

Course analysis AG2809 – HT2019

Number of students: 3

Number of students passing the course: 3

NB! This analysis is based on an evaluative discussion with the three students since an online LEQ can't be performed with so few students for anonymity reasons.

COURSE DESIGN

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

Due to what seems to be a generally different course selection among this group of SUPD students compared to previous years both this project course and AG2129 experienced a decline in students. For this course only 3 students registered and completed the course this round, which was given exemption to the minimum number of students for the course (#5). For such a small group it is not allowed to perform an online LEQ course evaluation since anonymity cannot be guaranteed. The below summary is therefore based on an oral evaluation that was done at the final course meeting with all students present.

Similar to 2018 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 sustainability challenges. 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 and RESULTS

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? 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 workload was experienced as high, but ok, since it was even throughout the course and that the course was well planned. It was a rather slow start but that was appreciated by the students since the workload was high in other parallel courses.

All students passed the course, and this high proportion of successful students is similar to previous years.

OVERALL IMPRESSION and ANALYSIS 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? 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 assignments of the course are interwoven which is a source of initial confusion of purposes, relations and expectations of the assignments. However, this integrated process design became clearer during the first class meetings and did not seem to be an obstacle to the learning process. It seemed that the changes in the instructions of Assignment 02 enabled a better understanding of its relation to Assignment 03, which was an obstacle during 2018. The format of class meetings with lectures, frequent progress reporting and seminars was appreciated as supporting the project work. The photo exercise (new this course round) was appreciated as a way to engage with Värmdö municipality, even if the material was not used later on in the projects.

Appreciated parts:

- The literature assignment including the instructions and discussions about how to perform a systematic literature overview.
- Working in the real context of Värmdö and the meetings with the Värmdö people.
- Relevant and inspiring lectures in the beginning
- The high level of independency
- That the course content was tailored towards the project process and that the project topic was adapted to the student's interests.
- The ability to explore different methods

Challenging parts:

- that important empirical material was in Swedish
- the small group size

Suggested improvements:

- Use the final presentation at Värmdö for presenting and discussing the recommendations in more of a workshop format. This can potentially become a validation of the recommendation and the outcomes can then become incorporated into the final report.
- Improve the integration of the SDG by linking them to visions, goals and targets at national and local level.

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 increase the number of students - clarify for prospective student what the course is about and how it is different compared to other courses that include project work. This will be done in collaboration with the other project courses within SUPD.
- increase the collaboration with the other two project courses within SUPD to provide an interdisciplinary learning environment even if the course students are few.
- increase the interaction with the external partner, maybe by different interactive activities such as a final workshop
- improve the integration of SDGs by linking them to the partner context and challenges

Sara Borgström, course responsible and examiner