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 mentioned in the final session and was then made available to students for four weeks after the final session (over Christmas and New Year).

21 out of 43 students completed the form. No distinction was made between the two course groups (Tuesdays and Thursdays, respectively), but students were asked to mention the teacher's name if they wanted to say anything that pertained to that teacher in particular.

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 were arranged 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 weekly meetings, 3 hours.

Quizzes on Canvas
Preparation tasks and subsequent discussions in class.
Students work on their own papers and read each other's 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: we are trying to add more recent reading material (e.g. Glasman-Deal, Rau, and Kmiec and Longo) that will eventually replace Swales and Feak "Academic Writing for Graduate Students". This is an ongoing process.

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?

Students report working 8,6 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?

Students have succeeded relatively well on the course. In one of the groups, students did not complete the Canvas quizzes to the same extent as in the other group.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

Best aspects:

Useful, concrete and directly relevant course content and examples
Feedback and peer reviews
The teachers and teaching methods

Suggestions for improvement:
Very slow pace in classes; time not used efficiently
Peer review groups: form groups of at least three students, so that there is more material to discuss.
More teacher feedback on drafts
Give more examples from student writing, not only from textbooks
Make sure peer review groups decide on a deadline for distributing material, to make the process smoother

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

See above

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 course works well but it is becoming clear that students require a faster pace than they did 5-10 years ago, and that time in the classroom can be more efficient and well spent, combined with peer review tasks to conduct on Zoom outside of class.
It is encouraging to hear that students think the course content and examples are useful and relevant.

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?

Note that all 12 areas inquired can be analysed as being strong (score 6.1-6.9).

Exceptionally strong areas: Collaboration with others; the opportunity to practice and receive feedback.

Weaker areas: The course is not always sufficiently challenging, and students do not always feel they are able to learn in different ways.

Men are slightly happier than women, but it is unclear what this could be due to.

It is possible 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 primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

- Decrease the number of contact hours. With Canvas quizzes and self-study material, and the fact that students are able to conduct their peer reviews in their own time between classes, most sessions will have 2 hours instead of 3. This will lead to the time in class being more concentrated and more worthwhile to many students.
- Find new course material to eventually replace Swales and Feak, whose examples might seem a little too simple and somewhat outdated for many students.
- Modify the quizzes in Canvas. Not all of them are designed in an optimal way.
- Long-term development: teachers need to learn more about AI tools and scientific research writing, and implement such discussions in class.