



Ekonomisk tillväxt och hållbar utveckling NA0167, 20047.1415

7.5 Hp

Studietakt = 50%

Nivå och djup = Avancerad

Kursledare = Robert Hart


Värderingsresultat

Värderingsperiod: 2015-01-19 - 2015-02-20

Antal svar	7
Studentantal	12
Svarsfrekvens	58 %

Obligatoriska standardfrågor

1. Hur många timmar per vecka har du i genomsnitt lagt ner på kursen (inklusive schemalagd tid)?




Antal svar: 7
Medel: 30,7
Median: 31-40

0-10: 0
11-20: 2
21-30: 1
31-40: 2
41-50: 2
>50: 0

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

2. Vad anser du om dina förkunskaper inför kursen?




Antal svar: 7
Medel: 3,0
Median: 3

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

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

3. Hur har informationen/administrationen i samband med kursen fungerat?



Antal svar: 7

Medel: 4,0

Median: 4

1: 0

2: 1


3: 0

4: 4

5: 2

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

4. Jag anser att helhetsintrycket av kursen är mycket gott



Antal svar: 7

Medel: 4,6

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 0

4: 3

5: 4

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

5. Jag anser att kursens svårighetsgrad har varit



Antal svar: 7

Medel: 3,7

Median: 4

1: 0

2: 0

3: 2

4: 5

5: 0

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

6. Jag anser att kursen har behandlat alla lärandemål som anges i kursplanen. Om Du markerar (1), (2), (3), eller (4) ange vilket/vilka lärandemål som blivit otillräckligt behandlade.



Antal svar: 7

Medel: 4,7

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0


4: 2



5: 5

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

7. Betygskriterierna var tydligt formulerade och enkla att förstå



Antal svar: 7

Medel: 3,3

Median: 4

1: 1

2: 0


3: 2

4: 4

5: 0

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

8. Jag anser att diskussionsklimatet under kursen har varit bra.



Antal svar: 7

Medel: 4,7

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 0

4: 2

5: 5

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

9. Jag anser att nödvändig infrastruktur kring undervisningen som lokaler och utrustning har fungerat ändamålsenligt.



Antal svar: 7

Medel: 4,4

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0

3: 1

4: 2

5: 4

Har ingen uppfattning: 0

Kursledarens kommentarer

Rob's comments on the course evaluation

Question 1, time. A big variation here. Two students report spending less than 20 hours per week, and two report spending over 40 hours. Overall, the comments and the average hours of over 30 suggest that the course was quite a lot too demanding in terms of time.

Question 2, background knowledge. Also significant variation here, but centered around the 'right' level. One student was disappointed that there wasn't more on issues related to agriculture and environment.

Question 3, administration. Six of seven respondents were happy, one not so. The problems raised regard a lack of clarity on the requirements, deadlines, etc. I have improved on this every year since the course started, but there is still more work to be done.

Question 4, overall. Wow! 4.6 is very pleasing. Thanks to those who filled in the evaluation for your generosity.

Question 5, difficulty. The course was judged as somewhat too difficult by most of the respondents, but judging from the comments I think this is about the workload rather than the technical difficulty.

Question 6, learning outcomes. No problem there.

Question 7, grading criteria. Some criticism here. I think this fits with the comments on question 3. More clarity about the exact requirements, opportunities to do resits, etc., is needed.

Question 8, discussion climate. No problem here.

Question 9, infrastructure. OK.

Question 10, timing of the exam and seminar. Not surprisingly, lots of different opinions here. However, there was clear interest in moving the seminar to be before Christmas. I will consider this carefully before next year's course.

Question 11, making the course better. Lots of interesting ideas here. See appendix. I need to think about what to take out of the course, either some gobbets or the research exercise. I will also think about the timing of the problems classes, and the timing of the seminar (if I keep that part of the course).

Answers to the final question about improvements to the course

-1. writing aspect merged to one research paper 2. lectures allowing for thorough discussion of theories in relation to resource interests to keep class motivated 3. rewrites on writing aspect and exams can both accumulate points 4. Lecturer enables

very transparent discussions of student understanding of the course in the lecture and clearly (very clearly) guides students in understanding better the course

- It would be great if something would be omitted: either the gobbets, the research paper or the exam. All three together are too much work for a 7.5 credits course. Also, three-hour lectures can be tough at the end. It would be better to have more lectures per week for two hours.

- Remove the research paper and have 4 Gobbets instead. Everything was instructive and it is a pity to remove parts but the course is very time consuming with so many different elements that you are unfamiliar with. It would be best if the course were 15 points and the computer exercises were reinstated. I would love to take such a course!

- The exercise sessions were spread across the whole course and not placed towards the end.

- Less things to do. It was just TOO demanding to be a 7,5 hp course. We are still only human beings! So maybe only one gobbet, the paper/presentation and then the exam. Since it was almost impossible to handle this and another course at the same time. There were a few of us that skipped the exam in our other course and take that exam on the retake, since it was impossible to manage to do both of them. And this is NOT the way it's supposed to be. It's a 7,5 credit course and it is NOT supposed to be this demanding, since it's on 50 percent "speed". I think the amount of work we have done is more like a 15hp course. But don't take this wrong. It was a REALLY good course and we have learned a lot and very interesting things. Without doubt it was the best course, in my opinion, during this whole program (environmental economics). A very important and interesting course! Like the course I've been waiting for during my whole time of studying economics!.... So well, I'm very happy about it. But still: it was just TOO much to do! Hope that helped a bit \dots

Studentrepresentantens kommentarer

- The overall impression was that the course was too time demanding. It is a compulsory course for the majority of the students – those who study in the Environmental Economics programme. Most of the students spend more time on this course than on their second. It is meant to be a 7.5 hp course so you should not spend more than 25 hours per week for it. The majority needed more than this.

- The background knowledge was estimated as fairly good by most of the students. It required a lot of macroeconomic knowledge as well as background skills in environmental policy. Almost everyone attended the respective courses before. Minor criticism came from the agricultural economists who argued that the course does not include agricultural issues at all.

- In general the students were very satisfied with the course administration. Sometimes it was uncertain when documents needed to be submitted. Sometimes they had to be uploaded to the website and sometimes not. It would be an improvement to clarify that in beforehand.

- The overall impression of the course was very good and most students enjoyed it. The contents were interesting and the discussions and articles were not less inspiring. In general we have learned a lot during the course and would definitely recommend it to other students.
- Generally the level of difficulty was estimated a little too high. That is because the amount of work was little too much for that specific amount of course time. Technically it was rather okay.
- The learning outcomes have been fulfilled and nobody had any complaints about that.
- Most students were satisfied with the grading system but there also were little confusion specifically about the extra-points-system.
- The class was rather small so it was easy to find an appropriate discussion climate. Questions and criticism were taken seriously and there was a respectful climate during the whole course.
- The website did give important information but still most of the students did not understand the different tasks correctly and many questions emerged during the course. The problem was that no one had a twitter account and did not follow Rob's comments and updates all the time. So there was no other way to check the homepage every day or ask Rob personally. The tweets were redundant.
- It is recommended to reschedule the seminar to another time because preparation for the seminar stole much time for preparation for the exam.
- In general there was little too much workload. A reduction of hand-in tasks would help or a transformation into a 10 or 15 hp course with a similar workload.