
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: Research methods in sport science,

Semester: Spring 2023

Ladok code: IV606G

Course coordinator: Sepandarmaz Mashreghi

Number of registered students: 22

Number of students who responded to the summative course evaluation: 9

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

Formative course evaluation was held throughout the course within the concept supervision time and in relation to course activities. Questions of what students thought about the course were asked continuously. The course provided two summative evaluations: one oral with 6 students present, and one digital with 9 students participating.

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.

As a whole students evaluate the course as well structured, and well guided and appreciated supervision of the teachers. On average, they experienced that they achieved the learning objectives of the course and appreciated the weekly flow of 'lecture-seminar-hand in of paper'. One student commented that: *"The hand-son approach in workshops reinforced the learning outcomes well and gave the class experience with conducting the types of research we were learning about. It was both helpful and enjoyable."*

The students appreciated that the examination forms were a direct link to the following course One year thesis, they could use assignments in the thesis and as such the thesis's work started already in this course. For students who wait and write the two-year thesis, this course was appreciated as a good first opportunity to start thinking of topic, possible methods and limitations.

Overall, the contents were in line with what students expected, one student wrote: *The four assignments were good markers of learning in the course.*

Although the examination forms were seen as reasonable, they were a bit confusing and especially the order they are mentioned in the course guide created a bit of confusion. In relation to annotated bibliography (one of the assignments), the students found that it was a bit difficult to find relevant literature to assess (qualitative thesis in chosen topic)

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.

The teaching team consisted of 3 teachers, of which 2 taught and examined about 90% of the course's learning activities and examinations. The whole course was conducted in a hybrid way with some of the course introduction and one of the lectures online, in addition to course evaluation. The rest of the lectures and workshops were done on campus.

The teaching team had a continuous contact to update each other on how the weeks went, how the students experienced one week's content, questions that arose, and worked with a focus to relate the course weeks' contents together to create a red line. Our focus was also to put this methods course in relation to the upcoming one-year thesis course, and to prepare students who were to write the two year master in spring 2023 for methodological choices and a critical approach to their topic, purpose and research questions.

We summarize the course good but less satisfactory than previous years. On the one hand, there was a group of students who came to all the classes and participated in the lectures and seminars. On the other hand, a larger number of students (as compared to years before) did not attend the lectures and seminars and these students were the ones who had trouble handing in their assignments or failing them. Many students, after proper feedback, managed to pass their assignments but 1-2 did not.

Analysis

Overall, the students felt that course was somewhat helpful and specially the examinations. Although they rated the course more average than previous years.

One major issue was in relation to the annotated bibliography. We as the teaching team feel that perhaps, there needs to be some adjustments to the scope of this assignment in terms of number of words, formatting etc.

Also the students had some difficulty writing a proper research plan and this particular assessment, needs more clarification.

There were also some issues regarding the authenticity of some of the students' work.

But most importantly, the teaching team feels that some of the above problems can be solved if we update the main literature for the course. The current main literature is not available digitally and it is hard to access, moreover it is somewhat confusing in some aspects.

Action plan

The first action plan is to change the main required reading book for the course. This requires small changes to the syllabus:

Tracy, S. J. (2019). *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated (435 pages)
Available online

~~Silverman, David (2013). *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook, Fourth Edition*. Sage. (488 p).~~

Next is to review and make some revisions to the scope of annotated bibliography. This does not require revisions to the syllabus at the moment.

In relation to the issue of plagiarism, we plan to ask the students to include the page numbers in their in-text citations. Moreover, we plan to emphasise that they have to bring in their own voices (personal experiences, reflections and such) in all their assessments.

Another plan is to review and revise the instructions for writing a research plan so that students are able to fulfil the examination successfully and also utilise this assessment for their thesis project. One idea is to discuss both deductive and inductive methods.

If the above plans especially in relation to writing a successful research plan does not work, then we may have to change the syllabus of the course in order to introduce a more deductive focused course content.

Proposed revisions to the course syllabus

At the moment, we will ask for a change of required literature on the syllabus.

See above for future plans.