



Report - AG2800 - 2019-02-01

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 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: 12 h (2 hrs more than last year)
- 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?

50% of the students spend 15-26 hrs/week. About equally many spend more or less than that (1 student only 6-8 hrs, 2 students 36-38 hrs). No big change compared to last year. I suspect (know from Word of mouth from some students) that there were a couple of free riders in projects, which is difficult to avoid entirely although I do my best to design the course to prevent this.

Comments from students is that the course requires a lot of work, but evenly distributed and fair in relation to size of the course.

Some mention difficulties when Project members have different ambition levels. Some spend more time, some spend less.

Some mention that the home exam took much more time than expected.

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?

Very similar to last year



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 course gets high to very high scores in all areas (5.8-6.5 of 7) with a couple of exceptions.

There were no gender differences in responses.

There was some variation between Swedish and international students in responses, where Swedish students rated the course slightly higher in most areas. One reason might be that there are not so many scheduled activities in the course, not so many hand in assignments etc, but it requires a lot of self studies. I Believe that Swedish students are well trained in this way of studying, possibly some international students are not.

Students with disability rated the course lower than those without.

-One student wrote "I have anxiety and I felt that this course was very stressful since a lot was expected from us, I was particularly anxious about finding all the data

that was required". This can understand this. I am not sure how to handle it, other than talking to students about it if they approach me about it.

- Another student wrote "Makes it difficult to work with groups." This too is difficult to solve (entirely) in the course. A Group Project will Always be stressful to those who have difficulty with this. What I can do is listen in with Groups (and tell other supervisors to do the same), provide clear instructions, the Group contract that the Groups fill in may also be a good help.

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?

Just as in previous years, I am happy to see that the students experience the course as meaningful and well organised.

There were a couple of areas that scored less:

"13 .I understood what I was expected to learn in order to obtain a certain grade" = 5.4

- Not perfect, but OK. This may be due to some differences in how Project supervisors act and communicate to students what is expected. This can be improved by "tuning" beforehand with the supervisors what is expected.

"20. I had opportunities to influence the course activities" = 5.1

- Not perfect, but OK. The students actually do influence a lot in their projects, but other activities are of course planned thoroughly beforehand. I do not have the time and resources to offer a palette of learning activities.



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?

There are many very positive comments about:

- lectures
- teachers
- the topic
- working in groups- how the course is organised
- variety of learning activities
- course design (eg home exam early in the course)
- Learning something that you can really use

Many positive comments, such as:

- "Thanks to all the supervisor and examiner. No doubt, it was one of the best courses I had in my master and a good ending of the program.

But

of course, it's also depending on your personal interest."

- "This course should offer twice in a year, since many students wants to learn about it and it shouldn't be offer at the very end of programme considering pressure of finding thesis and also further opportunity to work on the issue during thesis in different companies. Of course THANKS

a lot for your effort and contributions!

- "LCA was one of the best courses I have taken at KTH"

Suggested improvements from students (and my comment):

- smaller project groups (unfortunately not possible for economic reasons, cannot afford more supervisors)
 - need more time to revise reports after final seminar (this must be a misunderstanding, required revisions should be small, but I should add some more time)
 - huge time Crunch (yes, it's intense to do this course in one period, but ambition level needs to be adjusted, and they should work 20 hrs/week)
 - would like more exercises to prepare for the exam (yes, this was my intention to add this year, but I did not have the time, I hope to do so next year)
 - make the course available earlier in the program, not last semester
 - final seminars Before Xmas (no, it has to be in the exam period after Xmas)
 - home exam took much more time than expected (I will make it even more clear to students that they need to study Before as for a real exam, or else expect longer time)
 - explain simapro during lectures, or have supervisors that know the software (yes, that turned out to be a bigger problem than I thought. It's however not a good idea to teach simapro in lectures. More time in the lab could be an alternative, but this is expensive)
 - don't put lectures after the home exam and when there is a pressure to finish Project, it was difficult to prioritise (I know, it's a balance between timing and content)
 - spend more time explaining key concepts (I think that adding exercises could help, will definitely consider this)
 - unequal terms of supervision of projects (not good, I need to tune in better with all supervisors)
 - too static lectures sometimes, difficult to imagine what is explained (maybe consider flipped classroom, but this is a lot of work to implement. maybe add a few more lectures and have assignments done during lectures)
-

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

- Add exercises, so that students can practice calculations Before home exam.
 - Consider adding more lecture time to have time to explain/practice key concepts better.
 - Tune in better with other supervisors, we should have the same ambition level
 - All supervisors should be confident in simapro
-

Course data 2019-02-07

AG2800 - Life Cycle Assessment, HT 2018

Course facts

Course start:	2018 w.44
Course end:	2019 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 Mendonca Reis Brandao <miguelb@kth.se> Göran Finnveden <goranfi@kth.se> Elisabeth Ekener <eep@kth.se> Peter James Joyce <pjjoyce@kth.se> Carolina Liljenström <carlil@kth.se>

Assistants:

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	0
Total number of registered:	69

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate ¹ [%]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>
Performance rate ² [%]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>
Grade distribution ³ [%, number]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students