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

Course name: Generative AI in Teaching and Examination in Higher Education-VT25

Background information

- Date for course report: **August 29th, 2025**

- Semester: **Spring 2025**

- Ladok code and course instance code: **HP627E**

- Course coordinator**: Andreas Jacobsson (56166), Nathalie Auer (L0033)**

- Number of registered students: **49 (56166) + 31 (L0033) = 80**

- Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: **18**

Implementation	Mark with an X
The previous course report is communicated in connection with the start of the course	**X Via webinar and slides**
Early dialogue on expectations for the course	**X Via webinar and Padlet**
Formative course evaluation	**X Via Reflex**
Summative course evaluation	**X Via Reflex**
Feedback to students	It will be published in Canvas

Forms of evaluation
The course employed both formative and summative evaluations. Formative feedback was gathered through mid-course reflections and discussions, while the summative evaluation was conducted via a structured survey including both quantitative ratings and open-ended responses.

Summary of the students' course evaluations
Students expressed high satisfaction with the course content, structure, and delivery.

Key strengths highlighted include:

- **Hands-on exploration** of generative AI tools in real-world educational contexts.
- **Ethical discussions** and critical perspectives on AI use in higher education.
- **Engaging webinars** and guest lectures that supported learning outcomes.
- **Clear learning outcomes** and relevant reading materials.
- **Opportunities for reflection**, peer interaction, and practical application.

Quantitative results showed:

- A **mean score of 4.9** for achieving learning outcomes.
- A **mean score of 5.1** for the effectiveness of learning activities.
- A **mean score of 5.2** for the appropriateness of examination formats.
- A **mean score of 5.4** for promoting student responsibility in learning.
- A **mean score of 5.1** for overall course satisfaction.

Suggestions for improvement included:

- Extending the duration of workshop in module 3 for deeper engagement.
- Clarifying mandatory components early in the course.
- Reducing the number of webinars or allowing selective attendance.
- Adjusting scheduling to better accommodate working professionals.

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team

Overall, the participants expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the course. The teaching methods were effective, allowing students to explore personal interests while still achieving the intended learning outcomes.
The teaching team highlighted several strengths:
- Participants appreciated the diverse perspectives offered by the guest lecturers and the richness of the learning materials.
- The course was well-structured and provided a balanced mix of synchronous and asynchronous discussions.
- The examination setup was thoughtfully designed and effectively aligned with the learning objectives.

Only one participant did not share this positive view.

Analysis
The course successfully met its objectives, with students demonstrating strong engagement and achievement of learning outcomes. The integration of ethical, legal, and pedagogical dimensions of AI was particularly appreciated. However, some structural and logistical challenges were noted, such as scheduling conflicts and fragmented organization, which may have impacted some students' ability to fully engage.

Action plan
Short-term actions:

- Review the number of webinars.

- Improve clarity on mandatory vs. optional components.

- Adjust scheduling to reduce conflicts with other courses.

Long-term actions:

- Update reading materials to reflect the most current research.

- Introduce more subject-specific examples and structured peer activities.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

- Clarify expectations and deliverables in the syllabus to support better time management.

- Update reading materials to reflect the most current research.

Information on course reports

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.

Revised 2020-05-24