



## Report - AL2130 - 2020-04-01

---

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 analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):**

Monika Olsson

### 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.**

Course evaluation is based on 2 course committee meetings (2 students are course representatives) - one in the middle of the course and one at the end (during the LEQ).

LEQ is used and open for 2 weeks.

Also comments during the course from students are taken into account.

### 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.)**

See above - 2 meetings

### COURSE DESIGN

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

The course is built upon modules to which lectures, assignments, literature and study visits are connected. A group project work runs throughout the course and is examined by a report and peer review at a poster session.

Changes implemented based on previous course analysis were:

- Clarified and more excessive grading criteria for home assignments
- All Home assignments are available already from the start of the course
- GIS seminar improved instructions with pre-reading

### 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?**

Yes, according to the LEQ it varied between 6-32 h/week main 15-17 h/week. Some thought the workload for the assignment was a bit too much but this could be due to less previous knowledge and also that the assignments are 3 ECTS and considered as the main examination instead of a written exam (which should be even more clarified next year).



### 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 well - student can choose their own ambition by doing more or less of the assignments for a better grade but manage an E with only 2.

### STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What do students say in response to the open questions?

The are very satisfied with the course. Some comments from course meetings:

Good activities (varieties and content) - like poster session, study visits, lectures with different perspectives (specially mining waste)

Very interesting course - learned a lot

### SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Students like the course but have some suggestions for improvement:

- Assignments - grading should be even more clarified (specially assignment 1), deadlines should be more spread out, could be more varied (some practical), would be good to clarify the meaning of the assignments (they are a large part of the examination) and could be sent out to lecturing teachers before the lecture (however the assignments are mainly based on the literature which needs to be even more communicated)

- Lectures were very appreciated however the Company perspective lecture needs to be revised

- Seminars - GIS should be compulsory. Both GIS and system thinking seminar worked well

- Study visits - Stena recycling was not good and should be changed

- Project - poster session was very appreciated, short time for start up - this can be improved by sending out a mail before the course with an introduction of the project so students start thinking of what they want to do in the project.

### 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.

Course works fine and only minor improvements are asked for. Changes from previous course works well but grading of assignments still a bit vague according to some students.

### 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?

No - LEQ shows good results with nr 20 as the lowest at 4,8 (Opportunities to influence course activities)

### PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Changes for next time:

- GIS seminar will be mandatory

- Clarification of assignment 1 (see suggestions in LEQ) and assignments in general (as major part of exam and more connected to literature not lectures)

- Try to put the study visits in the first part of each module to create an interest (depends on company availability)

- Send mail about the project to students in advance before course start

### OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No