

# Report - LS1465 - 2023-08-09

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):**

Jamie Rinder jamier@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.**

There is a student representative that mediates between the students and teacher if necessary. Students can make comments about the course to the student representative if they don't want to talk directly to the teacher. All students are invited to fill in the LEQ.

**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.)**

Seven sessions. Six sessions deal with the four assignments, and the final session is focused on assessment.

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

Four assignments (two spoken and two written), that are formatively assessed continuously over the seven sessions.

**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?**

Some students work a little less than expected. I think these students are not giving enough time to the Academic Word List and the KTH Guide to Scientific Writing.

**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?**

This group pulled together very well, and they performed well in group assignments and peer reviews. I think many of them were especially pleased to be back in a classroom.

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

Exceptionally positive responses about the course, the teaching, and the assignments.

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Students were very positive about the formative nature of assessment, the P/F grading system, and the teacher's support.

**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.**

I am very happy with the course and the students' comments.

**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?

The strongest aspect of the course is the alignment between the teaching, grading criteria, assignments, and feedback. No marked differences between differences based on gender/disability.

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

More references to the KTH Guide to Scientific Writing.

**OTHER INFORMATION**

**Is there anything else you would like to add?**

No.