

Report - LS1512 - 2023-05-31

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.

In the first half of 2023, there have been two written anonymous evaluations that registered students have had an opportunity to complete. There has been a midterm evaluation (Period 3) and an LEQ-12 at the end of the course (Period 4). In the LEQ-12, students have had the option of stating gender, type of student (e.g., international master student or international exchange student), and disability status.

To complement the fill-in chart based on different statements, students are given the opportunity to write comments in the LEQ-12. Also, in some cases, students have been able to give oral feedback on a regular basis and in particular around the last session and last oral task.

Students in this course were given two weeks to complete the LEQ-12. The response rate was 38%.

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.)

During P3 and P4, there have been three Swedish A2 groups who have meet weekly (1.5 hours) for 14 sessions, which have all been onsite.

There has also been time allotted outside of class where the focus has been on spoken interaction. Students have come during the midterm break to practice their speaking in pairs during sessions of 15-20 minutes/pair and have received formative feedback after their exercise. Throughout the course, topics have expanded, and students have come back for a final oral session at the end of P4.

COURSE DESIGN

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

Like previous courses, this round uses continuous assessment to evaluate progress throughout the course. There have only been slight changes regarding some tasks. Based on previous evaluations, there has been a wish for some time to be allotted to workbook exercises in class, as well as some more focus on vocabulary. This has been considered. The students have worked both in pairs and groups of four when discussing grammar. There has also been a vocabulary list provided with some key words for each session. The list has included space for students to add their own words, as well. Like previous courses, there have been anonymous quizzes on a regular basis where students have had a chance to evaluate their own progression with regards to some grammar and vocabulary.

Throughout the course, significant focus has been placed on using the target language in class. However, 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?

Most of the students (75%) state that they worked 3-5 hours/week which is slightly more than the fall of 2022 (64%). Zero percent claim that they only worked 0-2 hours/week compared to 19% last time. The same result (0%) goes for 9-11 hours. This differs from last time when 4% said they studied more. There is an increase in students who put in 6-8 hours (25% instead of 12 %).

The workload is considered well balanced. Like the previous course offering, students seem to continue to study fewer hours than the expected level for the course due to the challenge of keeping up with other courses. There is however a clearly articulated desire for more time to review and prepare between classes. Students indicate that if they had more time, they would be able to further develop their language skills in this course.

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?

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

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

In the comments, students seem to appreciate the interactive and dynamic nature of the course. Speaking in the target language has sometimes felt challenging in a good way and the overall learning environment is viewed as being supportive and motivating.

The variety of exercises is something that is mentioned as a positive aspect of the course. Watching the news in easy Swedish and getting more familiar with Swedish culture has been appreciated. The fact that there is continuous assessment instead of one final test makes students see progression every week.

There is a desire from a few students to work more out loud on pronunciation in class. Some students also would like classes to take place more often than once a week or possibly having longer sessions.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

When looking at the result of the average response to LEQ statements, there is no question rated below 6 (7 equals a strong agreement with the statement).

Students seem to find the topics somewhat to very interesting and that the course challenged them in a somewhat to a very stimulating way. Most students entered a +3 (71%) and a +2 (21%) when answering if they could learn from relatable examples. Regarding how they felt the course activities helped them achieve the intended learning outcomes efficiently, the rating is +3 (54%) and +2 (46%).

In the diagrams, many students feel that the course offered a variety of different ways of learning. About 83% strongly agree with that (+3) and 17 % entered a +2 on that statement.

The highest scores in the diagrams (6,9/7) relate to collaboration as well as feedback and security.

About 92% (+3) and 8% (+2) feel like they were able to learn by discussing with others. The same digits go for the statements that the "assessment of the course was fair and honest" and that students were able to get support when needed.

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?

Based on the evaluation, there should be a continued development of exercises in relation to pronunciation.

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?

-
