

Report - AL2110 - 2023-04-13

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):

Miguel Brandao, miguelb@kth.se

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS

Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

Students were sent a survey, which one-third (12 students) completed. I have also met with a student representative to discuss students' feedback. The survey includes gender and disability aspects.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

One meeting took place via zoom with the course representative regarding students' feedback.
Meetings were held with individual students and with student groups.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course design has not changed since the last offering. It is based on lectures, two debates, project group work and a home exam. The home exam period, between release of questions and submission of answers, was shortened to 3 days (instead of one week).

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?

7.5 credits equal 200 hours. All students answering the survey reported less time than that. Students are supposed to spend time on their own and dedicated to the group work, as well as reading literature and doing the home exam.

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?

Like last year, they have succeeded very well.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

Regarding the workload, students mentioned that:

- the lectures were really interesting, and there could be more of them to deepen topics, like in the project work
- a CENMI student thought there was overlap with his previous studies
- the workload is well distributed
- the course was not work intensive - more encouragements to go read articles concerning the theory evoked during the lectures would have been nice. However, having a lot of time to dive deep into our subjects was great
- There are few scheduled hours but, between the project and the exam, it was necessary to read several scientific articles. Then the writing of

the project report itself took some time since it needed to be carefully structured in order to respect the length limitation.

Regarding the discrimination, students mentioned that:

There were no prejudices or discrimination regarding one's sexuality or gender identity that I am aware of

Regarding their programme, students mentioned that:

- I am: Internationell masterstudent)
- Double degree student

Regarding the environment, students mentioned that:

- The environment was welcoming to all students and the course material was in English

Regarding the best aspect of the course, students mentioned that:

- really nice topics and nice way to discuss them in lectures
- project work scope in combination with the debate would have been more stimulating if the report could be longer, and maybe have a second phase where we were forced to go in depth of one of the issues, or some second step to practice systems thinking
- The debate was quite fun.
- very interesting, people were often motivated and really interested in the subject, and precise questions
- The teacher is very charismatic and knows a lot, which makes listening interesting - but I sometimes felt a bit too passive in my listening and not having to work between classes (except from the project)
- Learning content
- The topics were really interesting and the professor is clearly passionate and informed about them
- Dynamism, interesting topics and lively lectures!
- Interesting topic, and teacher very knowledgeable in it.

Regarding suggestions to improve the course, students mentioned that:

- the overall level of the course was too basic and that the exam and project work should be made more difficult. More detailed lectures.
- the organisation of the course needs to be improved. For example, more information on how the grading works.
- more feedback on the work
- more mandatory and diverse activities

Regarding advice to future participants, students mentioned that:

- try your best to read some of the material provided, and ask questions to feel engaged in the classes
- Reading literature can be really helpful and a general interest in the subject is important.
- Do not hesitate to ask questions during the course

Regarding other things to add, students mentioned that:

- many thanks for this class, it was very interesting! It would have been great to include this class in the Environmental engineering Master's (EESI), I had to take it as an extra-master class even though it seems very relevant
- that interesting but so complex that I have much more questions about food system than before the course
- make grading criteria explicit
- Feedback wasn't really needed
- practice / exercises not necessary
- teacher very respondent to the questions we had
- 4 person is great for a group project - and people were all very motivated
- I did not ask for support, but I think the prof. was available for questions

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Positive Comments:

- The lecture slides are very informative and clear, helpful during self-study
- The lectures follow a good structure, very easy to follow and have a great story line
- The exercises during lectures are helpful, so there could be more
- The lectures give a good background info for students who are not familiar with the topic or didn't do their bachelor program at KTH
- The debate session was fun and informative, stimulated great discussion

Neutral/Negative comments:

- Too easy
- Little feedback
- Some repetitive content reported relative to other courses

OVERALL IMPRESSION

Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

The students have rated the course highly, some even saying it was the best course they took at KTH, while others thinking it was too easy. The average scores ranged from 3 to 7, indicating an overall agreement with the statements (22) in most questions. The only two statements scoring lower than 4 were 14 and 15 on feedback.

ANALYSIS

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

Most students seem to have enjoyed the lectures a lot. while others thought they were too basic.

As is not uncommon, it was pointed out that the group work is not distributed evenly among group participants, which appears to be inevitable.

It is fair to say that there are not many occasions where feedback can be expressed.

International students rated the course higher than Swedish students, as have women relative to men.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

The course was a success, indicated by the general satisfaction from students, and only minor changes need taking place. One or two more lectures are planned for the following run, and improvements in the course materials (including slides) is to take place. The existence of an assistant next year will also address the issue of feedback.
More exercises will be produced.
