

Report - LS140V - 2024-03-13

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.

This course analysis is valid for HT23 and VT24.

For HT23, students were given the opportunity to fill in the LEQ questionnaire; however, only 2 out of 5 students responded, and no course report was created. For VT24, with only four participants, there was no LEQ but students were invited to comment on the course in a Google doc that was shared with the students during the last course meeting.

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.)

The last course meetings in both semesters served as a brief evaluation meeting.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course has had 5 2-hour meetings instead of 6 3-hour-meetings. The learning activities and examinations have remained the same: Three written assignments, peer reviews, and lectures on relevant points regarding grammar, punctuation, and clarity.

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?

Without an LEQ, I don't have information on the students' workload, but I don't think the students work as much as 80 hours on this course. This impression is based on the submitted written assignments and the fact that students tended to hand in work late.

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?

HT-23: Five out of five students completed the course during the semester.
VT-24: Two out of four students have completed the course two weeks after the last session.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Outcomes from the last course meeting, Spring course:

I am keen to learn more about writing in English (top takeaway)
I have a long way to go when it comes to professional writing (top takeaway)

Did the course meet your needs?
"Not sure. However, it did make me aware of where I am in my journey of the English language."
"I would say yes because I had a professional to review my text."

Was the course challenging, yet stimulating?

Somewhat challenging
Challenging enough

These answers suggest that students who are not professional engineers, but still students, might benefit better from a course designed for students. One student also mentioned the benefit of having a professional teacher review their texts.

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 course in general has a good structure, with relevant contents. However, students in the spring did not perform very well, due to them taking the course in parallel with thesis work and other studies. More teacher-led time is probably needed. This course is also dependent on the mix of participants: ideally, the course is intended for professional engineers with some work experience. They are asked to bring relevant texts from their workplaces to work on during the course - which in most cases sparks lots of good discussion and provides great learning opportunities for all. This was basically the case for the autumn course 2023. During the spring, the participants were students in other courses, which had a lot of impact on the course. We also decided to move the Spring course to Zoom, to see whether more students who had registered would be able to come to the course meetings. This was unfortunately not the case. One student said that it was much harder to have discussions in Zoom meetings than on campus.

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?

One student with dyslexia stated that the Canvas quizzes were hard to follow, due to a messy visual impression and interface. The quizzes were removed from the VT-24 course.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

With more students on the course, the course will automatically improve for everyone (more drafts to discuss, more opinions in the classroom, etc.).

Add better quizzes to Canvas.

Go back to 6 sessions, not 5.
