

Report - FDS3102 - 2024-06-06

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 survey was open for three weeks after the final session. 18 students out of approximately 40 replied.

In addition, teachers asked students spontaneously about their opinions on e.g. the course contents, and made it clear that their opinions are always welcome.

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 have been 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, 2 or 3 hours. This was a major change this year, with five sessions shortened to two hours. This meant e.g. that three of the six peer reviews were conducted outside class.

Quizzes on Canvas

Preparation tasks - discussions in class.

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

One written assignment (grant proposal abstract) in three drafts.

Four brief peer review reports.

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

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, which is quite good considering that they should spend approximately 10 hours/week on the course. Some students reported as much as 24-26 hours (1), 21-23 hours (1), 15-17 hours (1) and 12-14 hours (1). As we know, however, the hours for this course are hard to estimate since students work on their articles alongside the course work.

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 in general done well on the course, with several students being ready for the final tutorial before the summer break. Like in the autumn, there were very few drop-outs, probably thanks to our stricter cancellation policy. This has a positive effect on the peer review teams.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Best aspects (typical answers): "I have been given explanations and names to methods I've been using before and therefore been given tools to use these methods more intentionally". Interactive environment and engaging lessons. Supportive teachers. Help to improve the papers.

Suggestions for improvements (typical answers): Update the course material (at least 3 responses). A few students mention that there is too much focus on general language in the beginning, and all the paper writing is done in the second half. One student said that the location (M block) is very inconvenient; however, with the Department of Learning's move to Brinellvägen, this is a necessity.

Additional questions asked:

1. What parts of the course material have supported your learning the most?

- KTH Guide (2 students). Certain parts of Swales and Feak. Teacher's instruction. One student said that Glasman-Deal's book was more useful than Swales and Feak.

2. What aspects of the course structure have suited your needs and your style of learning?

- Here, a number of students mention the peer review and feedback given. Some students prefer doing the peer review in class (this leads to a more focused discussion), others outside of class (more flexible regarding time).

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Students are generally pleased with the course (LEQ scores between 5.8 and 6.9 out of 7.0).

However, some students feel that the second half of the course is a little rushed and that they would have liked to spend more time on each section of the paper.

Students have different opinions regarding the course literature and how the peer reviews are conducted.

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 feel a strong need for updating and re-shaping the course. We note that Swales and Feak isn't used to a great extent, but some students still seem to find it very useful.

Shortening some sessions is also positive from a teacher's perspective - the classes are more focused and students are still able to carry out their peer reviews in a good way.

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 question that scored the lowest (5.8) was "The course was challenging in a stimulating way". (One student answered -2, and without this outlier, the average score is 6.0). This is probably because some students had expected less language teaching and more writing.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- Swales and Feak will be removed as the mandatory text book. We will still keep some of the contents in the teaching but not require the students to buy and read the book.
 - The course will have 8 sessions instead of 10 (but the course will still be worth 5 credits). This will hopefully make it easier for students to fulfil the attendance requirement (6 out of 8 sessions).
 - The peer review reports were not commented on in this LEQ, but teachers feel that they take time to comment on and are not as effective as they could be. Next year, the peer review reports will be replaced by a different task to help students keep track of their progress.
-