

Report - FDS3102 - 2022-06-21

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 3 weeks. Respondent rate: VT-22 - 50%, HT-21 - 64% VT21 - 69%; HT20 - 64%.

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 were arranged.

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. A mix of Zoom and on-campus sessions.

Course meetings are mostly devoted to discussions in small groups, facilitated by the teacher. An important part of the course is the peer reviews of the participants' own drafts.

One written assignment: a mobility grant proposal, written in three drafts.

The examination consists of a 30-minute tutorial with the teacher on a complete manuscript + a final reflective assignment.

Recent changes: For HT 2021, language and grammar tasks (punctuation, etc.) were moved online, as Canvas quizzes.

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 they have worked on average 9 hours/week, which roughly corresponds to the expected 10 hours/week for this course. The question is, however, hard to answer for this course, since work on the article could also be seen as course work. Students may interpret the questions differently (a couple of students report approx. 20 hours/week).

Students think, however, that the workload is reasonable.

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.). It can also be related to the fact that we now have sessions every other week in P4 instead of every week, making students less focused on the course and more focused on other PhD duties.

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, it is common that one or two students report that they have been disappointed with their peer reviewing groups, if there has been one student who hasn't done their share or if the English level of the peers hasn't been even. This could possibly be remedied by emphasising the importance of group work at the beginning of the course.

Students are also very pleased with the teachers and the friendly atmosphere. Zoom works well in this course, but when presented with a choice, a good number of students prefer face-to-face sessions.

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, and to be most helpful to others. "Take the course seriously". "This is a course where you are very much a part of the others' experience".

One student expressed that the course didn't match his or her expectations - it was too general.

TO IMPROVE:

Overall, we should work on how we present the course material on Canvas - several students find the Canvas pages tricky to navigate. 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.

One student suggests a change of focus of the written assignment (the Proposal).

The peer review discussions would benefit from having clearer instructions: what, exactly, are students supposed to do or discuss?

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

See above (no meetings with students took place).

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.

FDS3102 continues to be a generally well-planned and enjoyable course, although the experience depends a lot on the peer review group.

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?
-

From the summary of the LEQ, we can hardly identify stronger and weaker areas - the scores are between 6.0 and 6.9 The weakest areas are 4) The course was challenging in a stimulating way and 19) The course activities enabled me to learn in different ways.

The course could probably become a bit more challenging and interesting if we updated the course material and added some discussion on "non-IMRD" structures.

One student, who is hard of hearing, was very happy with the teacher's clear speech.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- Course material should be more up-to-date
 - The KTH Guide to Scientific Writing in English (www.kth.se/writingguide) will be integrated into all course activities as of HT22.
-