



## Report - FDS3103 - 2021-08-26

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 two optional zoom meetings which provided consolidation of the most important Canvas content and an opportunity for students to raise any issues.

---

**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 mainly delivered through Canvas, where materials and lecture recordings were provided. 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 8 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 did not engage with feedback on their writing, which might explain some of the lower hours reported. 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, but a small number failed to engage with feedback on their writing and so were required to make further, in some cases substantial, revisions before they could pass the course.



## **STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

### **What do students say in response to the open questions?**

---

The course was described as relevant, useful and interesting, and as 'a useful toolbox' for writing

There were positive comments on course structure and pace

Comments described feedback on assignments as fair, justified and useful

There were positive comments on the assignment, e.g. 'the perfect training platform to test the skills we learned on the course'

Suggestions for improvement of the course: smaller assignments with more frequent feedback; a bigger course; test on IMRAD not challenging enough

Advice for future students: take the course and take it seriously; work steadily

## **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

---

In summary, most respondents indicated that the course and related activities/assignments were relevant to and useful for their PhD studies and their development as scientific writers. The highest scores related to assessment and feedback. There were a few lower scores for other questions but no negative comments. The lowest scores were for collaboration with other participants. This reflects that there was only one opportunity for peer review, and only two Zoom meetings.

## **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.**

---

My impression as the teacher is that the course content and structure, as well as the main assignment, are working well. It is clear that introducing opportunities for more peer review and feedback would be a good thing, and this is something to consider. The next course will have Zoom meetings or live lectures instead of recorded lectures, so this will change the dynamic of the course to some extent, and provide more opportunities for peer review and discussion. Most students valued and responded effectively to formative feedback, but a small number of students did not, and this negatively affected their work. The zoom/live lectures will provide an opportunity to discuss the importance of feedback. The Canvas test on IMRAD needs to be rethought.

## **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?**

---

Update lectures for live delivery

Introduce activities exploring the importance of feedback and providing opportunities for peer review

Rethink Canvas test