

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

Course name:

“Educating for Widening Participation and Inclusion”

Background information

- Semester: HT23
- Ladok code: HP703E-36177
- 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?

2 of 7 (29%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
4 of 7 (57%)	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: 5,1
Standard deviation: 0,7

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?

1 of 7 (14%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
3 of 7 (43%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
2 of 7 (29%)	has to some extent (level 4)
1 of 7 (14%)	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: 4,6
Standard deviation: 1,0

- One of the participants would have wanted the teaching to be less centered around the course material and more centered around their teaching practice and experience, as well as being more structured – i.e., discussing a specific topic.
- Another participant similarly felt that the course material was too much in focus, not the experience of teaching and learning in practice. The participant suggested that they should have interviewed colleagues on this topic, which they would talk about during the sessions.

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?

0 of 7 (0%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
4 of 7 (57%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
2 of 7 (29%)	has to some extent (level 4)
1 of 7 (14%)	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: 4,4
Standard deviation: 0,8

- One participant suggested that the written course examination (a reflective essay) could have been more inclusive if different options for the examination were given.

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

1 of 7 (14%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
2 of 7 (29%)	has to a large extent (level 5)
3 of 7 (43%)	has to some extent (level 4)
1 of 7 (14%)	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: 4,4
Standard deviation: 1,0

- One participant had expected the course to center more around their own experiences and not the course material.

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

2 of 7 (29%)	has to a very large extent (level 6)
5 of 7 (71%)	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: 5,3
Standard deviation: 0,5

Other noteworthy perspectives from formative and summative course evaluation

- Some highlighted the break-out room discussions as particularly rewarding. One reason that was highlighted was that it allowed everybody to contribute with their perspectives during the sessions.
- The book Burke, Crozier, & Misiaszek, *Changing pedagogical spaces in higher education: Diversity, inequalities and misrecognition* (Routledge, 2017) was criticized for being too US/UK-centric, as well as being too theoretical and vague. Several participants would have liked a wider international perspective in the course material.
- One participant highlighted that the course “practiced what it preached,” meaning that it made efforts to make the teaching and learning more inclusive.

Analysis

The students’ main complaint was the course literature. This was in two respects. First, they felt it was too focused on teaching in the US and UK, while they would have liked a broader international perspective in the literature. Secondly, the teaching was primarily based on discussing this literature during the sessions. The participants would have liked more variety in teaching methods. The reason why the emphasis was on the course literature was that the teacher was teaching the course for the first time, which meant, among other things, that he did not have already developed material to work from. There was also no time to develop this material, as the course was started when there were many other tasks that were on-going at the time. However, if the teacher gives the course again, this will not be a problem, as there is a course design that can be used and modified.

One thing the participants appreciated during the course was the equitable option that was offered. This meant that those who could not attend sessions could discuss the material with other participants in the discussion forum on Canvas. Similarly, they could do their oral examination in the form of a video if they could not attend the examination seminar. The participants appreciated this, as they could have more control and flexibility in their learning.

One thing that was also desired was more emphasis on how to realize widening participation and inclusion in teaching and learning in practice. The course books touched on this theme by giving examples and experiences working with these issues from different perspectives. However, some participants would have liked the teaching to be more about their perspectives. A challenge with this is that several participants were not currently working in higher education or had no experience teaching in higher education. For this reason, the participants with less experience had to interview someone with that experience to write a reflective essay rooted in the experience of working on these issues in practice. There could be reasons to develop this so that all participants must interview/engage in dialogue with colleagues in their field about how and if widening participation and inclusion is realized in that field.

Action plan

The course should focus more on the practice of working with widening participation and inclusion in higher education. One way is to develop the examination tasks to be more centered on this issue.

The course material should have a wider international perspective.

The equitable options for the course should be continued and developed. Other courses within the program could also benefit from adding similar equitable options.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

The assessment might need revision depending on how the examinations are developed in the future.