## Module Coordinator Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module title</th>
<th>Problem-based field study – power relations and actor perspectives in everyday social work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University where module is delivered</td>
<td>Aalborg University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module coordinator</td>
<td>Lars Uggerhøj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module teaching team</td>
<td>Kjeld Høgsbro, Pia Ringø, Lars Uggerhøj and representatives from four Field Study practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dates of the classes | February: 7th, 20th, 21st, 23rd  
March: 15th + 2 weeks of visiting Field Study practices |
| Number of classroom hours | 27 |

### Distribution of assessment marks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of assignment</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Fx</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students passed.

### Commentary on teaching

- What teaching activities and methods were used?
- What worked well during teaching?
- Were there any problems during teaching?
- What reading or work was set for students outside class?
- How engaged and committed did students seem?

The aim of the module is to provide students with the skills and competences to conduct a field study with a focus on power relations and actor perspectives. The module expands exposure to the idea of research from Semester 1 and let the students engage with primary research as a foundation for more in-depth work on research techniques in the second year of ADVANCES. The module represents the practical application and instantiation of themes and approaches covered in other Semester 2 modules on problem-based approaches and power and actors within welfare systems. The teaching part of the module is placed just before the 2 weeks
visit to practice in social work and is focused on methodological approaches to help students carry through the Field Study. One day is planned as a seminar where students meet the four Field Study practices – through presentations and time to ask questions and comment – and to establish groups for the Field Study group work and the Problem Based Learning group report writing. Besides teaching and seminar activities in the beginning of the semester students have in 4 groups visited 4 Danish institutional settings for fourteen days. During the Field Study students conducted a piece of study defining the specific institutional dynamics within the organization. The focus has related both to the overall headline of the Aalborg Semester: Actor Perspectives and Power Relations and to the PBL approach – using both the findings and the contacts from the field study in the later PBL-project. Lectures have been placed in a mix with lectures on ‘Actor Perspectives and Power Relations’ and ‘Problem Based Learning’.

The student feedback is in general a little more positive in 2017 than in 2016. Although some students still feel that the assessment requirements are not totally clear, most students think that the assessment task was relevant. The evaluation of teacher engagement, punctuality and efficiency in answering mails is very positive and for some questions even 100%.

Students are very happy to meet social work practice, to see the Danish welfare system in action and to get into dialogue with practitioners. Just like other cohorts this cohort would like to expand the time for visits. We know this, but unfortunately it is not possible for students to stay longer as practice cannot plan for longer visits. It is a challenge for practice to have international students visiting – and also a very interesting challenge for all practices (we have every year had very positive feedback from practice) – but they are not able to use more resources on this. On top of these visits practice also accept visits and studies during the later PBL-project writing. Most students seemed very committed during the module, all students were enthusiastic during the Field study in practice and very engaged at the assessment presentations.

Commentary on assessment:

- Brief description of the module assessments
- What information was given to students about the assignment?
- What type of feedback was given to students?
- How was student performance?
- What was the range of marks achieved by the cohort?
- Was there any learning outcome that students achieved particularly well or less well than others?

Students have – in groups – presented results of and findings from the Field Study. The presentation was oral and included experiences, observations and discussions from the Field Study including initial analysis of power relations and actor perspectives. Participants at the presentation were – besides all students – two
representatives from the teaching team. The assessment values the student’s ability to form initial analysis of power relations and actor perspectives as well as the ability to reflect theoretically, methodologically and ethically on processes from the Field Study – including the student’s role during the Field Study. The presentation and discussion was marked as either passed or failed.

Just like cohort 1, 2 and 3 all students passed the assessment.

The assessment structure and plan is described in the Aalborg semester handbook and described at the Field Study seminar two weeks before the Field Study takes place. The last three lectures – four hours pr. day in three days – focuses specifically on the Field Study mainly methodologically, but also on the different practices and the assessment.

Besides the marks passed or failed the two representatives from the teaching team gave each group an oral feedback. The student’s performances were all very good involving well done observations, analysis and discussions.

Comments on the module evaluation by students:

- What did students most enjoy?
- What areas did students identify as needing development?
- What pieces of the qualitative feedback are interesting and useful?

Number of respondents: 11 out of 12 students

Students have generally made positive comments about the content of the module and the academic level. Some students found that the requirements for the module and the assessment could be more clear. Likewise some students found the academic level challenging. It looks like establishing groups after only two weeks – which was introduced in 2015 – still helps students to use the group work much better. Up till now we haven’t seen any conflicts in groups although groups are established early in the semester and continue all the way through the PBL module.

Action points for next academic year:

- What changes are recommended for the module next year?

1. Since 2014 (first cohort) the descriptions of the module, the assessment and practical matters have been qualified through the module Handbook. The Handbook descriptions are an ongoing process. Therefore the handbook is changed throughout the semester whenever needed as well as we will make necessary changes after going through the evaluation. According to the feedback given from some students about missing requirements for the module and the assessment, we will improve and clarify information in the very first weeks before the Field Study in practice.

2. Besides the Handbook Blackboard has been introduced and used in Aalborg since the spring semester 2015. This is also an ongoing process that will carry on
through each semester.

3. Before the 2017 teaching the methodological lectures were renovated a bit and connected even more to the Field Study. The 2017 feedback seems to point out that we have succeeded in this. Fewer students are critical towards the teaching and the academic level. The level has not been lowered, but better connected. Few students still find the academic level challenging, and we will be aware of this, but do not expect to make changes before cohort 5.

Are there any specific matters or questions where you would like advice from the External Expert?

Module coordinators should submit the following information to the External Expert to aid the evaluation of the module:

1. 5-6 marked pieces of student work, including feedback, covering the full range of grades awarded
2. Full list of student marks for the module, including evidence of moderation or double marking
3. Module handbook, giving an overview of the module and teaching and learning; assessment(s) and marking criteria
4. Report by module coordinator, including ideas for changes in the next academic year
5. Summary of the module evaluation by students (see grid below)
6. Any additional relevant materials provided to students, for example, assessment guidance.

Responses to module evaluation (please highlight most popular response in yellow)

1: Did the module outline make it clear what you were expected to do?
2: Did the teaching help you to achieve the module’s learning outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: Was the module content intellectually stimulating?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4: Was the module well-structured and coherent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5: How did you like the teaching and learning strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6: Was the core reading useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7: How interesting was the core reading?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8: How helpful were the module materials (e.g. handouts, slides, online links) for your learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9: Were the assessment requirements clear?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10: Did the assessment tasks seem relevant to the module content and learning outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some-what</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11: What did you enjoy during this module?

- field study and interactions with the Danish practitioners
- The theoretical and analytical approaches presented in the class were very interesting for me. Moreover, the field study has been an amazing experience for me. It is full of new perspectives in social work and helping process and enabled me to question approaches I have taken for granted.
- group discussions
- The two week field exposure was really interesting and helpful. It gave us the opportunity to see how the welfare system of Denmark works, allowed us to get exposed to context and culture by talking and engaging face to face to the citizens and social actors. This field exposure should also be replicated to other countries/universities involved in the program.
- I enjoyed learning about ethnography and the means to implement it in.
- I really enjoyed the possibility to approach to one of the institutions who works in the Welfare system and compared it to the institutions of my country.
- I liked the group work and the assignment that is assigned to group is really interesting. It has benefitted me alot, for instance if i do notunderstanad another firned can clarify me again and again. Group work in class and also in the field seems really interesting for me.

I have learned alot. I have learned how the system works and and also leaned the power relationship between different actors. Working in organization with these power perspectives has taught me alot which was notpossible in my home country.

Thank you Erasmus for this course design and structures.
- The opportunity to be more practical and meet service users.
- I particularly enjoyed discussions about the service users' perspective, their recognition, and involvement in the provision of social services which were developed and created to achieve clients' well-being in the first place. How to transform the meeting between service and service users into the respectful and yet helpful experience was a very challenging task, but also quite thought-provoking.
- I enjoyed the variety of professors that taught us. It was intellectually stimulating to have persons from different disciplines speak to us and most of the topics we very new for me so it gave me lot to think about.
- The module introduced an interesting perspective of institutional ethnography and had an opportunity to investigate power relations in an institutional setting. Theories and different methodologies provided a strong knowledge base on power relations and actor perspectives.

12: What did you least enjoy about the module?

- The teaching in class, especially the theories/concepts/terms are difficult to understand; might be language issue ?
- Nothing.
- no comments
- The assessment requirement is unclear.
- The field study time is very short and limited. To conduct a real ethnographic study we need more time and structure. It would have been nice to be more engaged with the organization rather than just sit for interviews.
- In general, the module was very interesting although I missed a better explanation about the field study. In first place, because during the module, tools and methods of ethnography were explained and it seemed that we could have the opportunity to organize our own schedule with them (the institutions), but at the end we just attended meetings they planned.
- There were more positive parts rather than compulsorily finding out the negative sides.

The field duration should have been a bit stretched few weeks more. This might enable us to learn more from the organization rather than short glimpse for 2 weeks.

Thank you
- The nature of the reading material was very difficult
- Institutional ethnography was definitely the one which was relatively novel for me and hence, very interesting. Though, I felt more lectures on the issue would have been useful to comprehend different ideas behind it and easily translate it into the practice field.
Some of the topics and theories were complex and the readings were heavy, as such I was unable to read thoroughly before every single class and this made it a bit more challenging to understand the content when presented in class.

Lectures were too long and draining at times.

13: What changes, if any, could be made to improve the module?

- not sure
- in the last classes before the field work started we should have more time to make questions in class.
- The module team must ensure to discuss the module and the course requirement in the beginning of the class/programme. It was quite unclear for us what is expected from us. The module was surely sent to us but atleast if it was discussed to us we could have chances to clarify our thoughts and queries. We recognized that we are given the discretion on how we present our outputs but if only atleast it was discuss through, it can make it clearer for us.
- More interactions during the class as they are the most interesting.
- I would like to have more meetings with the institutions to organize and share the information we observed.
- I could change the module or the field work:

I would have included a meeting supervisor once or twice in between the field work to access the progress so that we are on right track accessing the organizations on the power and perspective.

Thank you

- Improve on the nature of the reading material to make it more user friendly
- Field study preparation could have been more extensive and supervision during the preparation would have been more effective. As I did not have much experience in research, I would benefit from at least one supervision meeting with a supervisor that would enable us to stay on the right track.
- I think this module could be slightly longer. Considering that we don't have classes after March, it would have been could to schedule the classes further apart instead of having a full day of classes, most days of the week. It was overwhelming at times to listen to a lecture for a whole day.
- Prolong the field work study to 3-4 weeks

19: Was the academic level of the module too easy or too hard? Please explain your answer.

- Bit difficult to understand the academic terms
- Neither of them. It fits my level of understanding and enabled me to improve my analytical skills.
- professors should context the Nordic welfare state before introduce the concepts of this system
- It was tolerable but most of the time challenging. But I don't considere it too hard rather it was fine.
- Normal but for someone like me who never explore power relations in this manner, I think more time would be better to explore all the different ideas.
- In some way, it was easy to understand the main concepts and the theories, but on the other hand, for some of us English is our second language and it was difficult to comprehend some specific examples or issues
• I really liked how the course was began with the social systems that operates in Denmark and nordic countries and other necessary information.

It has been easy to understand the module and made us to think more for the further answers.

It has been a great part of learning, but lets see how will i be doing in my assessment.
• It was a little difficult especially when it came to using conventional terms.
• The academic level of the module was pertinent to our skills, experience, and background. it was quite stimulating intellectually.
• It was very suitable for the postgraduate level. Challenging and stimulating while not very difficult to fully comprehend.
• It was fair...largely because the concepts were new to me so and needed some time to have an appreciation of the concepts

20: Did you feel prepared for the field study?

21: Did you feel welcome and taken care of at the field study places?

22: Have the field study helped you clarify what you want to write about in your PBL project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23: What changes, if any, could be made to improve the field study?
• Instead asking the agency to prepare the programs, I think it will be good if there are some days that we can plan the programs
• I and my team have enjoyed the field study so much. We have learned a lot. However, the service in the organization is very specific and limited to connect with all or most of the concepts we learned in class. But I feel this by its own will enable us to critically analyze the approach we observed in light of the broad theories and approaches we grasped in class.
• no comments
• Module requirement must be discussed clearly beforehand especially expectations from the field.
• Be more engaged with the organization. It is not very efficient to only visit for interviews and not be allowed to observe a lot or talk with the clients.
• Better communication and understanding between the fields and the university.
• I mentioned in the earlier questions i guess about support from the professor in field work days to assess if we are on right track or not.

regards

• Increase on the time for the field work. Two weeks are not enough especially in a country like Denmark where you need to first understand institutional structures.
• The stuff in the field organization was extremely welcoming and friendly. They were answering all our questions with patience and accuracy.
• Perhaps to give us more time to prepare the presentation. We had interviews to conduct and because of the schedule of some staff members, we had to interview one person 2 days before our presentation so perhaps we should have 2 weeks of field study then 3 or 4 business days to do any other reflections and preparations for the presentation. But this is a very minimal of not, unnecessary adjustment. Just a mere suggestion.
• Prolong the study to 3-4 weeks
30: Was the workload for this module acceptable? Please explain your answer.

- It is alright
- Very acceptable.
- I think the workload was very reasonable
- Yes.
- Yes the readings were divided and the time given for us to prepare is very good.
- Yes. It was reasonable according to the time
- Work load is acceptable
- Yes it was. This is because I consider the work load to be in line with post graduate education.
- The Workload was realistic, it also helped me to adjust to the group work.
- Yes it was. We had enough time to coordinate and reflect. Sometimes however as stated earlier, it was a bit hectic to read, reflect, take notes and do all activities but I think this is in reason of the workload expected at the postgraduate level. Nevertheless, that was (as expected) the not so comfortable part.
- The workload was acceptable.. There was ample time for lectures and critical issues were covered

Overall Status
### Marks - Cohort 3 and 4

#### Cohort 3 - 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Field Study</th>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>PBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mum</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMK2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JET2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3470</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>STG2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MAF2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CHW1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ANZ1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FOB2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>JOS2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GUR1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>XIC2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grade point average:** 8.17, 9.25

#### Cohort 2 – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Field Study</th>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>PBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIP1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAA2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADN1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CLD2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JOE2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LIM2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LLM1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NOA2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TIT2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ANN2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CHW2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>VEM2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GAE1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grade point average:** 9.38, 7.69
# Module Coordinator Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module title</th>
<th>Problem Based Approaches (PBL) in Social Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University where module is delivered</td>
<td>Aalborg University, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module coordinator</td>
<td>Lars Uggerhøj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module teaching team</td>
<td>Lone Krogh, Kjeld Høgsbro, Pia Ringø, Vibeke Bak Nielsen, Søren Peter Olesen, Lars Uggerhøj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of the classes</td>
<td>February: 3rd and 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April: 7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May: 10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June: 23rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision during: April, May and June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classroom hours</td>
<td>17 + supervision (35 hours pr. group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of assessment marks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of assignment</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Fx</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written project with oral defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall             |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |       |

**Commentary on teaching**

- What teaching activities and methods were used?
- What worked well during teaching?
- Were there any problems during teaching?
- What reading or work was set for students outside class?
- How engaged and committed did students seem?

The aim of the module is to provide students with knowledge about the theories, the methods and the practical forms of the Problem Based Learning (PBL) model as well as practical guidelines on how to conduct Problem and Project Based Learning when doing research on social work issues. The module will through lectures, class discussions and especially project-based group work identify PBL as an approach to
teaching, learning and research practices based on the idea that wondering and reflecting should guide the learning process and the definition of the problem to be studied. Students will be trained in understanding and working with PBL as a combination of theoretical, methodological, empirical and practical problems within the field of study. As well as students will be taught how PBL can be seen as an appropriate approach when doing research in different European contexts characterized by different interests and actors pursuing and promoting conflicting perspectives and interests, discourses, concepts, theories and models of social work and that PBL can encourages students to do research in such a context in an independent, reflective and knowledge based way. These learning processes are established through lectures, supervision and group work with the main emphasis on supervision and group work.

The presentation of PBL in the beginning and just before starting to write the project seems to work well – although a couple of students would like some more. The description of the assignment and the requirements for the seminar has been revised and this has changed the feedback in a more positive direction. We will continue to keep an eye on this.

The supervision seems to work very well with high ranking in the evaluation. Since 2016 we have put more emphasis on the combination between PBL and social work which has been a little difficult for students at earlier cohorts.

The PBL approach, with very much emphasis on group work, students own responsibility and their collaboration with the supervisor as a partner and facilitator, is new and challenging for many students. But they work very hard and enthusiastic with the challenge and marks also show that they do a very good job. The feedback is generally better in 2017 than in 2016 and students express a lot of interest in the PBL approach and the challenges connected to it in their evaluation.

One student is a little critical to the sudden stop of lectures and would like some lectures to continue through the writing project weeks. Our experience is that all lectures are needed before starting writing the project and that students need all the time they can get to collect data, analyze and write the project.

Commentary on assessment:

- Brief description of the module assessments
- What information was given to students about the assignment?
- What type of feedback was given to students?
- How was student performance?
- What was the range of marks achieved by the cohort?
- Was there any learning outcome that students achieved particularly well or less well than others?

The assessment is based on a written report produced by a group of students – established before the Field Study – and defended in a group exam. Groups are all the way through the process of writing the report supported by a supervisor from
the teaching team. The combined written and oral form values the student’s knowledge, skills and competences to do problem based research in complex contexts in an independent, reflective and knowledge based way. Groups are free to choose the focus of the project-study, but it has to be within the theme of ‘Power Relations and Actor Perspectives’. The project must involve a clear reference to the theoretical, methodological, empirical and practical problems of knowledge within the field of study as well as it involves looking at the individual student’s and the groups capability to reflect on processes of learning and the academic advancement. The written part counts 50 % and the oral part 50 %. All though the assessment of this module integrates knowledge from module 6 and 8 it represents an independent assessment.

Two representatives from the teaching team – the supervisor and a general marker (participating at all oral exams) – have read the report and participated in the oral defence as well as they have undertaken all marking and comments to students. There was agreement on the range of marks. Students are given an oral feedback together with the mark immediately after the oral presentation and a small discussion among the markers.

The average marking (in the Danish marking-scale) has fallen from 9,25 in 2016 to 7,69 in 2017. As the average marking from 2015 to 2016 fell from 10,62 to 9,25 the average making has fallen from 10,62 to 7,69 from cohort 2 to cohort 4. Students are marked individually, but as the PBL report is written and defended in a group the groups often have the same mark. Consequently we often see the average marking changing quiet a lot as a very low or high marking in a group of three or four people out of 12 or 13 students influence the average marking heavily. In 2017 one group was marked low – two group members with 4 (D) and one group member with 2 (E). If this group had 7 (C) instead of 4, 4 and 2 the average marking would raise from 7,69 to 8,53. For the first time marks were differentiated within one group – the group with the lowest marking. Markers found that the difference in the performance at the oral defence was too big to give the same mark to all group members. In all one group was marked 12 (A), two groups were marked 7 (C) and one group was marked 4, 4 and 2 (D, D and E) while three groups were marked 10 (B) and one group 7 (C) in 2016.

Information about the assessment is both given in the Aalborg semester handbook, through the final lecture before starting the writing process, at the seminar and through supervision. Last year students wrote in the evaluation that lecturers didn’t give the same information about the PBL project. This has been taken care of and we don’t see this critique in 2017.

Comments on the module evaluation by students:

- What did students most enjoy?
- What areas did students identify as needing development?
- What pieces of the qualitative feedback are interesting and useful?

Number of respondents: 9 out of 12 students
In general the feedback in 2017 is a little better than in 2016 – which was also the case in 2016 compared with 2015. Therefore we seem to be on the right track. Especially the supervision is ranked high by students, but also the new way of teaching through the PBL approach: ‘It is educational and intellectually stimulating’ as one student is writing and it ‘offered opportunities for me to assess my individual capacities through my groupmates advices’ as another student writes.

It is clear that the handbook descriptions have removed most of the critical feedback we got from cohort 1 and 2 concerning the structure of the module. Also better time to finish the project has removed most of the critique concerning this.

### Action points for next academic year:

- **What changes are recommended for the module next year?**

1. Since 2014 (first cohort) the descriptions of the module, the assessment and practical matters have been qualified through the module Handbook. The Handbook descriptions are an ongoing process. Therefore the handbook is changed throughout the semester whenever needed as well as **we will make necessary changes after going through the evaluation.** Before the start of the Aalborg semester in February 2017 the possible differences between the handbook description, the lecture descriptions, the seminar description and the feedback from supervisors were looked into and balanced – both concerning the module description and the assessment description. **This will be followed up before the start of spring semester 2018.**

2. Besides the Handbook Blackboard has been introduced and used in Aalborg at the spring semester 2015. This is also an ongoing process that will carry on through each semester.

3. The introduction to the seminar will be critically looked through and qualified if possible.

4. **It will be discussed if it is possible to have lectures during the period of working with the PBL report.** It could be challenging to continue lectures because students are expected to use the content of the teaching when writing the PBL report, but also because we have to keep to the budget. If we are going to teach for a longer period some lectures from the beginning of the semester will be cancelled. **We will think and analyse this through before the start of spring semester 2018.**

Are there any specific matters or questions where you would like advice from the External Expert?
Module coordinators should submit the following information to the External Expert to aid the evaluation of the module:

1. 5-6 marked pieces of student work, including feedback, covering the full range of grades awarded
2. Full list of student marks for the module, including evidence of moderation or double marking
3. Module handbook, giving an overview of the module and teaching and learning; assessment(s) and marking criteria
4. Report by module coordinator, including ideas for changes in the next academic year
5. Summary of the module evaluation by students (see grid below)
6. Any additional relevant materials provided to students, for example, assessment guidance.

Responses to module evaluation (please highlight most popular response in yellow)

10: What did you enjoy during this module?
- Group Work
- to know new organizations in Aalborg
- The support provided by our supervisor
- The theories studied were very very interesting. Also if I studied them before, here I had the chance to go more in deep through the field study.
- The opportunity to do independent research in a field of interest with agencies involved in social work practice. It was educational and intellectually stimulating to research how social work practice works in Denmark.
The different teachers who were all very specialised, touching the different topics and theories (finally!), the readings, the opportunity to see the field (visits), the overall well impression of Denmark, the conference.

Content was intellectually stimulating and I found the discussions around power relations very useful.

Working in a group offered opportunities for me to assess my individual capacities through my groupmates advices and supervision in our time as a group. They offered me feedbacks and pointed out directly and indirectly ways on how i can improve my academic works.

The hands on experience of doing research on a very relevant social work issue.

11: What did you least enjoy about the module?

- No clear guidance from the start on the organizations to work with (this limited our research topics)
- nothing
- Language limitations to access service users
- The discussion session in the middle of the lesson. For me it was wasting time as we didn't add nothing to our knowledge or thoughts.
- Just general logistics that is involved in any research. It was a bit challenging to contact the different organisations to schedule different interviews and visits.
- That the classes totally stopped. I would have loved to have one morning a week more classes- just to be stimulated.
- The assessment criterias were a bit vague
- Being separated from the other groups. It can be isolating in a way because we all have our ways and preferences that most of the time doesn't allow us to meet as a class.
- The very fact that we had less time to conduct the field work. In future the academic team may explore the possibility of extending the period

12: What changes, if any, could be made to improve the introduction to writing the assignment?

- Introduce the PBL project at the start of the semester so people know they can start looking for what they would like to write the project on and not be limited by one organization that we worked with in the field study.
- provide for the students other ideas of field/themes. All groups decided to return to the same place because we did not know other social demands in the region
- It should be made clear that it is a research project. Some of us thought it was an intervention project like we do for practical intervention which is about designing project interventions. But it became clear later.
- Rather than change the writing introduction I would prefer to maintain the oral explanation of the assignment in class thus the students have the possibility to ask questions.
- It would have been better to have the introduction earlier on. Although the outline was written in the student handbook, it would have been better to have earlier discussions about what was expected, logistics etc. For example, somehow it did not occur to most of us that we had to either return to the agency we did the field study or find a new one on our own. This did not happen until we had the class discussion/ seminar about it. So it would have been better to have had some conversation a bit earlier in the semester so that we would have been a bit more prepared.
- More time between the presentation of the field study and the presentation/ introduction of the essay & PBL. So that we have time to change our mindset and come with questions.

Also, maybe have a question based session instead of the teacher presenting, because there was a lot of double information and the real important parts were missing (what to write about etc).

I liked the feedback bout your idea part.

- Assessment criteria should be clear and not abstract and ambiguos
- The introduction must be done before going to the Field agency. It will also be useful to have it done during/simultaneously in the introduction with field agencies as it will allow us to have greater understanding of what we can already accomplish for the PBL while in the agency. Having the field agency representative knowing the essence and connection of PBL with the agency field works will also allow them guide our stay accordingly.
- More can be done to help students familiarise themselves with the PBL guidelines especially in terms of helping students with problem conceptualization before going to the field.
18: Was the academic level of the module too easy or too hard?

18a: Please explain your answer

- Neither too easy nor too hard. I learned a lot from the readings and the implementation and as a group we organized ourselves well so we had enough time and space to work.
- Our supervisor was very kind and helpful for all our needs regarding the PBL.
- I think that it is up to the standard.
- I think the question n.18 is not very well formulated. I think it was very well formulated because normally the social work background is only focus on the social work theories. I did my study in Sociology as well because I was really interested in theories about institutions and social issue. Thus, I'm really happy that in a semester dedicated to the social work, the social workers were involved within a society framework.
- The academic level was sufficient and neither of too extremes (i.e. too easy or too hard). Based on the flexibility of the guidelines, in terms of what we could research, how, what problems we could identify etc, I felt that it was challenging enough for the postgraduate academic level.
- No. At the beginning it was challenging- because the classes were so long, so often (three times a week!!), but it was really good. I liked the intellectual challenge. But then it completely stopped and even though we are working on the project of course, really i feel like I haven't been actively learning. I would have loved more classes about other theories or more in dept for example during the last months, even if its only once a week!!
- The module was fair, it detailed practical issues that confront social work
- somewhat hard. As most theories for me was very new.
- I wouldn't want to rate the academic module in terms of hard/easy, but rather I would look at it in terms of relevance to postgraduate education. And in this case, I found this module very stimulating in the sense that it challenged me to think big as a postgraduate student and to even become more confident in shaping and being responsible for my academic work. I felt I was learning new things, while at the same time putting to use what I already knew with much confidence.
19: Was it clear to you what was expected of you at the seminar?

- Very much: 44%
- Some-what: 33%
- Not much: 22%
- Not at all: 0%

20: How long time did you use to prepare for the seminar?

- 0-5 hours: 33%
- 5-10 hours: 44%
- 10-15 hours: 22%
- 15-20 hours: 0%
- 20 hours or more: 0%

21: Did you feel that the seminar helped you in writing your assignment?

- Very much: 44%
- Some-what: 44%
- Not much: 0%
- Not at all: 11%

21a: Please explain your answer

- We had a more clear idea after the seminar.
- In the seminar professor Lars helped answering some questions about methodology and other characteristic of the PBLs
- It helped me to avoid some confusions I have at the beginning
- I assisted to a meeting in which the research was made in the same field of our PBL. Thus, we found inspiration by that.
- It helped us to hear feedback from our colleagues especially in terms of the wording of our research and the focus of it.
- For me there was no extra input coming from this meeting. Another meeting with supervisor would have been more helpfull than this- it is like paralel helping. Also it took a very long time and could have been strucutred more, if repeated.
- The seminar was useful in clarifying issues
- It helped us in reframing our paper and also give us a sense of urgency in the pacing of our paper works.
- We were afforded an opportunity to make a mid-way evaluation of our work but also to fine tune and improve on the weak areas. It was important in such way that it allowed for peer review as well guidance from the lecturers. This allowed for positive criticisms and open feedback, which I am very sure helped in writing the final draft of the project.
22: What changes, if any, could be made to improve the seminar? Please explain your answer.
- would have preferred it to be a bit earlier as we had not started implementing the project by then and we changed a lot after the seminar.
- should be useful to have one part in the seminar focused into review the theoretical approach in order to make it clear that groups are choosing the right categories and authors for the PBL
- All is well. However, more can be done on how students can relate the theories discussed and their application in the project.
- No changes.
- I can't think of any changes that could improve the seminar.
- Ask the students to formulate questions leading their time in the seminar. Let everybody brainstorm about good research question. I don't know- a way to involve everybody. And the tables were organised not well-it made it more difficult to follow (than a square for example).
- The students may be required to submit written frameworks that can be used as a discussion reference point in the seminar
- more formal one, with presentation.
- The seminar looks fine with me.

23: Did you feel motivated to learn in the module?
- Very much: 89, Some what: 11

24: Was the module useful for your future career?
- Very much: 78, Some what: 22

25: Were you able to draw on your previous experience and knowledge in the module?
- Very much: 67, Some what: 33

26: Has the module extended your knowledge and skills in social work?
- Very much: 89, Some what: 11

27: How much have you learnt from this module?
- Very much: 67, Some what: 33

28: Overall, how satisfied are you with the module?
- Very much: 78%

29: Was the workload for this module acceptable? Please explain your answer
- Yes acceptable and the time given is sufficient if we organize ourselves well from the start.
- The material and time for the project were very reasonable
- Totally acceptable. Despite the time we take to get started with the organizations, which take a bit longer period than we expected, the workload is totally fine with me.
- It was not stressful and we had time to organise our schedule for the exams.
- Yes it was, but for our group it was a bit challenging at times because some of the interviewees were not available until later than planned so a lot of the research was not written or conducted until closer to the deadline but this again was more related to general challenges of research rather than the module itself.
• Yes but no. In the beginning it was too much (also to quick after arriving in Denmark). Also I didn’t understand the printing (can you organize an intro that this is understood-) so that we can print the articles and come well rested and prepared?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort 3 – 2016</th>
<th>Cohort 3 – 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Than after the 'marathon' of classes and theories it was like there was nothing, only some work. Which we really took seriously, but it was with no comparison with the former two months.

• There was enough time to prepare for the project.

The workload for the module was acceptable since we were having close supervision and support from the supervisors.

Overall Status
## Marks - Cohort 3 and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Field Study</th>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>PBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, mum</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, SMK2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, JET2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 3470</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, STG2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, MAF2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, CHW1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, ANZ1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, FOB2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, JOS2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, GUR1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, XIC2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>8,17</td>
<td>9,25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cohort 4 – 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Field Study</th>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>PBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BIP1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
<td>02/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MAA2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ADN1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CLD2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 JOE2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LIM2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 LLM1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 NOA2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 TIT2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
<td>4/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ANN2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 CHW2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
<td>4/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 VEM2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 GAE1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>9,38</td>
<td>7,69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Module Coordinator Report

Module title | Power Relations and Actor Perspectives
---|---
University where module is delivered | Aalborg University, Denmark
Module coordinator | Lars Uggerhøj
Module teaching team | Per H. Jensen, Christian Albrekt, Lars Uggerhøj, Søren Juul, Flemming Larsen, Janne Seemann, Marianne Skytte, Jakob Skjøtt-Larsen, Kjeld Høgsbro, Maria Appel Nissen, Mathias Herup Nielsen, Mia Fallov, Mette Rømer and Walter Lorenz
Dates of the classes | February: 9th, 10th, 13th, 14th and 17th
March: 15th, 17th, 20th, 22nd, 23rd, 27th, 28th and 30th
April: 1st, 4th, 5th and 7th
Number of classroom hours | 73

Distribution of assessment marks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECTS Scale</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Fx</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary on teaching
- What teaching activities and methods were used?
- What worked well during teaching?
- Were there any problems during teaching?
- What reading or work was set for students outside class?
- How engaged and committed did students seem?

The aim of the module is to provide students with an understanding of as well as ability to analyse and act within the complex structures, dynamics and mechanism which shape modern welfare states and social work practice. Students will have the opportunity to explore and apply these ideas more in depth during the Field Study in the field study module (module 8) and in the PBL study (module 7). Students will
during lectures be introduced to theories, practice knowledge and research findings of different interests and actors pursuing different perspectives and promoting conflicting interests, discourses, concepts and models for social work – with a special focus on meetings between powerful systems and often powerless citizens. Building on earlier ADVANCES modules covering the various structures and ‘spaces’ that exist to support well-being (‘Critical Knowledge and Perspectives’ and ‘Working in Social and Public Spaces’), this module will focus on different theoretical approaches to the concept of power as well as different theoretical approaches to understanding the field of actors influencing and being influenced by social work practice. Actors in the field of social work are understood as individuals, professions, organizations, management, politicians, service users as well as discourses and social movements etc.

Students seem to be generally satisfied with the theoretical level, the presentation of often difficult theories and with the combination of the three ‘Aalborg modules’. The level is marked as reasonable and acceptable. Compared to 2016 the evaluation of this module the feedback is in general a little more negative. The differences are, though, very small and not focused in any specific area. Almost all feedback is placed in ‘Very much’ and ‘Some What’, very few in ‘Not much’ and none in ‘Not at all’. Some critical remarks are that changing professors almost every lecture (14 lecturers were teaching this module), that the assessment objectives could be more clear and that group work is a little too long. Comparing with feedback from 2016 fewer students have marked these three critical elements.

The use of many lecturers is a normal procedure at Aalborg University. We try to use the best lecturers within the specific fields and are not subject to change this procedure. Few students have mentioned that some teachers are more sociology than social work oriented. Lecturers are not all experts in social work. They must know about social work, but are not all expected to have specific knowledge about social work practice. We are not able to change this, but by involving so called assistant teachers – students from the Danish master program – we have tried to put social work more on the agenda. Assistant teachers have been allocated to students during the group discussions in this module. Lectures are divided into two hours lecture (9am to 11am), two hours group work including lunch (11am to 1pm), two hours feedback/discussion and maybe a concluding short lecture (1pm to 3pm). During their participation in the group work between 11am and 1pm assistant teachers should focus on practice in social work and involving all students and their different perspectives in the discussion. The feedback on the assistant teachers is not specifically positive. According to students comments from assistant teachers didn’t provide as much information about Danish practice in social work as expected, they didn’t add much to the discussions and they seemed to become more supervising and teaching than joining the discussions. Although not very positive the critical feedback aiming at too little practice orientation, too little involvement of students experiences and too little group work/discussion – as we have seen from cohorts 1, 2 and 3 – has almost disappeared.

When almost solving one problem others raise: for the first time we have heard that there is too much group work in this module.
Assessment objectives have been strengthened in the handbook and through the presentation of the essay and in spite of some critical feedback, the critical feedback has diminished quite a lot.

**Commentary on assessment:**
- Brief description of the module assessments
- What information was given to students about the assignment?
- What type of feedback was given to students?
- How was student performance?
- What was the range of marks achieved by the cohort?
- Was there any learning outcome that students achieved particularly well or less well than others?

On the basis of both lectures and common discussions of chosen subjects, students have written an essay. The essay is expected to be connected to the focus established through the Field Study and to the focus students will have in the upcoming PBL-project. In that way all three modules at Aalborg University are linked. The essay is written individually.

Two representatives from the teaching team have undertaken all marking and comments to students. There was agreement on the range of marks.

The average marking (in the Danish marking-scale) has been raised from 8.17 in 2016 to 9.38 in 2017. In 2017 six students were marked 7 (C), two students were marked 10 (B) and five student were marked 12 (12). In 2016 eight students were marked seven (C), three were marked 10 (B) and one was marked 12 (A). Comparing these 2016 and 2017 markings, the markings in 2017 have had more than 50% at top levels – 10 and 12 (B and A) –and just below 50% have had the little over average marking 7 (C). Please see the figure at the end of the report for the Essay markings in 2016 and 2017.

One student made a complaint about his mark: 4 (D) and according to Danish law the faculty processed this and after consulting the examiners, decided that the essay should go through a second assessment. The second assessment marked the student 7 (C) raising the mark one point in the Danish scale.

**Comments on the module evaluation by students:**
- What did students most enjoy?
- What areas did students identify as needing development?
- What pieces of the qualitative feedback are interesting and useful?

Number of respondents: 7 out of 12 students which is surprisingly low according to other modules and cohorts. Students were kindly pressed for feedback twice after having received the evaluation form.

Students have in general made positive comments about the description of the module, the content of the module, the academic level, the variation of approaches, the way difficult theories were presented, the workload and the relevance to their studies.
future career. As mentioned above the feedback is in general more negative than in 2016 but almost all marks are given in ‘Very much’ and ‘Some-what’, few in ‘Not much’ and none in ‘Not at all’. The most critical feedback is given to assistant teachers – please see description above. One interesting remark is that students expect assistant teachers to intervene more as student themselves and not as teachers. This should be compared to feedback from earlier cohorts focusing on the wish for meeting Danish students. The consequences of the feedback on assistant teachers will be presented below in the action points.

Besides introducing assistant teacher this year we tried to arrange another type of meeting between Danish and international students. Instead of making the ‘World Social Work day’ an open invitation it was put into the curriculum at both programs. As guest speakers we invited Dr Walter Lorenz – world known author and researcher in social work and Honourable Doctor at Aalborg University – and Dr Mette Rømer newly graduated Dr in social work and with international experiences in social work. While all Advances students turned up only 12 Danish students out of 50 turned up. Although much better than 2016 we will have a new strategy for 2018 – please see below.

**Action points for next academic year:**

- What changes are recommended for the module next year?

1. Since 2014 (first cohort) the descriptions of the module, the assessment and practical matters have been qualified through the module Handbook. The Handbook descriptions are an ongoing process. Therefore the handbook is changed throughout the semester whenever needed as well as **we will make necessary changes after going through the evaluation**
2. Besides the Handbook Blackboard is used at Aalborg modules. It is also an ongoing process to develop this and we will continue this in the future.
3. When planning the 2018 spring module we will discuss if assistant teachers should be used again. We are sure that they have solved some of the problems described by earlier cohorts, but not all. And especially the issue of connecting to Danish students is still to be solved.

    Either as a supplement or instead of assistant teachers we have decided to co-teach Danish and international students in 6 lectures. These are all lectures that are almost similar at the two programs. In all 6 lectures will be co-taught and we will use the Advances concept of two hours teaching, two hours group work and two hours feedback and maybe a closing lecture. We expect this will connect students from the two programs better as this becomes a part of the curriculum in both programs and as they will have to work directly together in the group work. We are facing some administrative challenges, but we hope to solve them this fall and introduce the co-teaching in spring 2018.

4. We will keep an eye on the group work – if it is too much. But we won’t change it now as the connection between Danish and international programs is new and could
Module coordinators should submit the following information to the External Expert to aid the evaluation of the module:

1. 5-6 marked pieces of student work, including feedback, covering the full range of grades awarded
2. Full list of student marks for the module, including evidence of moderation or double marking
3. Module handbook, giving an overview of the module and teaching and learning; assessment(s) and marking criteria
4. Report by module coordinator, including ideas for changes in the next academic year
5. Summary of the module evaluation by students (see grid below)
6. Any additional relevant materials provided to students, for example, assessment guidance.

**Responses to module evaluation** (please highlight most popular response in yellow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Some-what</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Did the module outline make it clear what you were expected to do?</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Did the teaching help you to achieve the module’s learning outcomes?</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Was the module content intellectually stimulating?</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Was the module well-structured and coherent?</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: How did you like the teaching and learning strategy?</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Was the core reading useful?</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: How interesting was the core reading?</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8: How helpful were the module materials (e.g. handouts, slides, online links) for your learning?

- Very much: 96%
- Some-what: 14%
- Not much: 0%
- Not at all: 0%

9: Were the assessment requirements clear?
- Very much: 43%
- Some-what: 43%
- Not much: 14%
- Not at all: 0%

10: Did the assessment tasks seem relevant to the module content and learning outcomes?
- Very much: 43%
- Some-what: 43%
- Not much: 17%
- Not at all: 7%

11: What did you enjoy during this module?
- the classes are very informative and readings are very interesting.
- Thought-provoking discussions about a rarely discussed concept of power in social work. I enjoyed the idea of working in groups to generate ideas and critique arguments.
- Learning about the different theories
- lectures and discussions
- The theoretical perspectives which were vital to critically look at social work approaches and practices.
- The module was very interesting not only because of the experiences that professors presented to us, but also because of the structure of the modules and the topics chosen.
- I liked how the course started with the social welfare system in the host country and about its operating system.

The theories and teaching strategies were systematically managed. I was so much interested and learned to see the organizations from the wider perspectives and the power relation.

I felt I learned a lot.

12: What did you least enjoy about the module?
- It is a pity we don't have more time for in-depth study; and changing professors for each class is not helpful to learning in the sense of bonding
- The assessment objectives were not precise on what were expected to do. The assessment criteria looked vague in my opinion with repeated objectives.
- The abundance of theory and the lack of examples to link them to practice
- no comments
- Nothing
- I didn't like too much the schedule for each class. I found it a little long and sometimes the group work was very distracted for me.
- I found everything interesting and worth learning.

13: What changes, if any, could be made to improve the module?
- more contact/bonding time with professors; maybe in an informal setting? Personally I find the professors are all very knowledgeable and interesting. I would like to know better about some of their topics.
- The assessment criteria should be made clear to allow a better understanding of the expectations. Additionally, it would be very helpful if case studies from other European countries are considered rather than focusing so much on Denmark.
- More coherence in linking theory to practice
- no comments
Though I enjoyed all the theories and perspectives presented in the module, they were more sociological than specific to social work. It would be nice to bring current power dynamics in social work profession in terms of the power of the professionals and the profession itself. Emerging perspectives in social work and the global aid, international agencies and the politics of empowerment.

I think that the group work could be part of the session at the end of each module. I really think that not all of the people were in the disposition to repeat what they discussed during two hours, but it could be different if exercises are made during the class. I enjoy the methodology used by Janne Seeman. She proposed us to do activities throughout the class, and I think that it was better for understanding and discussing some topics.

It was interesting and stimulating.

19: Was the academic level of the module too easy or too hard? Please explain your answer.

- it is alright
- The academic level of the module was easy and this was even made possible by the lecturers who tried to explain points/issues despite English not being their first language.
- Average but it's my first time being taught these theories like that so had to read more to understand
- the level was reasonable for me
- It was fair and up to my expectation.
- I think that it was some kind of both. On one hand, I felt comfortable with the topics and the theoretical approaches because of my background, but one the other hand, I felt that not all of us were in the same mode to learn, maybe because of the complexity of the theoretical frameworks.
- The contents in the academic course was really good. Though it was a bit difficult to catch up the professor. It stimulated very much to think critically and reflect the practices of home country,

It can not be judged stating hard or easy. It was somewhere in middle for me. I could understand some lectures perfectly and some were a bit difficult to catch up.

20. Were assistant teachers helpful in group discussions??
21. Did assistant teachers strengthen the focus on social work?

- Very much: 71%
- Some-what: 29%
- Not much: 0%
- Not at all: 0%

22. What changes, if any, could be made to improve the involvement of assistant teachers?
- nil
- Assistant teachers should do more in terms of sharing the Danish system to the international students. I honestly felt that that in some instances they didn't provide as much information as I would have liked.
- Did not add much to the discussions maybe they can talk about the situation in Denmark in more detail
- no comments
- The idea of having the teaching assistants is very nice. However, the experience of the ADVANCES students, which is very diverse and different from the Danish social work and the experience of the teaching assistants limited their contribution. And, I have observed when they feel a bit strange towards how the students (us) behave which is actually different from their culture. So, it is good to orient them on this to make them comfortable to work with a very mixed international student groups.
- I think that it could be interesting to have other kind of approaching with Danes students, such us attending a class together or a workshop. But I don't really like the "supervision" made by the assistant teachers. For me, their role was more verifying that we were developing our group work than giving us a guidance for resolving the exercises.
- Assistant teachers should have contributed more and should have reflected the Danish perspectives so that we could understand how it is in Denmark.

23: Was the module useful for your future career? 71%
24: Did you feel motivated to learn in the module? 71%
25: Were you able to draw on your previous experience and knowledge in the module? 29%
26: Has the module extended your knowledge and skills in social work? 57%
27: How much have you learnt from this module? 57%

28: Was the workload for this module acceptable? Please explain your answer.
- It is alright for me--
- The workload of the module is without any doubt acceptable. I liked the fact that we were given an opportunity to explore our own areas of discussion when it came to the essay. It's typical of postgraduate study and Danish system in particular. Thank you for that.
- Yes acceptable
- The workload was reasonable
- Yes
- Yes, although as I said, I would like other kind of dynamics for the classwork.
- It seems acceptable. We are still working on it.
29: Overall, how satisfied are you with the module?

- Very much: 45% (3 responses)
- Some-what: 57% (4 responses)
- Not much: 0% (0 responses)
- Not at all: 0% (0 responses)

Overall Status

- New: 0% (0 responses)
- Distributed: 30% (3 responses)
- Partially Complete: 0% (0 responses)
- Complete: 70% (7 responses)
- Rejected: 0% (0 responses)
**Cohort 3 - 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Field Study</th>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>PBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, mum</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, SMK2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, JET2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 3470</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, STG2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, MAF2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, CHW1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, ANZ1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, FOB2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, JOS2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>07/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, GUR1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, XIC2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>07/C</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade point average: 8.17

**Cohort 4 – 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Field Study</th>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>PBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIP1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAA2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADN1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CLD2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JOE2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LIM2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LLM1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NOA2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>7/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TIT2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ANN2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>10/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CHW2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>VEM2</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GAE1</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>12/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade point average: 9.38

**Marks - Cohort 3 and 4**