

Report - LS1512 - 2023-01-23

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):

Emma Forsgren Hurst, emmafth@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.

Registered students have had an opportunity to complete a midterm evaluation around session 7 and an LEQ-12 around session 14. For the latter, they have had the option of stating gender, type of student, and disability status. Nobody has declined to disclose that information.

The answer rate of the LEQ-12 is 54%. To complement their answers, students are given the opportunity to write comments in the evaluation. Also, in some cases, students have been able to give oral feedback on some assignments on a regular basis.

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 have been five Swedish A2 groups who have meet weekly (1.5 hours) for 14 sessions which have all been onsite.

To develop oral communication skills, there have been additional meetings in pairs outside of class after session 7 where students have received formative feedback on their speaking.

COURSE DESIGN

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

Like previous semesters, the course uses continuous assessment to evaluate progress throughout the course. There have only been slight changes regarding the work outside of class. For example, there are three listening comprehension tasks instead of four to complete at home. Also, more emphasis has been placed on one pronunciation task instead of having two to record at home. Two additional grammar exercises designed to stress what has been covered in class have been added to the course layout.

A lot of focus has been put on using the target language in class. However, over the course of the semester, all language skills have been worked on and tested regularly.

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?

Overall, the answers resemble the ones from the previous semester. Students seem to continue to study fewer hours than the expected level for the course. Most students (64%) state that they worked 3-5 hours/week which is a similar result compared to the spring semester (67%). More students (19 % instead of 12 %) study 0-2 hours. The same percentage (12%) study 6-8 hours in the two semesters compared. There is a slight increase this semester (4% compared to 3%) in the percentage of students that average more than nine hours (up to 17 hours) of studying time.

The workload is considered manageable and balanced. Some students say that the demands in other technical classes have interfered. However, they still feel like the sessions onsite made it possible to follow along and develop their language skills.

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?

A vast majority of all registered students who completed the course passed it. The result doesn't deviate from the previous two semesters.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

There is an overall positive view of the interactive nature of the course where there are a lot of speaking exercises in the target language. Students come from different backgrounds and get to discuss in different groups by comparing aspects of useful topics.

Another aspect that stands out in the evaluation is the link to the outside world, i.e., watching Swedish news and interviewing a person outside of class in Swedish using relevant vocabulary acquired in class.

Some students state that the course is well organized and that there are a variety of methods and assignments, as well as repetition.

A few students suggest that they would like to have shorter classes but more often (twice a week) to keep their language learning more active.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

No question is rated below 6 when looking at the result of the average response to LEQ statements where 7 equals a strong agreement with the statement.

Looking at the diagrams, students seem to appreciate the different learning methods, concrete examples, and collaboration opportunities that were part of the course. 95% (+2 and +3) say they were "able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others".

Over 90% feel like "the assessment on the course was fair and honest". They also seem to like the formative feedback given during the course (+2: 23 % and +3: 70%) and that they got support when needed (+2: 12% and +3: 84%). One number that is higher than last semester is for the statement "the course activities helped me achieve the intended learning outcomes (+3: 63% compared to 57% last time).

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.

-

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?

When comparing the average response by gender, type of student, and disability, there are no major differences in the answers.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

In the short term, there should be continued development of the course in relation to raising awareness of the importance of actively expanding one's vocabulary.

Continuously developing course topics and examination material will in the long run keep the course relevant.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

-