



Forest and landscape ecology BI1451, 30047.2526

15 Hp
Pace of study = 100%
Education cycle = Basic
Course leader = Lisa Petersson


Evaluation report

Evaluation period: 2026-03-16 - 2026-04-06

Answers 8
Number of students 41
Answer frequency 19 %

Mandatory standard questions

1. My overall impression of the course is:




Answers: 8
Medel: 4,3
Median: 4

1: 0
2: 0
3: 0
4: 6
5: 2

No opinion: 0

2. I found the course content to have clear links to the learning objectives of the course.




Answers: 8
Medel: 4,8
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 0
4: 2
5: 6

No opinion: 0

3. My prior knowledge was sufficient for me to benefit from the course.




Answers: 8
 Medel: 4,4
 Median: 5

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 2
 4: 1
 5: 5

No opinion: 0

4. The information about the course was easily accessible.




Answers: 8
 Medel: 4,8
 Median: 5

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 0
 4: 2
 5: 6

No opinion: 0

5. The various course components (lectures, course literature, exercises etc.) have supported my learning.




Answers: 8
 Medel: 4,4
 Median: 4

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 0
 4: 5
 5: 3


No opinion: 0

6. The social learning environment has been inclusive, respecting differences of opinion.




Answers: 8
 Medel: 4,4
 Median: 4

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 1
 4: 3
 5: 4



No opinion: 0

7. The physical learning environment (facilities, equipment etc.) has been satisfactory.




Answers: 8
Medel: 4,6
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 1
5: 6

No opinion: 0

8. The examination(s) provided opportunity to demonstrate what I had learnt during the course (see the learning objectives).




Answers: 8
Medel: 4,8
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 0
5: 7

No opinion: 0

9. The course covered the sustainable development aspect (environmental, social and/or financial sustainability).




Answers: 8
Medel: 4,4
Median: 4

1: 0
2: 0
3: 0
4: 5
5: 3

No opinion: 0

10. I believe the course has included a gender and equality aspect, regarding content as well as teaching practices (e.g. perspective on the subject, reading list, allocation of speaking time and the use of master suppression techniques).




Answers: 8
 Medel: 4,6
 Median: 5

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 1
 4: 1
 5: 5

No opinion: 1

11. The course covered international perspectives.




Answers: 8
 Medel: 4,1
 Median: 4

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 2
 4: 3
 5: 3

No opinion: 0

12. On average, I have spent ... hours/week on the course (including timetabled hours).



Answers: 8
 Medel: 30,0
 Median: 26-35

≤5: 0
 6-15: 0
 16-25: 2
 26-35: 4
 36-45: 2
 ≥46: 0

No opinion: 0

Course leaders comments

No comments from the teacher

Student representatives comments

In general, the course elicited high scores in the course evaluation, indicating that the students who answered the evaluation were generally satisfied with the course. The respondents highlighted the interesting topic and appreciated the commitment of the course leader. They appreciated that a wide range of topics were covered as this gave a good overview of how nature works. However, the wide range of topics

also meant that the information about each was perceived as elementary. The students indicated that more in depth coverage of forestry-specific topics would have been desirable. Respondents also said that the link between the ecology course and the first course should have been more explicit, particularly with regards to the tea bag index experiment and its purpose in the ecology course. The easy access to the course literature was highly appreciated but students also indicated that more information about the course should have been available earlier. Additionally, the students requested more quizzes to complement the readings as they felt that the large amounts of literature needed a clearer linkage to the learning goals. More ecology-specific discussions during the excursions were also requested. The main complaints concerned Igor's lectures. Some students perceived them as confusing, unhelpful and lacking in connection to the learning goals and examinations. Furthermore, students felt that Igor created a hostile learning environment by pushing too much for students to answer questions during lectures. The computers provided for the computer exercises were lacking in performance which created obstacles in completing the exercises. However, the statistics module led by Adam was highly appreciated. Respondents indicated that the disturbance lectures should have been held earlier in the course as many other lectures were related to the concepts covered during the disturbance lectures. Students would have preferred several lectures in one day rather than one or two lectures each day. Additionally, some lectures were perceived as redundant as the information conveyed was fully covered by the course literature. The invigilators present during the last examination were perceived as hostile based on their strict and unkind manner of enforcing the examination rules. With regards to sustainability, students felt that the focus was skewed toward environmental sustainability rather than social and financial sustainability and that the ecology topic could have been explored from a wider variety of perspectives. Additionally, most discussions were centered around Sweden and the US. The respondents felt that a wider range of regions could have been covered. Further reflections about the nature of tropical forests were requested. One student felt that an unnamed teacher mocked their previous studies which they found unacceptable. Students also requested that stronger efforts could have been made to avoid describing ecology from a heteronormative point of view. In general, the students spent a reasonable amount of time on their studies during the course. The course received generally high scores, indicating the students were mostly satisfied with it. However, the response rate was very low (8 out of 41) which means that the results might not be representative of general sentiments toward the course. Possible bias due to students with strong opinions about the course responding while others neglected to do so might have skewed the results. As such, the results of the evaluation do not provide an adequate representation about how students perceived the course but judging from the results available, it was generally considered to be good.