



Report - AL2130 - 2021-03-30

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 monika@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.

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.)

Two course evaluation meetings with course representatives, one in the middle and one at the end of course.

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.

Main changes:

- Course was held totally online incl study visits due to Covid-19
- GIS seminar was mandatory and pre-reading was encouraged which resulted in better understanding of the task
- Ass 1 clarified

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?

Workload should be 200 h/7 weeks = 28 h/week. They spent 15-23 h/week (main) so ok. Problem is more that the workload is not evenly distributed due to assignments connected to specific parts of the course. An attempt was made to distribute these more evenly but did not fully succeed.



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 does students say in response to the open questions?

Open question was about the on-line version of the course. It worked well according to the students except for the "study visits" which would have been much better "live" (of course)

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

Course works well and is much appreciated.

According to the LEQ the main problem was "felt togetherness with others" which can be expected in an on-line course.

Assignments were "time consuming" and Ass 3 was commented upon as difficult and "lacking info/knowledge" about how to do this.

Study visits not so good since they were on-line

Would like more on prevention of waste and the upper part of the waste hierarchy

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 though lacks in contact with and between students due to on-line version.

Study visits need to be "live"

Assignments are tough but they are half of the grading (no written exam) - could be more evenly distributed but this is difficult due to the different course modules

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?

Weak areas are mainly probably due to on-line version of the course (like "felt togetherness" - 4.3 and Opportunities to influence course activities - 4.3)

Only 9 out of 30 answered the LEQ and of those all defined them self as female

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Ass 3 needs to have some more "backup" by lecture or literature

Study visits need to be "live"

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No - works well