



Report - AG2800 - 2018-03-05

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 2017 remains mostly the same as the previous year.

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 (Minor changes in lecture content)
- Computer labs: 10 h (2 hrs less than last year, for economical reasons)
- Supervision meetings with project groups: 4 h

Own studies, estimated time

- Attending lectures and studying course literature: 1 week
 - Completing home exam: 5 h
 - Project work: 3.5 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?

The time spent on the course varies a lot between students. While about 70% spend 9-20hrs/week (OK or good), some spend much more or less than this. There is a risk that those who say that they spend much less (4 individuals) were actually free riders in their project groups. Those who spend more can probably be identified as some of the very ambitious students in this course.

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?

A larger number than last year received A as the final grade. There was no difference in the grading of the home exam, but more students received the grade A on projects compared to last year. There is a risk that the grading template allows for "optimistic" grading by supervisors and this should be checked before next course round. My impression this year was however that most group projects were very well performed.



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?

On average, students rate the learning environment as positive (rated 6 out of 7, or slightly above or below this). This is similar to previous years.

On almost all aspects, male students give higher rating than female students. I cannot figure out from the replies why this is the case.

No clear pattern of differences between national and international students can be seen in the replies.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

Positive feedback

As previous year, students appreciate the atmosphere in class, working hands-on with projects, freedom to choose what to work with, meeting with teachers for supervision, and the well organised structure of the course. The home exam is also appreciated as a good learning activity.

Negative feedback

- some ask for more teachers in computer labs
- more time spent on simapro exercises
- more meetings in the computer lab
- more lectures focusing on specific aspects of LCA
- different expectations from different teachers
- make better use of log books
- choosing projects was confusing, can it be done on canvas?

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?

Problems with simapro.

There were problems with the software in the computer labs (not initially installed on all computers, server problems causing SimaPro to run slow or crash). This was out of our control. Installation and testing was done as required by IT support. Next year we will at an early stage double check one extra time that all is in order.

More flexible supervision.

Some students asked for more flexible supervision meetings. This is not possible from an economic and time planning view of teachers. We need to set a quite strict schedule.

Unfair distribution of work load in groups

This problem is hard to solve entirely. We have introduced a "Project contract" where students make an agreement in the beginning of the course how to share the work and solve any collaboration problems. We make it very clear that they should ask for help when problems occur.

Individual reflections could be used as a means to put individual grades, but will not solve the problem of unfair work load while projects are running. For teacher's working time reasons, the course does not have individual reflections.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Developing simapro excercises

I know from previous years that students want to practice more in simapro before working on projects. The course now only has a short exercise. This is a matter of time (economic resources). A possibility would be to offer exercises for students to work on on their own, provide answers but also set up some kind of peer review system. There is not room for more working time by teachers in the course.

Process for selecting projects

I don't know yet what a good set up could be. Will talk to teachers in other courses.

Simapro software in computer labs

Not course development, but important quality control to make sure this runs more smoothly next year.



Course data 2018-03-08

AG2800 - Life Cycle Assessment, HT 2017 Doktorand

Course facts

Course start:	2017 w.44
Course end:	2018 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:	Nils Brown <nwobrown@kth.se> Peter James Joyce <pjjoyce@kth.se> Carolina Liljenström <carlil@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	3
Total number of registered:	3

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate ¹ [%]	100.00%
Performance rate ² [%]	100.00%
Grade distribution ³ [%, number]	A 100% (3)

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students

AG2800 - Life Cycle Assessment, HT 2017

Course facts

Course start:	2017 w.44
Course end:	2018 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:	Göran Finnveden <goranfi@kth.se> Elisabeth Ekener <eep@kth.se> Nils Brown <nwobrown@kth.se> Peter James Joyce <pjjoyce@kth.se> Anna Björklund <annab@kth.se> Carolina Liljenström <carlil@kth.se>

Assistants:

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	57
Total number of registered:	57

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate¹ [%]	94.70%
Performance rate² [%]	96.60%
Grade distribution³ [%, number]	A 43% (23) B 33% (18) C 20% (11) D 2% (1) E 2% (1)

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students