Report - AL2608 - 2024-01-28

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):
Anna Björklund, annab@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.
- All students were invited to be part of the course committee. Four students volunteered for this.
- The course committee met once during the course and once after the course evaluation was concluded to discuss the course analysis with the course coordinator.
- Students were invited to give feedback directly to the course coordinator and there has been possibility for students between and after lectures to ask, discuss, give comments about the course.
- Part of one lecture was also dedicated for students to comment and give feedback
- A group of 8 students from Aalto university participated through the UNITE collaboration. A separate course evaluation form was distributed and a separate meeting was held with these students, organized by Aalto
- At the end of the course, a course evaluation form (LEQ) was distributed to all students (response rate 26/93; 28%).

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

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.
- The course was run on campus for the first time in three years.
- A simple hybrid solution was offered to allow students to join online.
- Lectures were not recorded.
- Project supervision was held on campus but also possible to join in zoom.
- 1 seminar was held online (NEW)
- 1 seminar was run as hybrid
- 1 seminar was held on campus ony, but with possibility to compendate in a separate online seminar if absent (NEW)
- 3 Computer labs were held on campus, 2 online (NEW).

The course examination consists of the following parts:
- PRO1 - Project work, 5,0 hp, grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
- TEN1 - Home exam, 2,5 hp, grade scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Scheduled learning activities:
- Lectures: 20 h
- Computer labs: 5x2 h
- Supervision meetings with project groups: 4 h/group

Own studies, estimated time:
- Attending lectures and studying course literature: 1 week
- Completing home exam: 5 h
- Project work: 3.5 weeks
- Critical review and final revision of report: 0.5 week

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?
The majority of students report to have spent between 12-20 hrs/week, which is within a reasonable range, depending on ambition level of individual students. 16% spent more than 20 hrs, 28% spent less that 12 hrs.

Students' comments about workload range from "OK" ,"workload was overall even", and "the workload was good and it was helpful with the deadlines", to a few saying things like "Too many things to do" and "the course felt therefore very compact and intense"

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 student group as a whole performed roughly equal to previous years.

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

Good things about the course according to the students:
- working with simapro & time in computer lab
- group project
- the professors' willingness to explain
- well structured lectures
- good to have one lecture per key topic, it was very clear
- combination of home exam and lectures (theory) and project (practice). It sticks!
- good to have home exam at mid-semester
- getting to choose our project topics
- supervision meetings, good quality feedback
- getting to apply LCA knowledge, hands-on experience
- presenting in a smaller setting at the final seminar, with room for discussions and not having to "sit through" all rpesentations

Things that students ask to improve
- more scheduled hours in computer lab
- reorganize computer labs schedule, so that more on site labs are held in the beginning, and only after that run remote labs
- too many activities
- too much material to take in and read
- too many peer review sessions
- did not make sense to have the exam in November
- schedule supervision meetings later in the course
- slow process to form project groups, need more efficient way
- would like to have more exercises to prepare for the exam
- status reports not necessary, too much thing to do to "tick the box"
- start a bit slower with the project
- reorganize Modules in Canvas for better clarity
- remove some instructions, or shorten them
- do either exam or project, not both
- smaller project groups
- fewer deadlines
- it would be nice to get at least an introduction to LCA methods and systems used in other sectors - the building sector for example (certification systems based on building LCA)
- discrepancy between the feedback provided during supervisions and the final evaluation raises concerns about the consistency and fairness of the assessment process
- not enough attention for lab tutorial and assistance, we had basically to do it by ourselves, because of this we didn't really grasp how to use the software until the very end
- it's a pity that there is no time to integrate peer feedback of final report before submitting for grading by supervisor

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

The feedback from students is similar to previous years, varying from very good to critical about some practical things (canvas, want more supervision, want more time in computer labs, too many things to do).

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 impression is that the course is good, appreciated and seen as valuable by most 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?

Male students have rated the course slightly lower than female students. This result was also seen previous years. There is no clear explanation for this. It may have to do with (on average) different learning styles among male and female students, where male students may (?) appreciate fewer strict deadlines and a more "loose" course structure, while female students appreciate the clear but more rigid course structure.

This was discussed with the course committee members, who have not picked up any comments from their peers that there should be any systematic reason for this. A hypothesis is that the response rate for female students is higher, hence representing a better average, while male students tend to respond to the course evaluation mainly if the are critical about the course

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

- Canvas: go through canvas to find ways to organize for better clarity
- Status reports and peer review: consider removing status reports, or reformulate how they are presented and used + communicate the purpose of status report & peer review better
- Exercises: add exercises for students to work on in advance of home exam
- Project groups: improve process for forming project groups
- Supervision and teaching: Harmonize better among teachers how and what we teach, to avoid conflicting messages
- Final report: Consider if the order of peer review and grading of final report should be adjusted, so that groups have time to improve reports based on feedback from peers