

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 4FF013	Course title Information literacy: searching, writing and presenting science	Credits 4 HP
Semester HT23	Period 2023-08-23 to 2023-09-13	
Course coordinator Duarte Ferreira		Examiner Jessica Norrbom
Teacher in charge of component		Other participating teachers Lovisa Liljegren, Lina Lindstein, Anna Borgström, Jenny Siméus
Number of registered students during the three week check 15	Number approved on the last course date 15	Response frequency course valuation survey 40 %
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Email contact with the course coordinator		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students https://sunet.artologik.net/ki/Admin/Survey/36118		

Note that...

The analysis should (together with a summarising quantitative summary of the students' course valuation) be communicated to the education committee at the department responsible for the course and for programme courses also the programme coordinating committee.

The analysis was communicated to the education committee on the following date: 231116

1. Description of any conducted changes since the previous course occasion based on the views of former students

This is the first time the course is given so no changes were made.

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations of the course

Overall, the course was positively received. The students reflected that they developed valuable skills during the course (mean 3.5) and they achieved the intended learning outcomes at the end of the course (mean 4.2). The students agreed to a very large extent that there was a common theme throughout the course (mean 4.8) as well as promoting a scientific way of thinking and reasoning (mean 4.3). The lowest score was received when answering whether the course was challenging enough (mean 3.0), which indicates that the level can be increased in the course. Another positive aspect was that the students felt that they could turn to the teacher/course coordinator for guidance (mean 4.3) and there was a good structure for the

course from the learning outcomes to the teaching methods (mean 4.2). The psychosocial work environment during the course was considered very good (mean 4.2) with most of the students reporting that they did not experience competition between them during the course (mean 1.5).

3. The course coordinator's reflections on the implementation and results of the course

Strengths of the course: The course offers clear communication and guidance, with an approachable course responsible: "The course responsible lecturer was very approachable and made it clear about the assignments and other activities of the course." "...guarantee for quality." The students appreciate the variety of assignments, including writing reviews and preparing posters, which stand out from typical coursework: "It was nice to get to write a review and to prepare a poster. Also nice to not have much group work for once." The literature search workshop and the focus on new topics, such as generative AI, were really appreciated for enhancing critical skills and broadening perspectives: "I appreciated the focus on new topics, such as generative AI. I now have a clearer view of the process of literature search, selection, interpretation, and presentation." The interactive and engaging teaching methods create a conducive learning environment: "The teachers presented in a very engaging and interactive way." Also, the course equips students with transferable skills that will be valuable in various aspects of their future careers: "The learnings will be helpful for our future careers and lives because searching, writing, and presenting are ubiquitous."

Weaknesses of the course: Some students found the lectures to be less informative and the course content was basic "Overall, I would say the content was a bit basic. I think at this point it would be more useful to learn about the publication process.". This was also reflected in the workshop content being criticized for being too easy and partly irrelevant. Suggestions were made to update the content to focus on more pertinent topics, like the publication process, the use on AI tools: "The workshops were too easy and partly irrelevant... It could be updated to more relevant things." "It would be nice to have more details on how to use AI tools... not knowing them in detail is a disadvantage." The use of Zoom for teaching was not universally appreciated, with some students finding it sterile and less conducive to building a network: "I don't appreciate the teaching on Zoom... An important part of the master is the network, and this on Zoom cannot be developed enough." Some students also noted that certain classes were too similar to workshops they had previously attended in the program "Some classes were exactly the same workshops... I had to skip them." leading to some comments that this course could be more beneficial earlier in their program and this could be a reminder how to perform before writing their master thesis "I suggest to hold this course earlier in the education... a refresher right now was just as useful with the upcoming thesis in mind"



4. Other views

5. Course coordinator's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

The course was overall appreciated by the students in terms of organization and contents. However, taking into account the students feedback, this course has some areas that could be improved:

Workshops content were criticize for their relevance and content (maybe some repetitions from previous ones). In collaboration with KIB, this will be revise and checked. If possible, more information regarding AI tools can be added to help the students understand the pros and cons of using AI tools. Since one criticism was that the course was easy, we can also revise the content of the course.

In-person learning can also be another aspect where, when possible, have hybrid or all in-person classes to allow a network within the students or some assignments that will require team work that will allow students to interact and work together. This will also need to have more mandatory presential moments to avoid just 1/5 of the students to show up and we miss the network/interaction aspect that is desired by the students.

Appendices: