

---

## Template for course evaluations at Malmö University

*Revised at the meeting of Utbildningsberedningen the 24<sup>th</sup> of November 2015.*

---

*The course evaluation is an important tool in the development of courses and programs as well as securing the possibility of student influence. The structure of the course evaluation is described in *Policy för kvalitetsbygge: kursutvärdering* and must contain background information/key figures, a summary of the students' course evaluations including an analysis, plan of action and proposed changes to the syllabus. The course evaluation is then published together with other information on the course.*

### Background information

Name of course: Sport and sustainable development  
Semester: spring 2020  
Ladok code: IV605G  
Course coordinator: Marie Larneby  
Number of registered students: 17  
Number of student responses on summative evaluations: 2 written, 5 oral

Activity	Mark with X
Previous course evaluation has been communicated to students at the start of the course	x
Early dialogue about expectations on the course has been held	x
Formative course evaluation	x
Summative course evaluation	x
Feedback to students	x

### Types of evaluations

Formative evaluations was performed through the course in relation to seminars and lectures with the course leader. A first summative course evaluation, with the course leader present, was performed at the end of the course, with 5 students attending. A written summative course evaluation was performed via a link to a questionnaire through Canvas. Reminders were sent via Canvas. 2 students handed in the questionnaire.

### Summary of the students' course evaluations

The **digital** course evaluation with two (2) students report the following values regarding the questionnaire's questions (value 1: to a very low extent, value 6: to a very high extent):

1. To what extent do you consider yourself to have achieved the learning objectives for the course?  
a) Average value 5,5
2. To what extent do you consider that the different course's work methods/learning activities have been supporting your learning for achieving the learning objectives?  
a) Lectures 6,0  
b) Seminars 4,5  
c) Group work 4,0  
d) Written papers 5,0
3. To what extent do you consider that the course's examination forms gave you the opportunity to show how well you achieved the learning objectives? Examination forms for the course have been written assignments in portfolio form (3 papers) and one (1) written report.  
a) Average value 5,0. Lowest value was 4,0 and the highest value was 6,0.
4. To what extent has the course given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning?  
a) Average value 5,5
5. To what extent do you consider that the course as a whole has met your expectations?  
a) Average value 5,5
6. Learning is, among other things, about acquiring new ways of thinking. To what extent do you think your mindset was challenged in the course so that you acquired new perspectives?  
a) Average value 5,5

According to the questionnaire, the two (2) students have put in a workload compared to 25–75% of full-time studies which is a lower result than expected as the course is a full-time (100%) course. Obligatory course literature has been read to a great extent. The students answer that the course content have relevance in relation to prospective occupation to a high extent (average 5,0).

The **oral** summative evaluation with five (5) students attending were more broad then the questions in the questionnaire and open for discussion. In general, the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the course. They appreciated the relation and ongoing dialogues with the lecturers, at lectures and seminars. In some cases, they argue that the lecturers could have communicated more on the contents as it sometimes was perceived as scattered, but also adding their understanding of lecturers' different perspectives and expert areas and expectations of the students' own ability to link contents. In general they found the idea of the teacher-led seminars in relation to each lecture as good and the seminars fruitful, but as they were not mandatory, it was easy to choose not to attend. However, they agreed that attending the seminars – which all had tasks during the seminars – provided a better base for the assignments then merely studying individually. They appreciated that they were expected to search and use relevant literature and scientific sources as an addition to the course literature, and that they were able to put an individual touch at the assignments. By choosing their own examples as a base for analysis and discussion on sustainability and sustainable development, they could elevate cases of their own interest, especially in the written report. They also appreciated that it was one person (in this case the course leader) that assessed all the assignments (three papers in the portfolio and one written report). As the course leader commented each paper in the portfolio in a formative way, the students knew what was adequate or inadequate, and what they could improve in the next paper. Of most concern for these 5 students, was that the word limit in the three papers of the portfolio (700 words +/- 10% per paper) for most was perceived as too limiting. They argued that as it is a portfolio with one grade, the papers could perhaps have a broader word limit and for the student to choose how many words per papers (e.g. 800-900 words +/- 10%).

### **Summary of involved teachers' evaluations**

The course was given for the second time and used a majority of the former course's design, but also developed and improved contents and work forms. Teachers for the course consisted of three (3) internal lecturers and one (1) external lecturer which gave a broad perspective on sustainability and sustainable development, but also the relation to sport. The course emphasized this relation even more than former

year, as a call for improvement from former year's course report. This may explain the high rating of the lectures in the evaluations. However, the in general low attendance at the lectures (50-80% attendance) surprises the course leader and teachers as it is a full time Master's program. Attending the few lectures and seminars (in average two/week) provide a discussion of the course contents, literature and the students' questions and experiences as a help. This low attendance needs a follow-up, as the non-attending students in general had problems of managing the level of the course assignment, which the attending students in general had not.

## **Analysis**

The course evaluations gives enough feedback to interpret that course learning outcomes are achieved in a good manner. 15 of 17 students completed the course during the semester, and most of them before the next course started.

The course is an important course as it gives the students a solid foundation to concepts of sustainability and sustainable development in relations to sports. Sustainable development and sustainability are relatively new concepts in relations to sport and is under continuous development. The students are interested in the topic and communicated the use of this knowledge.

The course runs during 5 weeks as a full time 7.5 credit course. Some students perceived this as intense and short of time. However, in comparison to running two 7,5 credit courses at half time parallel in ten weeks, the students appreciated focus in one topic and exams in only one topic. The 5-week course also enables a close relation and ongoing dialogue between course leader/teachers and students who meet every week. It therefore needs to be communicated **before** the course start that the students need to begin to read/study early in the course, and get the literature in time, as the first paper is due early on in the course.

Regarding the word limit of the 3 papers in the portfolio, many students perceived it as too limiting to be able to answer the task in both a broad and analytical way (700 +/- 10%). The opinion of the course leader that also assessed all papers, is that this limit **is** adequate to answer the task of each paper. However, some more words (e.g. 750 +/- 10%) probably will improve the level of many papers, which should be taken into consideration for next course. Of importance to mention, though, is that students who took the feedback for each paper into account (for instance when a paragraph was superfluous, or when they needed to be more analytical and less descriptive and so on) also showed improvement and managed the task better within the 700 word limit in the next papers, which also was communicated to the course leader by the students.

## **Plan of action**

The course is perceived to function well. The course's different teachers need to have a close discussion of which topical aspects are elevated and how the different lectures can work even better together, and relate to the task of the papers in the portfolio. It is the course leader's and the program coordinator's responsibility to communicate the importance of attending lectures and seminars.

The word limit of the papers in the portfolio should be taken under consideration, but an addition is not proposed either, as the course leader perceive that the papers were at an adequate level given the task.

## **Proposed changes to the syllabus**

No suggestions are given at this point. In a long term perspective, the portfolio with three papers could be replaced with a longer paper (with the same questions and learning outcome gathered in one task) which would provide space for more discussion and analysis.