

---

## 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: Education and Formation

Semester: VT25

Ladok code: ET703E

Course coordinators: Johan Dahlbeck & Morgan Deumier

Number of registered students: 27

Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 12

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 throughout the course in the form of discussions with teachers and students as well as at the final seminar of the course.

## Summary of the students' course evaluations

All in all, the students expressed very positive opinions about the course in the summative course evaluation as well as in formative feedback during seminars. All responses from the summative course evaluation span from 4-6 on a scale from 1-6 (1 being "to a very small extent" and 6 being "to a very large extent"). On the first question the mean of the assessment was 5.4; on the second the mean was 5.5; on the third question the mean was 5.4; on the fourth the mean was 5.2; on the fifth the mean was 5.3. Question number 6 invited other comments and so was not summative. Below follow some quotes from the student evaluation:

*In response to the question: "To what extent do you consider that the structure of the course (the kaleidoscopic method) has been helpful?"*

I LOVED it. It really helped me visualize formation and helped me connect/notice gaps between different themes. Don't change this!

This particular was absolutely fantastic and one of my favorites so far. It had so much meaning and VERY interesting topics that made a lot of sense and therefore made it fun to follow!

I like the metaphor, and I like how we talked about different parts of formation, focusing on what they are individually, and how they connect and interact.

*In response to the question: "To what extent do you consider that the literature and films were suited to the objectives of the course?"*

It is really interesting to refer to novels and films and the discussions based on them. We were able to open to the perspectives of the other on different themes and expand our visions.

As always, the films are so complimentary to what we learn. I love them. I also really liked the variety of literature this course.

The movies that were picked were excellent in relation to the course content. It put things into perfect perspective.

I think the literature and film were well suited.

*In response to the question: "To what extent do you consider that the study materials helped you develop your own understanding of formation?"*

My outlook has been reformed. It was a course that held so much meaning to it.

They definitely helped.

*In response to the question: "To what extent do you consider that the seminars have supported your work and your developing understanding of formation?"*

Very much so. It was unfortunate I couldn't come to every seminar in this course- I had a bit of work stuff to do, but I got the notes from lectures through classmates and feel that the seminars are always productive to constructing meaning.

They were great!

I like the format of seminars but I feel like in this course they often went off-topic. I wish it was more like: read the material at home, prepare questions and thoughts, share the questions and thoughts in smaller

groups or in front of the whole group, discuss the ideas, have the lecturers add more information to make it all more coherent, etc. I don't like that it sometimes turned into chatting about personal life that had nothing to do with giving examples that were connected to the theme of the week. I wish the lecturers had moderated the seminars more and that we had/made time during the seminars to talk about the reading material, the authors, and the topic, and our thoughts connected to this, and then personal anecdotes connected to it too.

*In response to the question: "To what extent has the course as a whole met your expectations?"*

This was one of a kind. Fun, sensical, and at a great pace to follow due to its simple weekly theme based structure.

Loved this course, truly :)

I enjoyed it.

*In response to the question: "Other comments about the course?"*

You guys are awesome! Keep up this metaphorical idea, especially in regards to formation.

Generally, it was an excellent course. The theoretical concepts made it more interesting and understandable. Well done to the teachers Johan and Morgan.

This was by far the best course I have embarked on. I am surprised at how I felt. The content was extremely interesting and I genuinely looked forward to attending its classes, as I knew the discussions would be fantastic. Also, it was such a pleasure having Morgan Deumier on board, a lecturer with a pure heart of gold. And of course, Johan, the greatest with the insides and outs of Educational Theory- a sea of information on his own. Thank you for always opening our eyes, and awakening us to becoming more aware, than we were before we embarked on this journey at MAU. You each are highly appreciated more than you will ever know.

### **Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team**

This being the second time we did the revised course, we have finetuned some things, changed some of the films and readings, and took a more considered approach to the kaleidoscopic method – all for the better. The seminars were generally very engaged and the philosophical rigour improved over the span of the course. This course is quite experimental in its setup and so the fact that the students took on this challenge with an open mind really paid off in the end. Some of the written papers produced at the end of the course were exceptional, which speaks to the transformative process of the course. We will continue finetuning the kaleidoscopic perspective, but feel that we are very much on the right track here.

### **Analysis**

Overall, both teachers and students are very satisfied with the outcome of the course. We will continue to change up the films and some of the marginal readings for next time, but this is mostly to help keep us (teachers) on our toes and not become too comfortable.

### **Action plan**

No major changes planned at this time.

### **Proposed revisions to the course syllabus**

No suggestions at this time.