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

Course name: Practice-Based Studies

Background information

- Date for course report: **February 2025**
- Semester: **Fall 2024**
- Ladok code and course instance code: **HP707E-L3343**
- Course coordinator: **Katherine Doerr**
- Number of registered students: **9**
- Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: **4**

Implementation	**Mark with an X**
The previous course report is communicated in connection with the start of the course	n/a
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 course evaluation was carried out as a semi-structured discussion at the course midpoint. In this discussion, student met in small groups and responded to a prompt: what works, what does not and why?. Then students presented their ideas to each other to create a common class response and then these principles were implemented in the remainder of the course planning. The summative course evaluation was administered using MAU survey and results are given 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 very large extent, median = to a very large extent, mode = to a very 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 very large extent, median = to a very large extent, mode = to a large extent); To what extent has the course as a whole met your expectations? (mean = to a very large extent, median = to a very 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 large extent, median = to a large extent, mode = to a 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, 44%. So fewer than half 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 question is not applicable because the only teacher was the faculty responsible for the course, Katherine Doerr.

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.

It appears that the content is in accordance with what students expect the course to be, and that the learning objectives are appropriate to their needs. The method of assessment is deemed well aligned to the objectives, as students respond that the type of assessment gave them the opportunity to show their learning to a large extent. Students had the opportunity to learn in collaboration with others and be responsible for their own learning to a large extent. While the fully-online approach to the course enabled a range of learning activities, these were slightly more limited than what would be possible if the students also met face-to-face. The main problem is 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 action plan is to encourage higher response rates for the course evaluation by more thoroughly explaining to students the importance of their participation in the evaluation, encouraging them to complete the evaluation, and devoting some class time to complete the evaluation.

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.

The reading list is somewhat dated and repetitive. Suggest revising this list prior to the course being offered again, including more recent scholarly articles as examples of practice-based research, At this time, given that overall students were satisfied to a large extent, no further revisions are proposed.

MALMÖ UNIVERSITET

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 C*ourse 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