Report - AG2800 - 2017-02-01

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):
Anna Björklund, annab@abe.kth.se

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.
The overall course design 2016 remains the same as the previous year. Only minor changes in lecture content.

The course examination consists of the following parts:
- Written exam (2,5 hp), grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
- Project report (4.5 hp), grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
- Critical review (0.5 hp), grade scale: P, F

Scheduled learning activities
- Lectures: 18 h
- Computer labs: 12 h
- Supervision meetings: 4 h

Own studies, estimated time
- Reading course literature: 1 week
- Completing home exam: 5 h
- Project work: 2.5 weeks
- Critical review and final revision of report: 0.5 week

THE STUDENT'S 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?
Students should be expected to work 20 h/week. On average the students seem to have been working a bit less than that.

6-14 hrs/w: 60%
15-20 hrs/w: 20%
21-26 hrs/w: 20%

Students comments:
"Lagom"
"A lot more work in the beginning. Got easier as it came along"

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 scored a bit less on the home exam compared to last year (but on the other hand fewer students failed the home exam).

It is unclear to me why this was the case. The content of the home exam was very similar to previous years and the lecturers have not changed. One possible explanation might be that many more students attended the course, so that there was less teacher-student interaction compared to last yea. Students may also have felt less pressure to perform if they had less sense of relationship to the teachers.

OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

The lowest average scores (between 5-5.5) were:
2. "The intended learning outcomes helped me to understand what I was expected to achieve"
14. "I received regular feedback that helped me to see my progress"

The learning outcomes listed in the course plan are not very specific. However they are concretized in the course memo, and in particular the grading template that the students have access to. We do not work specifically in the course to make the students aware of these. Maybe we could, if it would make students feel more secure about what they are expected to do in the course.

Regular feedback is not formalised thrugh activities (such as assignments) in the course. Most teacher time and resources are spent on frequent project supervision meetings and computer labs. This is an active choice in the course design, as I believe that this is of most benefit to students. However, this is possible to the benefit of "outspoken" students, who ask questions etc. More quite students might benefit more from written feedback and regular assignments.

The largest difference between male (4.6) and female (6.0) students was in:
4. "The course was challenging in a stimulating way"
Negative response to this question was explained by one student:
"Due to group members, not the teachers and supervisors."

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

"I had a lot of fun, I learned a lot although at some point it was very stressful"
"Bland dom bästa kurserna jag läst på KTH! Tack"
"Great teaching, wonderful to work with an engineering tool. Great knowledge from all supervisors at the lab"

Students appreciate:
- working with a real LCA software
- designing their own projects
- highly organised course
- invited speakers
- pre-seminar very helpful
- practice, not just theory
- the project
- the course design
- regular meetings
- log book

Suggested improvements:
- do not grade report before the seminar
- more focus on being accurate
- more time between supervision meeting and log book, submitting before supervision meeting would be a better routine
- make sure all supervisors have time for supervision
- more clear instruction for report and grading
. more lectures on SimaPro, less on LCA in general
- inte examination över helger
- less bureauracy
- too many students in computer labs, not enough teachers and computers
- home exam before all lectures finish, they feel less important
- lab about databases was confusing
- more guidance on building simapro model at an early stage
- more explanation of waste scenarios
- Key concepts were not explained well at all. Please improve.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should primarily be developed? How could these aspects be developed in the short or long term?

Better "Regular feedback" could be improved, requested by about 20%

"Feedback from peer review does not matter". Can we use peer feedback better?

Explain better to students why the homeexam also runs over the weekend.

Maybe split the class in two during computer labs if the course remains this large.

AG2800 - Life Cycle Assessment, HT 2016

Course facts

Course start:	2016 w.44
Course end:	2017 w.3
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	PRO3 - Critical Review, 0.5, Grading scale: P, F PRO4 - Project Report, 4.5, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F TENA - Home Exam, 2.5, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Anna Björklund <annab@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Anna Björklund <annab@kth.se>
Teachers:	Miguel Brandão <miguelb@kth.se> Peter James Joyce <pjjoyce@kth.se> Carolina Liljenström <carlil@kth.se> Xenofon Chrysovalantis Lemperos <lemperos@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	51
Total number of registered:	51

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate[1] [%]	98.00%
Performance rate[2] [%]	98.00%
Grade distribution[3] [%, number]	A 8% (4) B 66% (33) C 24% (12) D 2% (1)

1 Percentage approved students
2 Percentage achieved credits
3 Distribution of grades among the approved students