
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: Master Thesis in Educational Theory

Semester: VT23

Ladok code: ET610E

Course coordinator: Johan Dahlbeck

Number of registered students: 7

Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 2

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	-
Feedback to students	X

Forms of evaluation

The course has been evaluated through a written assessment as well as orally throughout the course. The written assessment was based on five standardized questions (see below) and the oral assessment was conducted continuously throughout the course in the form of supervision meetings and seminars with teachers and students.

Summary of the students' course evaluations

Overall, the two students who responded to the written evaluation seem reasonably satisfied with the course (which is largely made up of student-driven activities). While they found it challenging to work autonomously, they did appreciate the joint meetings. In fact, they would have liked more joint seminars during the process of writing. 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?

It is useful

Ok. It was very open which was fine for the course

2. How did you experience the process of reading and writing during the course?

It was the short time

difficult to limit a topic. there are so many interesting directions to take. It would have been nice to have more seminars on the side, so as to continue the academic discourse

3. How well did your supervisor and the study groups support your work with the aims of the course?

The supervisor time was very limited.

a little, but i also held back

4. What is your overall assessment of the course?

Not bad

the discussions were, as always, rich.

5. Other comments about the course and suggestions for improvements?

The number of pages for thesis is alot.

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team

Overall, the teachers/supervisors found the course to correspond with their expectations in terms of it being an independent project where much of the responsibility resides with the students. The supervisors and students had three joint seminars as well as two full-day examination seminars. The main part of the scheduled meetings were individual supervision meetings between students and supervisors. The resulting thesis projects have been a pleasant surprise in the main. Because this course is largely made up of an independent project it becomes quite obvious which students are ready for this kind of challenge and which are not.

Analysis

The teachers and students are mostly satisfied with the course. The course is difficult to analyse as a cohesive unit as it was largely based on individual studies. Students were differently prepared and so while some finished in May as planned, some will be working on their thesis over the summer so as to submit in August.

Action plan

We will ensure that the students prepare for their individual project before the course starts as part of the preceding methodology course. As far as the matchmaking between supervisor and student we will do our best to ensure that this setup works as smoothly as we can but it is difficult to judge this in advance.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

No suggestions at this time.