



Report - DM2720 - 2018-04-16

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):

Elina Eriksson, elina@kth.se and Hanna Hasselqvist, hannaha@kth.se

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 a project, lectures and seminars. The seminars were based on reading related to the lectures. Previous year the reading was not mandatory, this year we did some of the reading mandatory and the students had to hand in a short summary before the seminars.

The main aim of the project work was to investigate how an (ICT/Media) organisation today works with sustainability in their core business. Furthermore, the project work resulted in suggestions/recommendations on how the organisation could improve the sustainability focus of their core business.

The learning outcomes were examined through seminars, a project report (one per group) and an individual reflection assignment. To get a higher grade, an individual reflection assignment could be handed in at the end of the course. The final individual grade was a combination of the project report grade and the individual reflection grade.

Previous year the grade was only based on the group work.

THE STUDENT'S 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?

In the course evaluation it became clear that a majority of the students had not spent the expected workload on the course. This could be due to the fact that some did not go to the lectures and that they could have spent more time on reading. The group work set up could also make it possible for some students to get away with less hours.

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?

In this course offering there were slightly higher grades, probably due to the fact that we had introduced a possibility to get a higher grade through an individual assignment.



OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

There were not significant differences and the results for all questions were in general positive.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

No clear weaker areas.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

The students liked the project set up. We need to better connect some of the course material to ICT.

Good advice:

Get a lot of interviews!

Begin early with establishing contact with the company and book a meeting.

Make an effort to read all the course literature and actively participate at the seminars.

Don't worry about the entire group needing to attend meetings with the company. The most important thing is having as many meetings as possible to discover as much about the company as possible. Just take good notes and relay the information back to the group.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

There is a wish for more concrete examples and tools that are easier to apply, however, there are since this is a new subject, no such ready to use tools at hand. We need to help the students more to reflect on how existing tools and research could be applied - for example through doing more analysis work during the seminars. Hopefully in the long term, there will be more concrete examples and tools as the area develops more.

We will reflect on the course structure in relation to the fact that the students did not spend the expected time on the course.

Course data 2018-06-19

DM2720 - Sustainable ICT in Practice, VT 2018

Course facts

Course start:	2018 w.3
Course end:	2018 w.11
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	INL1 - Assignment, 7.5, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Elina Eriksson <elina@kth.se> Daniel Pargman <pargman@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Daniel Pargman <pargman@kth.se>
Teachers:	Hanna Hasselqvist <hannaha@kth.se> Elina Eriksson <elina@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	11
Total number of registered:	11

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate¹ [%]	90.90%
Performance rate² [%]	90.90%
Grade distribution³ [%, number]	A 10% (1) B 30% (3) C 30% (3) D 30% (3)

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students