

# Report - LS2442 - 2024-11-06

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.**

In the individual meetings for TEN1 (oral examination), all students had the opportunity to talk to the teacher and express their opinions about the course. In these meetings, students were also reminded and encouraged to fill in the LEQ questionnaire, which was open for 3 weeks after the final oral examination.

---

**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.)**

No formal meetings were held.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

First time the course was offered.

The course consists of six 2-hour meetings, in which students work on different work-related discussion topics, vocabulary exercises and peer review of ongoing assignments.

Between seminars, students prepare by reading about language and structure in e.g. KTH Guide, taking Canvas quizzes, watching TED talks about topics relevant to the assignments, and reading texts about current employment-related issues..

The assessment consists of three modules: INL1 (four assignments, graded G/VG), TEN1 (oral exam) and SEM1 (attendance in the seminars)

---

**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?**

The 11 students who answered the questionnaire worked in average 8,2 hours per week - which is quite far from the expected 20 hours per week for a one-period 7.5-credit course.

In the former course LS1419, where the average was 7,7 for the whole year 23/24 (four courses). One reason could be the fact that LS2442 is a new course and still under development.

---

**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 students have succeeded very well, with 32 out of 33 students completing the whole course within a month after the last seminar.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

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

It's nice to take a course without so much technical focus, for a change. The assignments, such as CV + cover letter, are relevant and directly useful. Easy to follow the course and its contents.

In the question about areas for improvement, students mostly commented on the scheduling of seminars (15-17) and the deadlines. However, bearing in mind that the challenge and the room for reflection scored a bit lower in the LEQ, these areas could also be improved.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

With only a couple of exceptions, students express that they learn a lot, and that they really enjoyed the assignments, the feedback, and the discussion in class.

---

**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.**

Bearing in mind that this was a first-time course, the course ran very smoothly, and the atmosphere in the class was friendly and inclusive.

---

**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 weaker areas (scores 5.0 and 5.3) according to the LEQ questionnaire were "I had opportunities to influence the course activities" and "I explored parts of the subject on my own". These two statements are related.

Two slightly weaker areas (6.2-6.3) were

- The course was challenging in a stimulating way
- The intended learning outcomes helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve
- Understanding of key concepts had high priority
- I regularly spent time to reflect on what I learned

I understand that the course can be made more challenging and have better focus on reflection. There are reflective components in the assignments, but these can be better highlighted.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

---

Working with more mandatory quizzes in order to boost students' learning and make the course slightly harder in terms of workload, thus reflecting the fact that the course is an advanced course.

Revising deadlines and activities in the class for better manageability both for students and teachers.

---