

Report - FAK3105 - 2023-01-03

Respondents: 1
Answer Count: 1
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):

Nina Wormbs, nina@kth.se

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS

Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

Course evaluation was available 2022-12-02 - 2022-12-15. 9 out of 12 students (75 %) answered.

Through out the course we discussed time spent on task and the schedule was changed in conversation with the students. One task was thus dropped. This was appreciated by most, but also seem to have led to the conclusion that tasks were not thought thru. One possibility would have been to keep to schedule and the evaluation would perhaps have been that one of the tasks, which got more time, was more difficult. That balance is hard to strike.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

See above. The course was taught during an full week and conversations on taks took place continuously.

COURSE DESIGN

Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

Students were to prepare an essay before the course. During the course week, several smaller assignments and one larger were carried out and students were made to comment on each other in groups or pairs. After the course week, the initial essay was revised and we met again in two groups after a few weeks, when the course leader had read and prepared comments and there were also prepared peer-feedback.

These writing assignments were intermingled with visits by professional writers and academic writers with different perspectives on non-academic writing.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

6/9 students worked 36-40 hours per week. One student worked more than 41 hours and 2 less than 33.

The student who wrote more than 41 hours per week guessed spending in total 50 hours. (Which is well below the nominal 80 h)

The course in 3hp, which corresponds to 2 full weeks. Some students still thought it to be a heavy workload, despite the fact that is was less than the nominal time. Some also commented on the fact that other courses were easier earned. Most students thought the time was well spent.

THE STUDENTS' RESULTS

How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

This is the second time the course is given and the first time was in 2010. A comparison is therefore hard.

Students succeeded overall well. However, some were less prepared to write non-academically, even though they had applied to the course. Still, I believe they spotted their own academic writing, which was also valuable.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

In general the students were very content with the course design, the intensity of the week and the possibility to focus, and the open atmosphere of the course. The course leader also got good evaluations.

Suggested improvements regarded more focus on how to write rather than how not to write. More on how to improve a text. One student suggested more focused tasks whith clearer instructions, "focusing on a few selected stylistic points" and more structured discussions.

A couple of students though that the schedule should have been more detailed and one that there were too many tasks.

To analyse a text that was already published was also suggested.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

The meetings with the students were very positive and rewarding. The evaluation is positive, but not to the same extent. Still, the overall evaluation was very good. 7 or 8 students (out of 9) scored the highest on all questions save the one on feedback (I was able to get support if I needed it) where 5 scored the highest and 3 the second highest.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

The main changes from 12 years ago were:

I gave this course by myself. That was harder than expected and very tiring.

All but one guest lecturer were also exchanged and several of the assignments.

It was given in English and not in Swedish, which made it harder for me having English as my second language.

Overall the course was successful. Students were in general happy and felt that they had indeed learned new things that they might implement in their practices.

ANALYSIS

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

No.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

It might be good to co-teach parts of the course. It will likely increase costs as there is a great value in the translation of skills from a visitor to a practise and connect between visitors and continuous conversation. Thus one cannot take shifts, or those qualities would disappear.

To find other writing assignments that might connect to visitor's talks might also be useful.

To work on improvement would be valuable, but very hard since students are also very different. Not all of them would be able to improve significantly during that week and thus the design of such a task would be challenging.

To include an assignment that contained analysis.
