



Report - FDS3103 - 2022-01-10

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):

Jane Bottomley, jabo@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.

After the course, all students were invited to complete a course survey online.

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.)

There were five Zoom lectures.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course was delivered through Zoom lectures and supporting material on Canvas. There was also a course book, which students purchased and used to support and enhance Canvas content. Learning activities included text analysis, language study and text production strategies. Students received detailed formative feedback on text submissions so that they could work on developing and improving a text over the duration of the course.

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 reported working between 2 and 11 hours a week, so there was variation. I would expect students to need at least 5 hours a week to deal with the content in enough depth, and to respond adequately to feedback. Some students reported variation in workload due to assignment deadlines etc. It is to be expected that students manage the workload in a flexible way.

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?

All students passed the course. One student required support with their understanding of what constitutes plagiarism, but in the end, they produced satisfactory original work.



STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

General comments:

The course was very well-organized and structured. I felt that I learned a lot about scientific writing and my writing. I have developed a deeper understanding of what is required from me as a writer to attend to an audience of readers. I have also gained a deeper understanding of my weaknesses and I am therefore able to work on them in the future.

The lectures and associated discussions helped clarify a lot of concepts. The instructor was very adept at explaining the material and encouraged helpful discussions to make us think about the various aspects.

Best things about the course:

The active discussions about relevant examples from other participants and diverse articles.

Video lectures with an active and knowledgeable teacher.

Good examples to understand the concepts mentioned in the course.

Realizing how "moves" can be used.

IMRAD structure

Suggestions for improvement:

It would be great if some assignment could be introduced to read one research paper and then analyze the IMRAD structure of the paper and paraphrase it. Currently, I think the IMRAD quiz is good but it focuses on excerpts from different papers which makes it a bit difficult to practice the IMRAD concepts.

Perhaps the lessons could be shortened if their content is condensed. Sometimes it felt like the lessons were longer than they needed to be.

Although this would of course jeopardize the open discussions.

Maybe give some more time to be able to peer-review papers.

It would have been nice to be able to work on an existing funding proposal, so that the outcome of the work hopefully could be used to fund research in reality. (If a student couldn't find suitable funding, the task could still be completed as today). Or to work on a paper and get feedback.

No! It was a great course, thanks for having me Jane!

It would have been nice to be able to work on an existing funding proposal, so that the outcome of the work hopefully could be used to fund research in reality. (If a student couldn't find suitable funding, the task could still be completed as today)

Advice for other students:

I honestly do not know. It is hard to improve your writing skills within one compulsory course. It should be accumulated over time.

Attend all lectures and read the Hofmann book carefully. Some of the chapters are quite helpful there.

This course has a lot more to give than you would expect, so please try to give it as much attention as time allows.

Group discussion is really a good chance to learn different opinions.

Try to learn and practice by daily life, and if you have questions, the teacher could help.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

In summary, students commented that the work load was well balanced. There were also positive comments on course organisation, relevance and usefulness. Students particularly mentioned a number of concepts which had priority on the course, such as audience, the IMRAD structure and rhetorical 'moves'. A number of students mentioned the usefulness of discussion on the course, though another did note that this takes significant time. There was a suggestion on a deeper reading task to explore the IMRAD structure and on integrating a 'real-life' proposal into the assessment.

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 highest scores related to assessment, learning outcomes and support. There was a more mixed response for other questions, but occasional low scores were not supported with comments..

My impression as the teacher is that the course content and structure, as well as the main assignment, are working well. The newly introduced Zoom lectures worked well and provided opportunities for deeper discussion. A lot of the students expressed a preference for Zoom over live lectures, and the next course will also be on Zoom. However, we will need to consider returning to live lectures in Autumn 2022. The Zoom lectures also gave me the chance to explain the nature and importance of formative feedback, and this time the student response to feedback was significantly improved. The IMRAD test was made slightly more challenging this time, but there is still room for development here.

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?

No significant variation.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Develop personalised reading tasks for exploration of the IMRAD structure. (short term)

Consider drawing on students' current work to inform the assignment proposal. (long term)