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: Education: Education and Politics
Semester: HT21
Ladok code: ET607E
Course coordinator: Johan Dahlbeck
Number of registered students: 11
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
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 five standardized questions (see below) and the oral assessment was conducted at the final seminar of the course (as well as continuously in relation to the regular seminars).

Summary of the students' course evaluations

Overall, the students are very pleased with the course. While they found it challenging and intense (especially the readings), they also found it very rewarding and several students highlight how the course has impacted their understanding of the relation between education and politics. 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 do you think of the structure of the course?

Excellent.

I found it logical and easy to follow as the key authors were taken in chronological order, more or less.

The structure was great, in my opinion. It took me some time to get used to meeting on Mondays, instead of Tuesdays, as in the previous year. With Tuesdays, we had a bit more time to read the texts. But once I got used to the shift, it went by fine. I think it was great we had the end of the seminar round-up summary type of a thing for all the thinkers and philosophers. That really helped a lot. Also, the presentations by the teachers in terms of PowerPoint were great. I think it makes a huge difference in terms of going back to see what areas need to be studied more or what one's philosopher is saying about a concept or such.

It was evident that a lot of thought and planning had been put into designing the course, making it fit in the big picture of the programme and selecting the bibliography. I was introduced to great and relevant thinkers and perspectives that will allow me to better understand - and hopefully engage in - contemporary theoretical discussions in the field.

The course is well-structured, with reading and writing week. We also had guest seminars which were informative and supportive.

It was specific and well structured.

Good and clear with seminars on Mondays and Thursdays. Good with guests (Moa de Lucia Dahlbeck) joining us. PhD-student Morgan joined us once or twice. Appreciated the reading week and the writing week. The first examination felt very rewarding since we shared our experiences, it was also a nice and informal atmosphere.

The course is well organized and well presented. The course materials are well developed and include relevant things that we need to know.

2. How was the literature suited to the objectives of the course?

The literature suited very well. Great mix of books and supporting articles.

Fairly suited, with a good mix of very theoretical works and those of a more practical nature.

I found the varied texts of books and articles and also podcasts interesting. It definitely added to our thinking and perspectives.

It suited the objectives of the course.

The literature is precise for the objectives of the course and it helped me to understand relation between education and politics in different scenarios.

It was suited properly.

Very well suited. Of course there could be more political theories included, but there is not time.

I think the literature for the course is best suited to the course objectives.

3. How did you experience the readings in the course?

Very well. All the readings were incredibly dense, but fascinating to get into the complexities of political theories and the educational consequences they pose.

Since the subject of politics is far from my area of comfort, I found the readings tough, but stimulating.

The readings were intense in terms of how much we had to cover but I enjoyed the variety of texts and thinkers.

I felt challenged in a very positive way and willing to know more about each author and the concepts discussed. Perhaps inviting students to engage differently in some of the seminars - by suggesting specific and different questions/conceptual focus points/ analytical tasks to each, for instance - could allow for more equal participation - without it being too imposing - and help us through the preparation of the final paper.

Readings in the course were interesting, however, it's too vast to cover in the stipulated time.

The readings were difficult and sometimes overwhelming.

Heavy and sometimes difficult to understand (ex: Rawls, Hobbes). Interesting. Lilja's article was helpful when we read Arendt. I also appreciated the podds.

I enjoyed the readings but I sometimes struggled to understand some words in the texts.

4. How well did the study groups support your work with the aims of the course?

In all honesty, our study groups didn't really get back up and running after the summer break. However, as a whole group we had many opportunities to talk about the literature and aims of the course in an informal capacity throughout.

The Thursday meetings were there, held regularly for those who wanted to join. My feedback, though, is limited, as I tended to work on my own this course.

I think it was easier for us all to be present on Zoom and have group discussions regarding the texts in the previous year. This time around, as it was in person, the study groups weren't fully functional. I missed that and I am hoping we can bring it back for the next course as the group discussions prior to the seminars or even afterwards help a lot.

As we moved from zoom to face-to-face, some of the group discussions got lost along the way. I felt we had less time to discuss things in the study groups before or after the seminars and I missed that. Perhaps not everyone enjoys them as much as I do and it is not always easy to make time for more discussions and/or work on collective tasks/assignments. However, I personally feel they have been incredibly beneficial in previous courses.

We could not completely justify discussions in study groups, however, we had worthy writing sessions.

Very well.

We did not really have study groups this time. However, I have taken part in the "shut-up-and-write"-sessions, PSE-seminars, and informal gatherings after/before the seminars.

The study groups are good and highly interactive. I find them very helpful as they helped me to develop intellectual and thinking ability. In addition, my ability to identify, formulate and solve problems has increased through the discussions we normally have.

5. What is your overall assessment of the course?

I loved it. I was a little apprehensive before the start, because of the changes from last year (Having physical classes, no Morten and Johan duo). But, I relished having sessions with Peter and Johan, it was so nice to be go into this political world with both of you. It was incredibly interesting to hear Peter's views on Arendt and Rousseau, and Johan's views on Spinoza (finally). Moa was great! It was a shame she couldn't be there in person. The (mini)lectures helped a whole lot in solidifying a foundation onto which we can explore in more depth later on. Thank you very much for the great course. In terms of changes for the future, I personally wouldn't change anything. It's very much in the sweet spot. Thank you all so much!

It certainly stands out from the rest of the programme and gives new perspectives on the subject of education. I particularly liked the wrap-up at the end as it helped to bring the host of material into relation with each other, things fell into their places in a way.

Overall, I enjoyed the course. If we had a bit more time for each thinker or maybe a section of their text to focus on, I think that would have made it more interesting because then we would have gone into depth. But nevertheless, I have enjoyed this course as it really made me think of politics and education side by side.

It was hard work, but also great fun. The oral exam was a very positive experience. The lectures allowed for some extra 'ground-setting', which aided my learning experience. And the seminars, as usual, were very interesting and productive.

The course is intriguing and challenging. I am thankful to my teachers for the guidance, knowledgeable seminars and guest lectures. I personally feel this course has completed changed my perception on politics and made me understand that politics is the base or framework for any reformation.

It was a challenging course.

4 out of 5. Interesting and rewarding but also very heavy. You made me a little bit more interested in politics. =)

I love the course. The central theme (Education and Politics) was interesting and I learned so much in the seminars, study groups and home through the textbooks provided.

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team
Overall, the teachers agree with the students that the structure and scope of the course are apt and well balanced and that the readings and assignments serve to promote the learning objectives of the course well. We also agree that the reading is demanding but it seems as if the students have managed with support from the teachers. Based on previous course evaluations (from the first term) we have incorporated a reading week and a writing week, both of which have been very much appreciated by the students. The changes from online classes to on campus-classes seems to have changed the dynamics of the study groups. Instead of study groups, the students have gathered in a collective writing group to better suit their purposes. Since the study groups were conceived as a support structure for the students, the teachers are all for changing these to suit better with the purposes of the students.

Analysis
The teachers and students are all very satisfied with the course. The course has been demanding, both for teachers and students, but in spite of this it has been greatly appreciated by both faculty and students and the teachers look forward to giving it on campus next year again.

Action plan
We will evaluate the current reading list and we may exchange a couple of the academic papers.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus
No suggestions at this time.

.