Report - AL2181 - 2020-03-27

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 Brandão, miguel.brandao@abe.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 survey sent out.
Meeting held with students' representatives.

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.)

A meeting with two self-apointed students' representatives was scheduled after the course was completed. Only one student participated in the meeting, but had collected opinions from the rest of the class.

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

The course consists of 7 2-hour lectures, 2 seminars and a home examination. It also includes a group project and the reading of pertinent literature that students conduct on their own.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

Of the students who answered the survey, only 3% (13 students) reported doing the workload expected. It is not uncommon that students tend to minimise the time requirements of the course.

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 grade distribution was as follows:
A) 5 students
B) 46 students
C) 24 students
D) 1 student
E) 0 students
F) 3 students

The home exam may have been marked more strictly as there was a new course assistant.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

What was the best aspect of the course?
- Course description
- Gaining of an overview of the most common tools
- Knowledge of the different tools
- Project and feedback from the examiner
- Clear structure
- Project + home exam combination
- Interesting topics, good structure, engaged teachers
- A good understanding regarding how environmental impacts are assessed and how this also could be problematic
- Presenting at the seminar and listening to other presentations

What would you suggest to improve?
- Level of engagement with the class
- Involvement of the course coordinator
- More lectures and sessions
- Clear feedback on the project report to understand what was missing
- Better relationships within the group members via supervision
- Smaller groups in project
- More focus in lectures on how tools should be implemented via case studies
- Using polls to ask questions and receives answers
- Greater linkage between lectures and project work
- Clearer exam instructions
- Minimise overlap with CENMI students who take AE1502 Miljösystemanalys för energi och miljö, AE1502 and other courses
- Ensure more uniform level of knowledge among students, perhaps by dividing the course into two groups
- Clearer definition and more explanation of the criteria needed in the context of the project work, with reference to examples
- Clearer step-by-step application of each tool
- Clearer and more concise project information
- More feedback on a one-to-one meeting with teacher

What advice would you like to give to future participants?
- Take this course only if its compulsory
- Set a time frame for the group and yourself. Ask the teacher if anything is unclear.
- Start with the project early!
- have a mixed group of students for the project,
- Focus more on the decision making process instead of only the tools
- Make it clear from the beginning that everyone needs to keep the length of their texts in the project down. The theory of the tools can't be more than 1-3 paragraphs, there's not much space.
- Start the project work by presenting yourselves and the experience of environmental assessment you have.
- Read about all the tools, even though you might divide the tools between the group members. Make sure that all of the group members are equally as integrated in every part of the report, you will have use of it in the home exam.
- Quickly realize what the scope of the course is. Do not waste time in learing all details regarding every decision making tool.
- Read documents in canvas in advance and don't wait until the last minute.

Is there anything else you would like to add? (
- The course is for 7.5 credits and international students pay around 20000 SEK for a 7.5 credit course which is not at all justified!!
- The absolute best part of the course was discussions with Miguel, I learned more in a brief 5-minute chat/feedback then all of the lectures combined.
- The topics of the course were very interesting but it felt like we covered too much and nothing in detail at the same time. I would have liked to focus on one big thing in particular. It was difficult to follow for those of us who don't come from an environmental background.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Course content/ lectures
- Less on specific details of tools
- Very interesting lectures
- Repetition for CENMI-students
- Weak connection between lectures and project work
- Some lecturers were not good
- Too few lectures
- Include case studies
- Messy course literature - better referencing necessary

Project
- Too big groups
- Unclear project instructions (e.g. limits of words and pages)
- More feedback: written (after presentations) and justifying report grades with assessment criteria
- More supervision
- Unnecessary first seminar
- More interaction between groups in seminars
- Not effective in giving a detailed understanding on when to use which tool
- Handing out a feedback sheet for the course in the beginning (for lectures and project work) so that the students can fill out the feedback throughout the course which could deliver more info on what should be actually changed.

Home Exam
- Lack of feedback on the home exam grades: We do not know what we can do better.
- Hand out assessment criteria for the examinations, plus give exam grades (as points)
- Identical exam to last year's

Teacher.
- Could encourage more dialogue in class by creating a safe and good learning environment

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.

This is a very large course (>80 students), which is challenging to manage with little course assistance. In general, students have done well and have enjoyed the course.
With more assistance, more time could be devoted to the course which would translate in more feedback, smaller groups, etc.

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 big differences between students but CENMI students have been exposed to some of the content, making these parts of the course redundant for them.
International students appeared to be less happy with the course, but also appeared to perform worse (at least in the project group work)

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

More assistance would address most of the issues raised.