

---

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

*Revised 2020-05-24*

---

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.

### Background information

Course name: Sport psychology

Semester: Spring term 2025

Course code: IF125E-56005

Course coordinator: Anna Funke

Number of registered students: 16

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	
Early dialogue on expectations for the course	X
Formative course evaluation	X
Summative course evaluation	X
Feedback to students	X

### **Forms of evaluation**

The summative course evaluation was conducted in the form of a digital survey at the end of the course. 4 students (25 % of the active students) responded to the digital evaluation. During the course, we try to evaluate how the course content suits the students and how it is received. These sources form the basis of this course report.

### **Summary of the students' course evaluations**

In summary, the students' feedback is positive. The students who completed the summative course evaluation consider that they have achieved the learning objectives of the course ( $5.0 \pm 1.0$  on a scale from 1–6, on the digital evaluation). The same students also felt that the course had met their expectations ( $5.0 \pm 1.0$ , on a scale from 1–6, on the digital evaluation). Related to the learning activities, they especially appreciated the lectures ( $4.7 \pm 1.5$ ) and exercise campaign ( $4.7 \pm 0.6$ ). The ratings were also high in general regarding the oral presentations ( $4.3 \pm 1.2$ ) and field study ( $4.3 \pm 1.2$ ). Although the oral examinations were generally appreciated by those who completed the course evaluation (mean rating  $4.3 \pm 2.9$ ), the responses also reflected a wide range of experiences. One student expressed that it can be particularly challenging to recall and articulate course content under time pressure during oral assessments. This highlights the importance of considering individual differences in exam formats and acknowledging that stress responses can affect student performance. The students left very few specific suggestions for improvement in the digital course evaluation. However, based on the ongoing dialogue with students during the course, the overall impression is that most students were generally satisfied with the course content and structure.

### **Summary of the evaluations of the teaching team**

The teaching team is generally satisfied with how the course has progressed this year. Although only a few students completed the digital course evaluation, the feedback received – both through the evaluation and during the course – indicates that students found the course interesting and engaging. The oral examination format continues to be appreciated by many, although individual experiences vary. As in previous years, we note the challenge of encouraging students to complete the digital evaluation after the course has ended.

### **Analysis**

The course continues to function well, and no major changes are deemed necessary at this point. The structure and content have been refined over several iterations, and the course appears to meet its intended learning outcomes effectively. Minor adjustments may be made based on individual feedback and internal reflections, but overall, the course remains stable and well-received.

One area of potential development could be to consider how we might increase the response rate to the digital course evaluation at the end of the course.