



Report - FDS3102 - 2021-06-16

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.

The LEQ was sent out after the last session, and the form was open 2-3 weeks. Respondent rate: VT21 - 69%; HT20 - 64%; VT20 - 65%; HT19 - 57%.

Course meeting with all teachers to discuss the LEQ (except V20 when only Jamie taught the course).

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 course evaluation meetings with students.

COURSE DESIGN

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

10 three-hour meetings.

HT19: all on campus.

VT20: Sessions 1-5 on campus, sessions 6-10 in Zoom (with pre-recorded lectures + self-study)

HT20: all in Zoom ("live")

VT21: all in Zoom ("live")

HT20 students were encouraged to meet outside classes for their peer review, and less class time was devoted to peer reviews. However, we feel that students prefer doing their peer reviews in class, so this was the main approach during VT21.

In VT 20, due to Covid and moving the course online, students started to hand in weekly peer review reports. This gave the teacher(s) a better chance of monitoring students' work in the peer review groups, but some students say the reports take time and stop being relevant after a while.

As of HT19, we moved all the printed material (the "Binder") to PDFs via Canvas. We guessed that this would better match the way students work with tasks, but according to the course analysis (specific question), many students still want to print their material.



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?

HT19: average 6-8 hours
VT20: average 6-14 hours
HT20: average 6-11 hours
VT21: average 6-11 hours

This is good. Students should spend approximately 10 hours a week on the course, but the question is hard to answer for this course, since work on the article also is course work. Students may interpret the questions differently (a few students report approx. 20 hours/week).

It is interesting to see how students' estimated work hours increased when the peer review reports were introduced in the second half of V20.

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?

We note that more students than before are dropping out after the first half of the course, or are having difficulties keeping up after the first half. This may, or may not, be Covid-related (students working from home, difficulties with lab work, etc.).

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

BEST ASPECTS OF THE COURSE:

Generally, students are happy with the opportunity to discuss writing (both their own texts and texts from their fields) in groups. However, some students report that they have been disappointed with their peer reviewing groups, if there has been one student who hasn't done their share. This could possibly be remedied by making sure students understand the importance of group work at the beginning of the course.

Students express the usefulness of the "scaffolding" the course provides, e.g., with the CARS model.

Students are also very pleased with the teachers and the friendly atmosphere. Zoom works very well with this course. "First course that has made use of Zoom in a good way!"

Most students give the advice to future participants that they should have an almost finished paper when they start the course, to get the most out of the peer reviews. "Take the course seriously".

TO IMPROVE:

Overall, we should work on how we "package" the course material in Canvas, now we don't have the Binders. (As of HT2019, all material that used to be in the Binders is now published as PDFs on Canvas). Students of HT19 were specifically asked to comment on how they had used the Canvas material. In fact, many students still seem to want to print their material. This may have looked different when the course was moved online (easier to share screen/discuss over Zoom if you had done the tasks in the PDF).

Many students would like the material to be in one zip-file or published as one document, instead of several separate PDFs. It's too confusing.

In HT20 and VT21, students comment on the repetitiveness of the peer review reports.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

A number of different aspects are brought up in the questionnaire as regards what could be improved: some think there is too much grammar, others that there is too little. Some want the same peer review group throughout the course, others want to switch partners now and then.



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.

This course continues to work very well, both for students who are very fluent writers in English, and students who need more basic language support.

We believe that the peer review reports do play an important role, but they shouldn't be boring and repetitive for the students.

There are too many tasks to complete per week, and we rarely seem to have time to deal with them all in class, something that confuses some students.

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?
-

The statement "The course was challenging in a stimulating way" doesn't get a higher score than 5.8 (HT19. Compare, however, with 6.4 in V20). Hopefully, this score can be improved by moving grammar quizzes online and spending less time in class going through the more simple language tasks.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

1) Quizzes in Canvas

2) Consider how the course material (previously the Binder) is "packaged" and presented. Too many short PDFs are confusing.

3) The Peer Review Reports assignments need updating. The plan is to keep the weekly assignment, but to vary the tasks. One week the task could be to annotate the section you've written, the next week could be to write down five "lightbulb moments" from this week, etc.