

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

Course name: **Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Educating for Widening Participation and Inclusion**

Background information

- Date for course report: **December 2025**
- Semester: **Fall 2025**
- Ladok code and course instance code: **HP703E**
- Course coordinator: **Katherine Doerr**
- Number of registered students: **22**
- Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: **11**

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

Describe the method(s) and implementation for both the formative and the summative course evaluation.

The formative evaluation was conducted through a semi-structured discussion at the midpoint of the course. During this session, students worked in small groups to address the prompt: “What works, what doesn’t, and why?” They then shared their ideas with the class to develop a collective response, which informed adjustments to the remaining course plan. The summative evaluation was carried out using the MAU survey, and the results are presented in the following section.

Summary of the students’ course evaluations

The students’ views are objectively summarised here based on the various course evaluations for the course (see above). Individuals may not be named in the course report.

The course evaluation asked five questions on a 6-point likert scale. The questions and their answers were: To what extent do you consider you have achieved the learning objectives for this course? (mean = to a large extent, median = to a large extent, mode = to a large extent); To what extent do you think the learning activities have reinforced your learning and your ability to achieve the learning objectives? (mean = to a large extent, median = to a large extent, mode = to a large extent); To what extent do you consider the types of assessment gave you the opportunity to show how well you achieved the learning goals? (mean = to a large extent, median = to a large extent, mode = to a large extent); To what extent has the course as a whole met your expectations? (mean = to a large extent, median = to a large extent, mode = to a large extent); To what extent has the course given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning? (mean = to a very large extent, median = to a very large extent, mode = to a very large extent). Overall, the mode, median, and mean of course response, which may be a proxy for effectiveness of the course, is to a large extent. The response rate to the survey was, however, 50%. So fewer than three quarters of the students did not evaluate the course.

Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team

The views of the teaching team regarding the content, learning activities and summative assessment of the course are summarised here.

This course was only taught by Katherine Doerr, the responsible faculty member

Analysis

The analysis is based on a summary of the students' and teachers' individual and joint course evaluations. Both success factors and problems are identified.

The course content appears to align well with students' expectations, and the learning objectives seem relevant to their needs. The assessment methods are considered appropriately matched to these objectives, as students indicate that formative assignments significantly supported their learning. Learners were given ample opportunities to collaborate with peers and take responsibility for their own progress. Although the fully online format allowed for a variety of learning activities, these were somewhat more restricted compared to what could be achieved through face-to-face interaction. The primary concern remains the low response rate for the course evaluation.

Action plan

The short-term and long-term changes that are to be implemented are specified here, along with a timeline. If no action is planned to address a specified problem, this decision must be justified.

The plan of action is to boost participation in the course evaluation by clearly communicating to students why their feedback is valuable, motivating them to complete the survey, and allocating class time for them to do so.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

Suggestions for possible revisions to the syllabus are proposed here, supported by the above evaluation and the action plan.

At this time, given that overall students were satisfied to a large extent, no revisions are proposed.

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.

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.

Revised 2020-05-24