

Report - FDS3103 - 2022-08-01

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?

Most students reported working between 3 and 5 hours a week.

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, although some were asked to look more closely at the feedback they had been given and to make further edits to their final text.

Some comments:

It is an acceptable amount of studying hour.

Reasonable amount of work for 2 credits for sure.

While the lectures were well structured and interesting, I would have preferred them to be shorter (e.g. 2 hours).

It's a really valuable course, plus because it's online, it saves time on commuting.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Best aspect:

It's useful for new scientists.

Very interactive.

Jane was great and very structured, the lectures were always pleasant to attend.

I very much enjoyed the lectures. They were packed with good examples and did never feel "too heavy" information wise.

Discussing about personal experience and getting proper feedback on our work.

Writing a proposal and getting 3 feedbacks, 2 from students and one from teacher. this was a perfect practice in scientific writing.

Very good use of examples in the lectures.

To improve:

Scheduling the lectures over lunchtime made it kind of annoying for me to follow the course, since I always had a team meeting the same day directly after lunch. Generally 3 hour lectures is also kind of rough.

Perhaps shorter lectures.

The IMRAD structure seems to distant from the way my field usually operates, maybe do a 'How to transpose the lessons learned from IMRAD' part.

Advice for future stds:

The recommended book/literature was really good.

Participate in the classes so as to get the most out of the course.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Number of positive comments on teaching approach, course organisation and activities.

Number of positive comments on feedback provided.

Mixed comments on lecture length and timing.

Only one comment raising issues with IMRAD content, but valid as I feel more personalisation would be useful here.

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.

There was a positive atmosphere on the course, and the feedback, though only covering a small number of stds, was largely positive. There were one or two very low scores but no comments to explain these.

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?

Nothing significant.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Assess possibility of moving course to campus and adapting course content accordingly.

Incorporate activities to personalise IMRAD content and encourage more field research on paper organisation.

Review input on referencing. Stds all seem at different points re their knowledge here.
