

Report - FDS3102 - 2023-06-27

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):

Susanna Lyne, suslyne@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.

This course summary is for both HT-22 and VT-23

After the course, the LEQ was open for three weeks and all students were encouraged to fill in the form.

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.)

No meetings with students to discuss the course. However, in the individual tutorials (the examination), teachers and students have the opportunity to comment on the course in a one-to-one setting.

COURSE DESIGN

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

10 weekly meetings, 3 hours.

Quizzes on Canvas

Preparation tasks - discussions in class.

Students work on their own papers and read drafts in peer review teams.

One written assignment in three drafts. Four brief peer review reports.

Examination: a tutorial on a full manuscript, accompanied by a 2-page reflective assignment.

Recent changes:

- the first sessions are largely based on the structure of the KTH Guide, rather than the old handout on effective writing

- Canvas pages have been tidied up

- Only four peer review reports (both students and teachers felt they were a bit repetitive).

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

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

Students report working 8 hours per week on average. It's not quite the 10 hours per week that the course should require, but for this course it is hard to estimate the workload since students work on their papers as well.

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?

Autumn -22 was a little "messy" due to several students dropping out mid-course, which affected the peer review teams negatively.

Spring -23 was better. This improvement is hopefully due to a more strict cancellation policy which is made clear in the application form.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Question: How did the peer review process work in your team?

Students have very different experiences. As a course organiser, it is difficult to know what will work and what won't:

Positive experience:

It was very effective, online sharing and commenting on documents.

We had good communication and got things done on time, and were able to give good feedback.

the peer review process works just perfect in my group. The process is effective due to we share the similar research interest.

Negative experience:

Not very good to be honest. My peer" review partner clearly was not prepared to write an article. It would have been nice to provide feedback to more complete article sections.

It was a bit unfair, for example, I never received any written feedback from one of my peers but spend a lot of time writing her feedback. I didn't have time to do all the tasks and spend time on the feedback. Feedback was a good exercise and gave a lot back, but it became too much with small tasks and writing feedback.

I was somewhat disappointed on the peer-review process. I was in a group of three people, including me. One of them didn't have much time to spend on the peer-reviews at the time, so they wouldn't send anything out to us. My other peer did send me some feedback but it mostly only highlighted sections where I used some of the concepts learned from the book/lectures.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Students are generally happy with the course.

The course is well structured and organised, and students report that they learn a lot from it.

"Putting a name/label on things that was known, but not that they had a name."

Students enjoy the lecturers' style of teaching, the open atmosphere and the opportunities to discuss writing with others.

Students also give the statement "I could get support when needed" a high score, which is very positive.

Areas for improvement:

- the Canvas organisation
 - making sure the peer reviews work better
 - the LEQ statement "The course was challenging in a stimulating way" scored 6.0 in the autumn and 5.3 in the spring. This is a score that could be higher, and an area that should be prioritised.
-

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.

- Teachers are happy to have the KTH Guide to use in class and in their feedback to students. It facilitates discussion.

- We have many inspiring discussions in the classroom.

- We need to make sure that the Canvas pages are easy to understand and navigate, and that it is clear what students should prepare for each session.

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?

Strong areas:

The supportive atmosphere and the feedback.

The background knowledge is sufficient.

Weaker areas:

The course is not always sufficiently challenging.

"I was able to learn in different ways".

No differences in experiences between different student groups. It is possible, however, that students whose English language skills are very strong, might find the course less challenging and could need more stimulation.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- We need to discuss what principles we should have regarding ChatGPT and other AI tools.

- Continue updating the material, more up-to-date examples etc.

- Add a (optional?) session (online) on how to use AntConc, to free up time in the first session

- Continue ensuring a clear structure on the Canvas pages and that peer review teams work optimally.
