



Report - MJ2659 - 2018-04-04

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):

Magnus Svensson, svensson@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

Lectures (~10): some more directly related to course literature and some more open but within general focus of the course
Literature assignment: seminars and written essay
Project work: individual (part1) and group (part2) with written reports for each part and a presentation of group work. Part 2 builds on part 1. Focuses on sociotechnical systems and planetary boundaries.
Written examination

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?

There seems to be a tendency to a higher workload than expected. One possible reason might be an uneven workload (the course is running on half speed during the whole semester), and students indicate that the workload is higher at the end - when the LEQ was performed.

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?

Exam: reasonably well and in line with previous years
Litass/project: also ok, but the written reports clearly indicated that some - quite a few - of the students have problems with writing reports (both format and content) and also how to handle references.

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?

Overall very good (values between 5.7-6.8). No major differences between groups.



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?

Weeker (5.7-5.9): information on expected learning outcomes and expectations for specific grades was somewhat unclear, which needs to be considered next time the course is given.

Stronger: the main part (18/22) of the questions had a response between 6.0-6.8

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?

+ Well structured/organized and interesting course. Also the feedback during literature seminars and the different parts of the project are mentioned as (very) positive.

- Total grading only being based on final exam (Litass and Project is graded P/F) is raised as something negative given that those parts form a large part of the total credit. Though it should be mentioned that a part of the exam (>10% of the credits) is related to the project work.

- The "role" of the lectures are not fully clear.

Tip: Read the course literature - and start in the beginning of the course!

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

* Feedback on written essay/reports may be more formalized (in discussion with program director and other teachers).

* Final grade: discuss if Litass and Project should give higher weight to final grade and if so discuss possible solutions.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

An interesting note is that some students have mentioned (later) that this course - and its focus on planetary boundaries - has been a very useful concept/framework during other courses proceeding this course.

Course data 2018-04-06

MJ2659 - Technology and Ecosystems, Larger Course, HT 2017

Course facts

Course start:	2017 w.35
Course end:	2018 w.3
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	LIT1 - Literature Assignment, 1.0, Grading scale: P, F PRO1 - Project 1, 2.0, Grading scale: P, F PRO2 - Project 2, 1.5, Grading scale: P, F TEN1 - Examination, 3.0, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Fredrik Gröndahl <fgro@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Daniel Franzen <dfranz@kth.se> Magnus Svensson <svensson@kth.se>
Teachers:	Miguel Brandao <miguelb@kth.se> Daniel Franzen <dfranz@kth.se> Magnus Svensson <svensson@kth.se> Hanna Eggestrand <hannaegg@kth.se> Monika Olsson <monika@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	43
Total number of registered:	51

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate¹ [%]	76.70%
Performance rate² [%]	93.20%
Grade distribution³ [%, number]	A 12% (4) B 18% (6) C 27% (9) D 24% (8) E 21% (7)

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students