



Report - AL2161 - 2020-11-19

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):

Hanna Eggestrand (hannaegg@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.

To gather information for the course analysis, KTH's standardised questionnaire (LEQ, 12 questions) was automatically sent out to all participants. In addition, two meetings with the two student representatives were held. The students were also invited to share their thoughts and experiences regarding the course during the project presentations.

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 online meetings with the two student representatives were arranged.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The overall aim with the course is to generate knowledge and skills regarding approaches for management for sustainable development, and change in companies and other organisations due to an increased focus on sustainability. The course also provides training in application of some of the tools used to plan, monitor and evaluate environmental and sustainability management in organisations.

The course is mainly project based and the projects are defined and performed in collaboration with companies and other organisations. Each project group also has an academic advisor/supervisor from KTH.

The projects are presented in a written report and an oral presentation. The project groups also read and comment on each others' work (in writing and orally) (peer review). In addition to the project report, each group member also conducts an individual written reflection. The report grade and the grade of the individual reflection generate the course grade (provided that the other mandatory course components, i.e. the project plan, the draft project report, the written and oral peer review and the project presentation are all approved). This year, the projects were conducted in groups of 3-4 students (previously 2 students).

Due to logistical constraints, the data seminar was not given this year.



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?

Based on the LEQ answers, the students' workload is somewhat lower than expected. The fact that there are very few scheduled teaching activities (only course introduction, supervision and final presentations) and the students' themselves have a great own responsibility to plan their own work probably has an impact on the time spent. The number of students per group being a bit higher this year may also have contributed to a smaller workload for the individual student.

A critical aspect described by some groups is waiting to hear back from the company contact.

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?

The students' results were of particularly high quality this year. The students enrolled in the course performed exceptionally well, but the reason for this is unknown (although it seems to be in line with how the same group has performed in previous courses).

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students are generally appreciative of the course and its content. They highlight the opportunity to work with companies and to get real-life experience. Some would appreciate more supervision, whereas others feel that they got the support they needed.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

The students appreciate getting real life experience and to collaborate with companies - even though it can be complex and challenging.

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 ongoing pandemic posed some challenges this year, both in relation to finding companies willing and able to participate and in that all the course's teaching activities had to take place online. Even so, the students were generally satisfied with the course, and their results were of high quality. Some would appreciate more opportunities to meet the other course participants.

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 significant differences between different student groups have been identified.

An area for improvement is the format for the feedback, especially in relation to the individual reflection (clearer motivation of the given grade). In general, the students would appreciate additional information on what areas could be further improved (even if the overall quality is satisfactory).

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

*Re-introduce the data seminar, or a version of it.

*Possibly clarify the links to the preceding Environmental management I course.

*Keep the combination of written and oral peer review, as the students appreciated getting to practice to give feedback in both formats.

*Consider giving examples of previous projects in the information about the course and/or in meetings with the students leading up to course selection.



OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

This year's students recommend future course participants to stay in touch with the company contact person and to not be afraid to ask questions, to plan well how to spend the time available (make sure to start early), and to include time to get to know the company and the context.
