on the topics.

No particular thoughts. I enjoyed the readings and found them to be relevant to the topic of educational philosophy.

4. What are your thoughts on the balance between primary texts (Aristotle, Kant, Suissa, etc.) and textbooks (Grayling and Godfrey-Smith)?

I found the balance to work fine. I often got clarification from the text books when I didn't understand what the primary sources were discussing.

The primary text like Aristotle, Kant etc and text book like Grayling and Godfrey-smith gave us deep know into foundational theories. It was a good combination.

The balance is good

I appreciated the balance between primary and secondary texts. Reading original works alongside textbooks provided both depth and clarity—it helped me grasp the core philosophical ideas and see how they relate to contemporary educational theory.

The combination of these Philosophers give a broader understanding of moral philosophy and education across time.

The primary texts were without a doubt some of my favorite readings, but I really appreciated the background knowledge from the textbooks. The textbook reading did overwhelm the primary texts a bit.

I felt it was good to have two core books that the readings could be related to. I think the books were great to conceptualize the primary sources and view them critically instead of just digesting the info presented in primary text.

Excellent

Excellent

5. What are your thoughts on the form of examination?

I enjoyed the format, I am a bit of a nervous speaker but I think it was a good exam to begin the class with and demonstrate our knowledge in practice as it was fitting for what we had learnt and the format in which the classes took.

I think an essay would be more effective in showing understanding of the problems in education today. A presentation has more variables that can end up affecting the final work being produced.

It was tough to get started, but I enjoy presentations, and I enjoy having the freedom to present creatively.

Oral examination can be quite intense and performance may sometimes depend on confidence and communication skill. On the overall, it promotes intellectual maturity so it's fine.

It just awesome, it allows us to have analytical thinking and reflections on our previous seminars. It makes us to active and not passive learner.

I found the form of examination appropriate and fair. It reflected the main learning goals of the course and allowed space for critical thinking rather than memorization.

Good

Certainly a first for me. I love it though because it shows that lecturers are interested in seeing if students are actually learning rather than memorizing

Less stressful

6. How would you rate the course overall?

See response ratio above.

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team

The teachers are very pleased with the overall outcome of the course. This is a very comprehensive introductory course and so there is not a lot of breathing space. Given this, the teachers are very pleased with the final presentations where the students really exhibited a good understanding of the main themes of the course. With regards to the balancing of student voices in the seminars, we did see a development over time and so we believe that it just takes a while to cultivate a good seminar culture.

Analysis

The teachers and students are very satisfied with the course and the idea is to keep the structure and the readings as is.

Action plan

No need for immediate changes.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

No revisions planned.