

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

### Course name:

“Educating for Critical Thinking”

### Background information

- Semester: VT24
- Ladok code: VT2024-HP622E-46151
- Number of registered students: 29
- Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 7

Implementation	Mark with an X
The previous course report is communicated in connection with the start of the course	
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?**

3 of 7 (43%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
4 of 7 (57%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
0 of 7 (0%)	has to some extent (level 4)

0 of 7 (0%) has not to some extent (level 3)  
0 of 7 (0%) has to a small extent (level 2)  
0 of 7 (0%) has to a very small extent (level 1)  
Mean: 5,4  
Standard deviation: 0,5

**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?**

**4 of 7 (57%) has to a very large extent (level 6)**  
**3 of 7 (43%) has to a large extent (level 5)**  
0 of 7 (0%) has to some extent (level 4)  
0 of 7 (0%) has not to some extent (level 3)  
0 of 7 (0%) has to a small extent (level 2)  
0 of 7 (0%) has to a very small extent (level 1)  
Mean: 5,6  
Standard deviation: 0,5

**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?**

**4 of 7 (67%) has to a very large extent (level 6)**  
**1 of 7 (17%) has to a large extent (level 5)**  
**1 of 7 (17%) has to some extent (level 4)**  
0 of 7 (0%) has not to some extent (level 3)  
0 of 7 (0%) has to a small extent (level 2)  
0 of 7 (0%) has to a very small extent (level 1)  
Mean: 5,5  
Standard deviation: 0,8

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

**5 of 7 (71%) has to a very large extent (level 6)**  
**1 of 7 (14%) has to a large extent (level 5)**  
**1 of 7 (14%) has to some extent (level 4)**  
0 of 7 (0%) has not to some extent (level 3)  
0 of 7 (0%) has to a small extent (level 2)  
0 of 7 (0%) has to a very small extent (level 1)  
Mean: 5,6  
Standard deviation: 0,8

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

<b>4 of 7 (57%)</b>	<b>has to a very large extent (level 6)</b>
<b>1 of 7 (14%)</b>	<b>has to a large extent (level 5)</b>
<b>2 of 7 (29%)</b>	<b>has to some extent (level 4)</b>
0 of 7 (0%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 7 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 7 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)
Mean:	5,3
Standard deviation:	1,0

**Other noteworthy perspectives from formative and summative course evaluation**

- Overall, the course participants appreciated the course content, with only minor criticism.
- Unfortunately, there was a lack of participation in the live Zoom-sessions., with a drop of about half the participants from the first session. The participants who attended them were thankfully active and contributed with interesting perspectives. Also, the response on these sessions was highlighted as especially appreciated. However, when the participants don't participate, the discussions might not offer the breadth of experiences that elevates the discussions.
- During the course an "equitable option" was offered to the participants who couldn't attend the live Zoom-sessions. This option was well received by the participants using it. Accordingly, they could participate in the discussions by submitting posting and responding in a weekly discussion forum on Canvas.
  - One participant wanted the teacher to participate and comment on the discussions in the forum, which he did not do due to time constraints. Also, it is difficult to give individual comments on the discussions. Therefore, whenever such an option is developed, a strategy for commenting on the discussions should be developed.
- One participant suggested that the two examinations tasks could be further integrated, perhaps by analyzing the learning activity in the reflective essay. That would require that the participants submit their learning activity during the first half of the course.
- This was the second year that I, Fredrik Portin, have taught this course. As I was given the task of teaching the course only a month before it was scheduled to begin, I didn't have the time to evaluate the course literature.

**Analysis**

The course was well received by those who participated in it. Unfortunately, no information is available on why some chose to drop out of the course.

The course literature is reasonable. However, in preparation for future courses, a revision of the literature could be considered to see whether there is any literature that is better suited for the course goals.

The comments did not give any reason to change the course design. Rather, it should be built and expanded upon.

If offering an equitable option, the discussions should be commented on by the teacher.

The examinations should be better integrated.

## **Action plan**

The course design works well and should be built upon.

The required reading should be reviewed and perhaps improved upon.

An equitable option should be offered in the future. However, if using the discussion forum in Canvas, a strategy for commenting on the discussions should be developed. One suggestion is to give one larger comment at the end of every week, instead of giving individual feedback on every post.

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

None.