

Course report for the Faculty of Education and Society at Malmö University

Course name:

“Perspectives on Research-Based Teaching of Higher Education”

Background information

- Semester: VT25
- Ladok code: HP613E-56107
- Number of registered students: 49
- Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 21

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

Formative dialogue during the course and summative evaluation in Reflex.

Summary of the students' summative course evaluation

Question 1: To what extent do you consider you have achieved the learning objectives of the course?

5 of 21 (24%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
13 of 21 (62%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
3 of 21 (14%)	has to some extent (level 4)
0 of 21 (0%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 21 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 21 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,1
Standard deviation: 0,6

Question 2: To what extent do you think that the working methods / learning activities on the course have reinforced your learning and your ability to achieve the learning objectives?

7 of 21 (33%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
11 of 21 (52%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
0 of 21 (0%)	has to some extent (level 4)
2 of 21 (10%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
1 of 21 (5%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 21 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,0
Standard deviation: 1,1

Question 3: To what extent do you consider that the types of examination on the course gave you the opportunity to show how well you had achieved the learning goals?

7 of 21 (33%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
11 of 21 (52%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
2 of 21 (10%)	has to some extent (level 4)
1 of 21 (5%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 21 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 21 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,1
Standard deviation: 0,8

Question 4: To what extent do you consider that the course as a whole has met your expectations?

9 of 21 (43%) has to a very large extent (level 6)
9 of 21 (43%) has to a large extent (level 5)
1 of 21 (5%) has to some extent (level 4)
0 of 21 (0%) has not to some extent (level 3)
1 of 21 (5%) has to a small extent (level 2)
1 of 21 (5%) has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,0
Standard deviation: 1,3

Question 5: To what extent has the course given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning?

12 of 21 (57%) has to a very large extent (level 6)
6 of 21 (29%) has to a large extent (level 5)
2 of 21 (10%) has to some extent (level 4)
1 of 21 (5%) has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 21 (0%) has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 21 (0%) has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,5
Standard deviation: 0,9

Other noteworthy perspectives from formative and summative course evaluation

- The course was mostly very well-received, but there were a few participants who did not feel that the course met their expectations.
- The pre-recorded lectures (supplemented with live lectures/seminars) were appreciated.
- The examination task was well-conceived, especially as it focused on the participants' real-life teaching experience and contexts. However, one participant suggested that it could be a little bit more extensive, as it didn't offer enough space to show that they had achieved all the learning outcomes.

- Several students had wished for the live sessions to be recorded. However, this is, unfortunately, not possible due to GDPR requirements.
- This course had many participants. For that reason, the oral examinations were conducted through peer assessment, as the teacher was not able to witness all the oral examinations. Some students questioned this, as it did not allow them to receive feedback from the teacher.
- The course was quite short and could have contained more sessions.
- One participant wanted more reading material.

Analysis

The course was well received apart from a few participants' reactions.

The course should be redesigned to better make use of the different expressions of research-based learning. Suggested outline:

- Each expression should have a module/session. It could look as follows:
 - Session 1: Introduction - Presentation of the Healey model
 - Session 2: Research-Led
 - Session 3: Research-Informed
 - Session 4: Research-Oriented
 - Session 5: Research-Tutored
 - Session 6: Inquiry-Based
- Each module/session should have new material and new lectures that relate to each expression.
- The examination papers should be redesigned to take better account of these expressions of inquiry-based learning. That is, they should identify one or more of these in their teaching and report on them. Perhaps they should also be asked how they can develop research-based learning, possibly by considering and incorporating those expressions that are not currently part of their teaching.

Action plan

The course design should be reworked.

The required reading should be reviewed and perhaps improved upon.

The examination task should be developed to consider the new suggested design of the course.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

None.