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):
Oliver Smith, omsmith@kth.se

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

Seven weekly meetings (approx. 3x45 mins). Continuous examination, no final exam.

Four assignments (graded P/F with grading criteria) + 30-min test in Session 6 on grammar/vocabulary.

In class: Review of previous learning (retrieval practice), Read and Report activities, group discussions, analysis of texts, practice presentations, individual work following direct instruction, guided vocabulary acquisition. Teacher gives whole class feedback and advice on assignments. Sessions start with students checking answers to vocabulary worksheets, and marking down any questions they did not understand. Teacher reviews these questions with whole class.

I have introduced retrieval practice as an integral element of the course. Guided vocabulary learning and constant, spaced testing of previously learnt knowledge.

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?

Average of 10.1 hours, so only half the amount of time they should be spending. This has been a problem on previous rounds, and is something to develop.

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?

All but one student passed the course. This is consistent with previous results.

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.

Extremely positive results with average of 6.61.

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?

There are no areas which are significantly stronger or weaker than another.

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

Long term - The course literature could be taken away, or replaced with something more appropriate. All the exercises could be given as digital tasks.

Short term - there is ongoing digitalisation of learning materials
Assignments - we could cover introduction, lit review, method and results in four assignments. This may be more helpful.