Report - FLS3107 - 2022-06-01

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):

Linda Söderlindh, course responsible, and Waldemar Petermann

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 participants had the opportunity to give written feedback on the course (content, assignments, etc.) halfway through the course. A few minutes during a course activity was dedicated to this, meaning that all participants provided reflections and suggestions. The Course survey were sent at the end of the course and the participants had two weeks to respond. At the very last course meeting, the participants discussed the course in groups and participated in an informal discussion with the teachers regarding course content, layout and learning environment.

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.)

A part from the description above, the participants were invited to participate in a half-time meeting about the course with the course responsible, but the participants declined.

COURSE DESIGN

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

During P3 the course were given via Zoom, in P4 on Campus. The course is divided into different sections that highlights different aspects of practical and theoretical rhetoric and communication. This semester, the number of participants increased by almost 75% and an additional teacher joined the course. This meant that the participants could be divided into four groups for their oral assignments and also have the same teacher for those assignments during the entire course. Formative evaluation is used and course alignment is in focus

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?

The majority of the participants spent between 6 and 14 hours on the course on average each week, a few between 0 and 5 hours. The later time frame is suspected to be a miscalculation since the course requires approx. 3 hours/week for scheduled activities and an additional 1-2 hours for preparing oral assignments.

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?

20 of the 23 participants have passed the course. An additional participant (a postdoc) also participated and passed. The participants have been very active during course activities, discussions and feedback, generously providing insights and collaborating throughout the course. It's apparent that the participants have acquired the knowledge and skills required to better communicate their research in different environments, attaining all of the course aims.

STUDENTS'ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Overall, the participants were satisfied by the course, expressing gratitude over the open and fun learning environment. In particular, they commented on the opportunity to practice without being graded as well as clear and constructive feedback from teachers and peers. The guest lectures were appreciated. Participants were divided on the course literature, were some comments asked for more extensive texts and others for less.

Suggested improvements included opportunity for hybrid lectures, more time for preparations, and earlier access to course material.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

From both the survey, half-time written reflections, and discussions with participants during the course, it is evident that students enjoyed the course and that they learned a lot.

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.

As teachers we are satisfied with the participants' learning, progression and results. Especially the learning environment in which the participants felt comfortable to experiment, discuss and give feedback to each other in a constructive way. Since the course is well based in research and theory, we would have preferred the participants making better use of the provided literature. And for future courses, we will emphasize the importance of using the literature

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?

It's apparent that the participants have different academic backgrounds when it comes to approaching the course. Expectations on the theoretically content of the course vary significantly. No difference in regards to gender or disabilities. Differences in familiarity with English, in written and oral form, were noticeable.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

For future courses we will provide the participants with course materials earlier on in the course. We are also looking into how the literature can be put to better and more apparent use throughout the course.