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 C*ourse 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: **Research Methodology, Research Ethics, and Academic Writing II**
Semester: Spring term 2021
Ladok code: ET606E-L9992
Course coordinator: Robin Ekelund & Hanna Sjögren
Number of registered students: 14
Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 8

Implementation	**Mark with an X**
The previous course report is communicated in connection with the start of the course	N/a (this is the first time the course was given)
Early dialogue on expectations for the course	X
Formative course evaluation	X
Summative course evaluation	X
Feedback to students	X

Forms of evaluation
A formative course evaluation was done orally during one of the seminars mid-course. The summative evaluation was done during the last seminar where the students, based on specific questions given to them, evaluated the course in groups and then sent written feedback to the course administrators.

Summary of the students' course evaluations
The students are overall positive in their evaluation of the course. They stress that the course have been demanding due to the advanced course literature and the general tempo of the course, but they also emphasise that the course structure, the lectures and seminars have been good. The students also write that they enjoyed working with two teachers who bring different perspectives and questions to them.

The course has focused on three main areas: methodology, ethics and academic writing and the students have worked with three assessments, each in specific relation to one of these areas. The students emphasise that three exams in a relatively short course has been too much.

The students also ask for more focus on the terminology of each of the methodologies that the course worked with (posthumanism, hermeneutic phenomenology and postcolonialism).

Below are some excerpts from the students' formative evaluations:

"The literature, the exercises have been very productive and helped us to work on our writing.
"The course was pressing and demanding: the texts were very advanced and the time was very short considering this high level. It felt a bit overwhelming at times."
"The texts chosen are very open ended, thought-provoking, and that is nice. Some of us have enjoyed not having all the answers at the end."
"The workload is… quite intense! But the workload was helpful :)"
"It was nice to have two teachers, we see that a very nice dynamic is created in doing so."
"Our expectations for our course were definitely met. Overall, we have learned a lot, we have lots of questions for the future, and we have had a lot of work…"

"We feel that more time could have been put on the terminology, glossary and learning various terms. We would like to see and to get some form of digested, condensed summary before being introduced to longer and heavier texts. […] We further appreciate presentations/mini-lectures where course content is introduced, and we also appreciate workshops where we collectively discuss similarities/differences between theories such as posthumanism and phenomenology."

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team
This was the first time this course was given and the teachers feel that the course overall worked really well. The course layout with mini-lectures, guest lecturers and seminars have been fruitful, much thanks to the students who were eager to discuss and immerse themselves in the course content. The structure where the students chose a dissertation with which they worked on two assignments (an oral assessment focusing on research ethics, and the main written assessment focusing on methodology and applying different theoretical perspectives) worked really well. The students worked well with the dissertations and developed a critical perspectives towards these, as well as to the different methodologies of the course. Academic writing was is another of the main focus areas for the course. The teachers believe that this work, and the assessment based on trying different styles of academic writing has been important and the students seemed eager to work even more with this. The teachers see no problem with the course being advanced and demanding, however, we concur with the students in that three assessments, in the span of a 7,5 credit course, is too much.

Analysis
Overall, the course has worked well and provided a good starting point to build on in the future. The main problem identified in the evaluation of both the students and the teachers are the facts that the syllabus asks for three assessments during a relatively short time. This hasn't been fruitful for either the students or the teachers and needs to be rethought.

Action plan

The plan for action, based on the analysis, is to rework the course assignments so that there are only two assignments: an oral assessment and a written assessment. The oral assessment can continue to focus on research ethics, but the assessment of academic writing needs to be reworked so that this learning outcome can be included within the main written assessment. Presumably by extending this paper with an analysis and discussion of the style of writing found in the chosen doctoral dissertation.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus
The teachers will propose a revised syllabus including two assessments instead of three.

For proposed revisions see below:

Entry requirements
Prerequisite course for this course is: ET605E Education: Pedagogical Relations
Level
Advanced level
Main field
Education
Progression level
A1F

Course objectives
The aim of the course is for the student to be able to develop knowledge of the relationship between the philosophy of science, theory and research methodology. In addition, the student will deepen their knowledge of different research methods, academic writing genres and research ethics.

Course contents
The course contains both theoretical and practical exercises in different research methods relevant for the field of educational theory. Phenomenological, hermeneutic, post-colonial, and feminist theories will be discussed and how these areas connect to different positions in the philosophy of science and different methodological traditions. In addition, ethical matters relevant to the various dimensions of the research process will be addressed, as well as academic reading and writing as a central aspect of methodology in educational theory.

Learning outcomes
Upon completion of the course, the student should be able to
apply different theoretical perspectives to the exploration of empirical methods, and discuss how these derive from different premises in the philosophy of science;
problematise ethical issues and power relationships in the research process, and relate this to a critical discussion concerning research methodology;
critically explore and apply different academic writing styles and genres.
Learning activities
The course is based on regular lectures, seminars and practical exercises. There will be opportunities for feedback between the students throughout the course.

Assessment
Test 1 (2101): Written exam with oral presentation (Skriftlig examination med muntlig presentation), ~~5~~ 7, 5 credits. This test examines learning outcomes 1 and 2 and 3.
~~Test 2 (2102): Written exam (Skriftligt examination), 2.5 credits. This test examines learning outcome 3.~~
~~The course coordinator will provide information about grading criteria at the start of the course.~~

It must be possible to distinguish between individual performances for all assessments.
Course literature and other study material
Barad, Karen (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How MatterComes to Matter. Signs 28 (3): 801–31 (30 p)
Eco, Umberto (2015). How to write a thesis. Cambridge, Massachusettes: MIT Press (200 p)
Friesen, Norm, Henriksson, Carina & Säevi, Tone (2012). Hermeneutic Phenomenology inEducation: Method and Practice. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers (pp. 1-54, 107-140) (88 p)
Kohn, Margaret and Reddy, Kavita (2017). Colonialism. In Zalta, Edward N. (ed.), TheStanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2017 Edition) (available online) (20 p)
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak? In Nelson, Cary andGrossberg, Lawrence (eds.), Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. Basingstoke:Macmillian Education, pp. 271–313 (42 p)

Additional 200 pages will be distributed during the course.

Course evaluation

Students who participate in or complete a course must be given the opportunity to share their experiences and provide feedback on the course via a course evaluation issued by the University. The University will compile the course evaluations and provide information regarding the results and any measures taken as a result of the course evaluation. Results will be made available to the students. (Higher Education Ordinance 1:14).