

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

### Course name:

“Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives on Research”

### Background information

- Semester: HT23
- Ladok code: HP704E-L3337
- Number of registered students: 30
- Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 14

<b>Implementation</b>	<b>Mark with an X</b>
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?**

<b>5 of 14 (36%)</b>	<b>has to a very large extent (level 6)</b>
<b>3 of 14 (21%)</b>	<b>has to a large extent (level 5)</b>
<b>3 of 14 (21%)</b>	<b>has to some extent (level 4)</b>
<b>2 of 14 (14%)</b>	<b>has not to some extent (level 3)</b>
<b>1 of 14 (7%)</b>	<b>has to a small extent (level 2)</b>
<b>0 of 3 (0%)</b>	<b>has to a very small extent (level 1)</b>

Mean: 4,6  
Standard deviation: 1,3

**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?**

<b>4 of 14 (29%)</b>	<b>has to a very large extent (level 6)</b>
<b>3 of 14 (21%)</b>	<b>has to a large extent (level 5)</b>
<b>5 of 14 (36%)</b>	<b>has to some extent (level 4)</b>
<b>1 of 14 (7%)</b>	<b>has not to some extent (level 3)</b>
<b>1 of 14 (7%)</b>	<b>has to a small extent (level 2)</b>
<b>0 of 3 (0%)</b>	<b>has to a very small extent (level 1)</b>

Mean: 4,6  
Standard deviation: 1,2

**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?**

<b>5 of 14 (36%)</b>	<b>has to a very large extent (level 6)</b>
<b>5 of 14 (36%)</b>	<b>has to a large extent (level 5)</b>
<b>1 of 14 (7%)</b>	<b>has to some extent (level 4)</b>
<b>2 of 14 (14%)</b>	<b>has not to some extent (level 3)</b>
<b>1 of 14 (7%)</b>	<b>has to a small extent (level 2)</b>
<b>0 of 3 (0%)</b>	<b>has to a very small extent (level 1)</b>

Mean: 4,8  
Standard deviation: 1,3

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

<b>4 of 14 (29%)</b>	<b>has to a very large extent (level 6)</b>
<b>3 of 14 (21%)</b>	<b>has to a large extent (level 5)</b>
<b>4 of 14 (29%)</b>	<b>has to some extent (level 4)</b>
<b>1 of 14 (7%)</b>	<b>has not to some extent (level 3)</b>
<b>1 of 14 (7%)</b>	<b>has to a small extent (level 2)</b>
<b>1 of 3 (7%)</b>	<b>has to a very small extent (level 1)</b>

Mean: 4,4  
Standard deviation: 1,5

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

<b>6 of 14 (43%)</b>	<b>has to a very large extent (level 6)</b>
<b>6 of 14 (43%)</b>	<b>has to a large extent (level 5)</b>
<b>2 of 14 (14%)</b>	<b>has to some extent (level 4)</b>
0 of 14 (0%)	has not to some extent (level 3)
0 of 14 (0%)	has to a small extent (level 2)
0 of 3 (0%)	has to a very small extent (level 1)

Mean: 5,3  
Standard deviation: 0,7

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

- Apart from one participant, the participants generally appreciated the flipped classroom design of the course, where they could watch video lectures before all sessions. The videos were generally perceived as well-done and informative.
- The course design was appreciated.
- One participant particularly mentioned the oral examination form as good. It consisted of a small literature review to find a theory they could develop concerning their research question (which could be the one they wanted to use in their thesis). They would then upload a video in a discussion forum in Canvas and make a short description of the theory they presented. In

this way, the group created a resource bank of theories together. They could read a brief description of the theories found by others and then look at the video presentation of the theory that particularly interested them. Accordingly, as well as providing the examiner with a basis for assessment, the presentations could be useful for all participants in the future.

- One commented that they would have liked individual feedback on their work. Due to time constraints, the examiner chose to give comments only to those who received U or G on their work, while those who received VG did not receive any comments. On Canvas, however, the assessment criteria were clearly described.
- A lecture on connectivism learning theory and experiential learning theory should be developed.
- One student asked if the final paper could use a theory that they didn't find through a literature review but that was already known. They were allowed to do it. However, for future courses, two paths of completing the written examination should be developed: One where they find relevant theories through a literature review, and one where they write about a theory by doing a literature review of how researchers have used that theory.
- Also, it should be made clear to the participants that they might have to find additional material to describe a theory. Their literature review might give results where a theory is mentioned. However, the exposition of that theory might be lacking, which then requires the participants to find out more about said theory in order to be able to describe it satisfactorily.

## **Analysis**

The course was well received apart from a few participants reactions. The comments did, however, not give any reason to change the course design. Rather, it should be built and expanded upon.

## **Action plan**

The course design works well and should be built upon. Particularly, more learning theories could be highlighted in video lectures.

The required reading should be reviewed and perhaps improved upon.

The participants should probably also need more insights into how to write an exposition of how they did their literature review, perhaps by introducing them to PRISMA flow diagrams.

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

None.