

Kursanalys (kursutvärdering)

Kurskod 2LG105/1EE120	Kurstitel Speech and language disorders in children and youth 2	Högskolepoäng 4,5
Termin (vt/ht-år) VT 2024	Tidsperiod 2024-01-15 till 2024-01-06	

Kursansvarig Anna Eva Hallin	Examinator Anna Eva Hallin
Momentansvariga lärare -	Övriga medverkande lärare Anna Nyman

Antal registrerade studenter vid treveckorskollen 35 (2LG105) +1 (1EE120)	Antal godkända vid sista kursdatum 22 (out of 30 students who took the first exam)	Svarsfrekvens kursvärderingsenkät 59%
Övriga metoder för studentinflytande (utöver avslutande kursvärdering) The course coordinator has, during seminars and in connection with lectures, also asked participating students for feedback on the course content, learning activities and the experience of taking a course in English to be able to support, modify tempo etc.		
Återkoppling av kursvärderingsresultat till studenterna This course analysis has been shared with the course assistant and discussed in the SLP program council/ programråd (with student representative) on 240409 and will be uploaded to the course website and Canvas		

Observera att...

Analysen ska (tillsammans med sammanfattande kvantitativ sammanställning av studenternas kursvärdering) delges utbildningsnämnd vid kursgivande institution samt för programkurser även programansvarig nämnd.

Analysen har delgivits utbildningsnämnd följande datum: [Klicka här för att ange text.](#)

Analysen har delgivits programansvarig nämnd följande datum: (Ej aktuellt)

1. Beskrivning av eventuellt genomförda förändringar sedan föregående kurstillfälle baserat på tidigare studenters synpunkter

Compared to last year there were two changes based on student feedback:

1. No learning activities were obligatory, but it was stressed on the course introduction, on Canvas and throughout the course that active participation in seminars was highly recommended to prepare for the exam.
2. No graded written assignments to lessen the workload during a course with few points. This meant that the written examination had to be expanded with one more reasoning question to evaluate all learning goals.

In addition, the course was taught in English for the first time, which also meant fewer guest teachers and subsequent adjustments in lectures/content. The course evaluation was done through Canvas for the first time.

2. Kortfattad sammanfattning av studenternas värderingar av kursen

(Baserad på studenternas kvantitativa svar på kursvärderingen och centrala synpunkter ur fritextsvar. Kvantitativ sammanställning och ev. grafer bifogas.)

Compared to last year's evaluation (which only had seven students responding), the students' mean ratings are slightly lower. A handful of students responded "to some/to a small extent" on most questions, but the students are mainly positive to the course. It is worth noting that the average ratings are very similar to the ratings from 2022, when the response rate was higher, but the course was not taught in English.

The summary of the respondents' ratings showed that

- 80% developed valuable expertise/skills during the course (mean **4.2**, last year: 4.9)
- 90% saw a common theme throughout the course (mean **4.1**, last year: 4.6),
- 80% thought that structure and learning activities were relevant (mean **4.0**, last year: 4.7)
- 79% thought that the examination required course understanding (mean **4.4**, last year: 4.6).
- 67% thought that the course promoted a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (33% said to some extent), mean **3.9**.
- 67% said that they achieved all the intended learning outcomes (30% said to some extent), mean **3.9**, last year, 4.3)

Representative positive comments from the free text responses include "the seminars were crucial in understanding the application of what we were learning in concrete ways", "the course made a lot more curious about research", "a well thought out and structured course", "relevant for practicum". The students also appreciated the literature quizzes, that learning activities were not obligatory and that lectures were recorded. The study days before the exam was also appreciated.

Surprisingly, the rating of how challenging the course was lower than both previous years (mean **4.1**, 2023: 4.7, 2022: 4.4). In addition, 13% of respondents did not think the course built on knowledge from previous courses, 29% thought so to some extent and 58% thought so to a (very) large extent (mean **3.6** last year 4.4). There was also a spread in the responses whether teaching materials were a support in the learning, with 67% saying to a (very) large extent, 17% saying to some extent and 17% saying to a (very) small extent (mean **3.8**, last year 4.3). Around half of respondents (58%) reported spending a bit less/around full time work on the course (100-130 hours), 21% spent more than full time, and 21% spent less or much less than full time.

In the free text responses, many students mention that the written exam was too extensive for a 4.5 credit course, and that it was experienced as difficult, partly because it was in English. Some students wrote appreciative comments about that the course was in English, and some that it made it unnecessarily difficult, particularly since it followed another course that was not in English (TSBU1). One student thought that the demands on student to use English during the course should be higher. Some concrete suggestions to support student learning more were: A word list Swedish-English with important terminology and more help with the padlet, and one more group review session before the exam and more support before the exam (for example with a group quiz and discussion). One student mention that parallell obligatory activities took a lot of important study tie from the course.

3. Kursansvarigs reflektioner kring kursens genomförande och resultat

Kursens styrkor: A well rounded course which connects theory to practice and has a variation in learning activities.

Kursens svagheter: Teaching in English places additional demands on students, and removal of all written assignments made the written exam quite large for few points (to assess if all learning goals were met).

3. Övriga synpunkter

Only about half of the student attended the two non-obligatory seminars, despite multiple reminders that these were important to prepare for the exam (which also some student note in the free text responses). It was good not to have obligatory activities, but worrying that so few of the students chose to attend.

4. Kursansvarigs slutsatser och eventuella förslag till förändringar

(Om förändringar föreslås, ange vem som är ansvarig för att genomföra dessa och en tidsplan.)

Given the challenge for most students to take a course in English, I believe that this first time was successful, and no major changes are planned for next year. It would be very interesting to know whether the students who wanted more preparation for the exam actually attended the seminars, since the purpose of the seminars was exactly that.

Suggested changes for next year mainly include clearer information about WHY seminars are important to attend, and some additional supports (e.g., a SW-ENG word list) could also be given to students. However, the reason why some courses at KI are in English must be clarified both in this course, and from the beginning of the study program. One more review session could potentially be planned in. The written examination could be modified and potentially only include one question per learning goal (and omit multiple choice/short answer) to make it a bit less extensive and align the exam even clearer to the goals.

The course and semester directors are responsible for these changes.

Bilagor: Kursvärdering