

## Course analysis AG2809 – HT2018

*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.*

This course round was rather small with 8 students and was differently designed compared to the previous round. This round was run without collaboration with the other SUPD project courses, except for a joint half-time seminar. Even if the core parts were the same, the course design was adapted to the group size and new circumstances. The course projects were developed in collaboration with Värmdö municipality and around the theme water sustainability. The course core part was the project work (10.5 ECTS) which was examined by oral presentation and written report, as well as progress reporting and log book. The project work was built on a background research process broadly addressing sustainable development in Värmdö municipality. Literature report and seminars (3.0 ECTS) included a synthesis of scientific literature of relevance for the project (extended background) and presentation and discussion of this literature during seminars. 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 there 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 responding students 3/5 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?*

8/9 registered students finalized the course.

### **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?*

It is clear that the responding students appreciated the learning environment since most of the aspects got the score above 6.5 (maximum 7). No differences between groups of students could be detected in the evaluation report.

### **ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

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

The stronger areas of the learning environment seems to have been the atmosphere of sharing and supporting each other and I the small group that allowed us to work as a team including me as

a teacher was part of that outcome. The size of the course allowed for in-depth feedback at several occasions, which was appreciated. Another thing that I think support the high scores is the high degree of flexibility in the course design, where the different class meetings are adapted to the students' progress and needs, and where the steps-wise assignments are made to support understanding of project processes. This means that the student's are impacting the detailed course design.

#### **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 engaged teacher and collaborative atmosphere, the close connection to real issues, good alignment between different tasks and assignments, relevant lectures,

**Suggested improvements:** Clarify the connection between assignment 02 and 03, better organisation of cross-course events, better timing of submission of assignment, more effective peer-review reading, more contact with the external partner.

Good advices for future students: a good chance to practice your knowledge in a real case, make use of all class meetings they are worth it, if doing interviews make sure you book them early, a good preparation for the master thesis project.

#### **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:

- clarify grading criteria
- increase the interaction with the external partner
- clarify the relation between the literature report and the project report

#### **OTHER INFORMATION**

*Is there anything else you would like to add?*

Sara Borgström, course responsible and examiner