Course evaluation report AG2809 – HT2017
The analysis is based on a LEQ course evaluation format.

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

The course was given in collaboration with the other SUPD project course lead by the Dept. of Architecture (Urban Ecologies Ad2863) and hence lead by a team of three teachers. The course core part was the project work (10.5 ETCS) which was examined by oral presentation and written report, as well as progress reporting and log book. The project work was built on a cross-course background research process. Seminars (3.0 ECTS) included attendance at a number of seminars about thematic topics related to water issues and urban planning in Södertälje as well as a written report based on literature relevant for the project work. Finally the students wrote a learning reflection (1.5 ECTS) where insights for future projects and work was captured.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

The student's perceived workload seem to be in correspondence with the expectations for a 15 ECTS/semester course (20h/week). Most of the students 5/8 stated that they spent 18-23 hours/week. Hence no significant deviation could be seen.

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?

All students registered at the course finalized it.

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 overall impression of the learning environment was high with scores for most of the questions between 5-6.5. There is an indication that the interaction across the courses was not fully successful even though there were many learning activities that encourage this (score 4,9 for course openness and inclusivity). Regarding course understanding of course organisation and expectations the responses (score 4.6) shows that the new teacher constellation impacted the learning environment, by having difficulties in communicating well ahead and provide aligned instructions. The students also experienced unclear expectations in relation to grading criteria since those were not well developed (score 4.5). There is also a difference in the impressions from between men and women, where the latter generally perceived the course less challenging, inclusive and interactive with the teachers and course colleagues. Since there were few respondents, it is hard to tell if this is an effect of just 1-2 men responding to the course evaluation and those being less content with the course.

I think a well-planned and communicated course interaction would have improved the course. I suffered quite much from the new collaboration set up with very short notice. It is not surprising that the scores for these aspects were lower. Even though the overall scores are high so the efforts made to have a frequent communication to sort out unclear messages etc. were key for the student's learning. Inter-disciplinarity is important in sustainable development and requires many different skills and abilities among the teachers and students, but a pre-condition is to have enough time to properly design such interaction in order to be successful.

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?

Best parts were: the flexibility to choose project theme, the numerous presentations (pin ups) in the studio, the connection to real issues, learning about the project process
Suggested improvements: better collaboration between the teachers, better communication, clarified grading criteria.
Good advices for future students: prepare to present unfinished work biweekly, use the presentation sessions to get support and feedback, use the opportunity to explore something you are interested in before the master thesis, this is a great course you learn a lot.

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

For course development:
- to make sure that the teacher team is set up earlier and the courses better align in order to support a clear communication of expectations. Alternatively reduce the level of interaction and instead plan for a number of interactive learning activities through the semester, e.g. half-time seminars, literature seminars, study visits.
- Develop the grading criteria so they are aligned with the learning objectives and use both to communicate the expectations.

OTHER INFORMATION
Is there anything else you would like to add?