



## Sustainable Plant Production - from Molecular to Field Scale BI1295, 40003.1819

15 Hp  
Pace of study = 100%  
Education cycle = Advanced

### Evaluation report

---

**Evaluation period: 2019-06-02 - 2019-06-23**

Answers 0


Number of students 0

Answer frequency

### Mandatory standard questions

---

#### 1. My overall impression of the course is:



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0


3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0

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



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0

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



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0

**4. The information about the course was easily accessible.**



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0

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



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0

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



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0



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



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0

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



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0

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



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0


3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

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:

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

No opinion: 0

**11. The course covered international perspectives.**




Answers:

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

No opinion: 0

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



Answers:

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

No opinion: 0


## Additional own questions

**13. The lecturers were available and supportive throughout the course**




Answers:

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



No opinion: 0

#### 14. The project tutors were available and supportive throughout the course



Answers:

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 0

#### 15. What aspect/part of the course did you like the most?

#### 15. Which aspect/part of the course did you like the least?

#### 15. If the course (or parts of it) would benefit from certain modifications, could you please provide suggestions on how to improve the course?

#### 15. Which suggestions would you provide to next year's students on how to get the best out of this course?

### Course leaders comments

This commentary is based on the response of all the students, both in Uppsala and Umeå. Total answering rate is 6 over 23, i.e., 26%. This is in spite of encouraging students to provide feedback, by clarifying ways their feedback has been used in the past and the importance of feedback relative to a new course, in part offered to students enrolled in a new master program.

As also recognized by the students, this was a new course. As such, it is to be expected that some aspects of the course may need improvement. A further element of consideration was the three-location nature of this course. In the planning phase we needed to consider the potential for students to be in all three locations, adapting some of the activities to such a condition. In the end, despite several students signed up in Alnarp, no student attended the course from there; and only one student was in Umeå. This rather unbalanced distribution of students did for sure create some difficulties in the within-class interactions, among the students and with the teachers.

All in all the course was well received. Several students commented positively or very positively on the level of interest of many parts of the class activities, the project, and on the teachers and project tutors. Also the grading criteria for the exam (the subdivision among ILOs, for the best checking that the different ILOs are indeed met) were appreciated. The students did not comment negatively on the logistics of the course.

The biggest critique pertained the exam per se. The take-home exam was chosen to facilitate the students, sitting in different locations and in some cases travelling at the time of the exam or re-exam. The type of questions and duration of the exam were in line with those of previous courses (in particular Biology and Production of Agricultural Plants). The number of questions was slightly reduced, so we were confident the exam logistics would not create a problem. Yet, the students lamented the features of the exam; and found some specific questions not well linked to the course content. Possible changes to be implemented are to go back to a class exam, at the cost of forcing students to be in person in a certain location on a certain date; or further explaining the whole idea behind the

take-home exam. The specific questions mentioned will be closely looked at.

The second other suggestion some students provided is the inclusion of more laboratories within the course. This aspect will be considered when planning the next course, assessing their potential impact on the whole learning process their feasibility in terms of available time and resources.

In response to the student representative's comment, we would like to note also the following:

- It is not possible to have folders and subfolders in Canvas, so the organization there cannot be improved, unless Canvas is modified or SLU changes the platform. The naming and order of the files was a way to ease this limitation as much as possible.
- The order of the lectures/seminars followed a precise structure (1. Basic plant production; 2. Plant production under disturbance; 3. Complexity and multifunctionality across scales; 4. Tools), with a progression from 1 to 3, and with the tools appearing as soon as possible in the course to facilitate the project work. We refrained from using a disciplinary structure (molecular biology; weed science; etc) as a way to facilitate the integration of the material towards the overarching goal (Sustainable Plant Production). However, this structure may need better communication. It should also be noted that some deviations were and are inevitable, due to the teachers' availability; and, in some cases, they were motivated by the goal of spreading the readings across different days or weeks, to facilitate the preparation of the different parts by the students.

## **Student representatives comments**

No comments from the student representatives