

Report - AL2181 - 2023-09-04

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@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.

Students of the course were provided with a survey of which 92 students had responded, 14 answers were given thereby amounting a response rate of 15.22%. Additionally, I met with two student course representatives to grasp the student's overall feedback about the course. The survey also includes aspects relating to gender and disability.

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 the student course representatives had taken place via zoom to discuss the student's feedback, constructive criticism and general comments. In addition, meetings with individuals and students' group had occurred throughout the course's duration.

COURSE DESIGN

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

The course consisted of lectures, two seminars, a group project and a home exam. Noteworthy, no significant changes were made since the last course offering.

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?

Because the course is assigned 7.5 credits, it is expected that a workload of 200 is met. However, of the students in the survey reported less hours in comparison to the course's expectation. Noteworthy, a student who claimed a workload of 6-8 hours per week commented that the workload was okay. Whereas another student who claimed a workload of 15-17 hours per week commented that the workload was manageable and flexible to increase or decrease depending on the nature of revision needed for lectures, seminars, project work and or 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?

Most of the students participating in the course did tremendously well to adhere to the learning objectives and most importantly, in the project work and home examination. Resultantly, this can be reiterated by the high grades that many of the students achieved.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

- When asked about the best aspects of the course, students consistently reiterated the importance of obtaining a general overview of the environmental tools used for decision making processes. Furthermore, another student stated that the accessibility of the lectures to be online and in video format helped them.
 - When asked about what the students would suggest improving for the course, students stated that it would have helped to receive more feedback for the draft report during the initial seminar session and group feedback session with the tutor.
 - When asked what advice students would like to give to future participants, students stated that you should think critically, as thought-provoking questions and seek clarification on what specifically needs investigating when it comes to the project work and how this could potentially be carried out.
 - Lastly, when asked whether the students would like anything else to add, one student noted that "the lectures were okay, but the project work was not supported at all. The seminars were not helpful".
-

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

- With regards to the response data, when students were asked response-based questions, clear patterns (both positive and negative) can be identified.
 - Firstly, when it comes to positive data points, most of the students agreed that the course was stimulating, worked with contemporary issues and helped challenged themselves. Additionally, many students predominantly agreed that the assessment of the course was fair and honest. Furthermore, students tended to agree with one another that through collaborations and open discussions, they were able digest and internalise the course material further. Also, when it came to the guest lectures, the students thoroughly appreciated the diversity of speakers and learned a great deal of new information.
 - Secondly, when it comes to negative data points, most of the students that participated in the survey, ranked statement 15. 'I was able to practice and receive feedback without being graded' as low. Furthermore, not necessarily negative; however, more balanced was statement 22. 'I was able to get support if I needed it', of which received mixed responses from the students.
-

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.

Overall, the course participants have held the course in high regard, of which can be reinforced by the high scores across the statements and generally positive comments stemming from the open questions. Nevertheless, students provided much appreciated constructive criticism that can help to improve the course structure.

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 of the students who participated in the course indicated that they enjoyed the course, and that the discussion were stimulating and of contemporary relevance. On the other hand, some students found these lectures too simple. Also, as many courses have difficulty in addressing the same issue, project work is not fairly distributed among participants.

• Ultimately, despite the student response being quite high, this is still a small representation of the total students who participated in the course. So, for all intents and purposes, making conclusions and assumptions based on the results expressed in the course evaluation still does not build a general understanding of how all the students felt throughout the course's duration; however, it does provide a great insight and helps for future improvements.

• Noteworthy, with one disability being declared and represented within the course analysis, the spread between Swedish and International student responses were nearly identical; however, when it come to declared gender representation, many of the students did not want to reveal their gender.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Overall, Environmental System and Analysis and Decision Making was a successful course, as reinforced by the general satisfaction provided by the students. Nevertheless, with insightful constructive criticism, some course adjustments need tweaking to align with a smoother course experience for the students. Additionally, with regards to the lectures and seminar structures, there will be some minor re-positioning to complement the project work and provide students with feedback via an earlier seminar presentation seminar.
