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 the course literature and some more open but within general focus of the course.

Literature assignment: seminars and written essay (analysis of one of the course books).

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?

The tendency to a higher workload than expected in 2017 seems somewhat less pronounced this year (2018). One possible reason for an uneven workload is that 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 is performed. To some extent, the uneven workload can be attributed to poor planning by the individual students (as they are aware of the tasks and have every possibility to start preparing early on), but the teachers can keep stressing the importance to plan ahead and start reading the books etc.

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: ok, although this year a larger relative part than previous year of the students got an F on the written exam. The main explanation as we see it is that several students have problems with writing reports (see below) and this unfortunately also feeds in to the written exam. How to handle this is an ongoing discussion on program level.

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. A lot of efforts have thus been given to the feedback to the students, mainly in written form on Canvas. The feedback has been acknowledged by the students, as they "saw how thorough the comments were and felt they were gaining from the experience".

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 5.7-6.7). 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?

Weaker (5.7): "The course was challenging in a stimulating way". It is a relatively high number (5,7), but still needs to be considered next time the course is given.

Stronger: the main part (10/12) of the questions had a response between 6.1-6.7.

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.
+ Literature seminar was very much appreciated by most students. "It encouraged discussion and the discussion has continued afterwards".
+ Also the feedback during literature seminars and the different parts of the project are mentioned as (very) positive.
+ Final seminar of the project work "was an excellent way to summarize and link the knowledge acquired from the PB framework to real life situations. Most of the students were satisfied and found it to be a good learning experience".
+ The guide for the exam (~ 65 examples of typical questions) was mentioned as very useful and practical for conducting the study for the exam.

- 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. We will evaluate the possibility of increasing the relevance of the project work in the final grade.

Tip: Read the course literature - and start in the beginning of the course! Course literature was also raised as relevant and "a good choice".

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

Final grade: discuss if 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 it's focus on planetary boundaries - has been a very useful concept/framework during other courses proceeding this course.

Kursdata 2019-02-04

MJ2659 - Teknik och ekosystem, större kurs, HT 2018

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2018 v.35
Kursen slutar:	2019 v.3
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	LIT1 - Litteraturuppgift, 1,0, betygsskala: P, F PRO1 - Projekt 1, 2,0, betygsskala: P, F PRO2 - Projekt 2, 1,5, betygsskala: P, F TEN1 - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Fredrik Gröndahl <fgro@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Daniel Franzen <dfranz@kth.se> Magnus Svensson <svensson@kth.se>
Lärare:	Miguel Mendonca Reis Brandao <miguelb@kth.se> Daniel Franzen <dfranz@kth.se> Magnus Svensson <svensson@kth.se> Hanna Eggestrand <hannaegg@kth.se> Ulla Mörtberg <mortberg@kth.se> Monika Olsson <monika@kth.se>
Assistenter:	

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	0
Totalt registrerade:	52

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad[1] [%]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*
Prestationsgrad[2] [%]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*
Betygsfördelning[3] [%, antal]	*Det finns inga kursresultat inrapporterade*

1 Andel godkända studenter
2 Andel avklarade poäng
3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter