



Sustainable Production Systems in a Global Perspective BI1192, 30066.1819

15 Hp
Pace of study = 100%
Education cycle = Basic
Course leader = Thomas Prade


Evaluation report

Evaluation period: 2019-03-18 - 2019-04-08

Answers 2
Number of students 11
Answer frequency 18 %


Mandatory standard questions

1. My overall impression of the course is:




Answers: 2
Medel: 3,5
Median: 3
1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 1
5: 0
No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 2
Medel: 4,0
Median: 3
1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 0
5: 1
No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 2
 Medel: 5,0
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

4. The information about the course was easily accessible.




Answers: 2
 Medel: 4,0
 Median: 4

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 2
 Medel: 3,5
 Median: 3

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 2
 Medel: 4,5
 Median: 4

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



No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 2
Medel: 3,0
Median: 2

1: 0
2: 1
3: 0
4: 1
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: 2
Medel: 3,0
Median: 2

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 2
Medel: 3,5
Median: 3

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 1
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: 2
 Medel: 4,0
 Median: 3

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

No opinion: 0

11. The course covered international perspectives.




Answers: 2
 Medel: 5,0
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 2
 Medel: 35,0
 Median: 26-35

≤5: 0
 6-15: 0
 16-25: 0
 26-35: 1
 36-45: 1
 ≥46: 0

No opinion: 0

Course leaders comments

Course leader Thomas Prade:

I present here the critical comments I received in the oral course evaluation of the 22 March 2019:

One comment concerned the time available for different examination task. For the e-case, the available time seemed too long given that there is little literature search to be carried out for this task. In comparison, the production system task could be longer (see also question 8 below). I agree on that matter and I will adjust deadlines for 2020 to accommodate the requested change.

The lecture on systems analysis, given in cooperation between Georg Carlsson and Thomas Prade as teachers, was perceived as very theoretical. To improve the learning outcome, the students made two suggestions: a) to not

have the lecture in the afternoon and b) to include more practical examples to visualize the effect of the theory better. I will try to accommodate the request, but having the lecture in the morning and to see over the presentations. My suggestion to take one case to follow throughout the lecture and apply the theory to that specific case was welcomed by the students. I will discuss this matter also with Georg Carlsson, to find a common view on the matter and to coordinate our presentations with respect to the suggestion.

Discussions in the lectures and assignment groups were seen as interesting and valuable by the students. I suggested that specific topics could be lifted to a new course item including a classroom discussion with students taking prior defined roles in the discussion. Alternatively the topic could be discussed in a panel discussion, where I would invite experts on the matter (primarily from our department, possibly from other departments or outside SLU). The topic would be decided at the start of the course to give the course leader time to plan and invite discussion partners. The students were mostly in favor of panel discussions and I agree that this would be an interesting step to start implementing more discussions in the course by modelling how to discuss a topic at hand for the students.

The students perceived a large focus on mechanization. Indeed, this topic reoccurs in several lectures. Some students wanted to see a shift in focus from technology solutions to techniques such as permaculture, no-till cropping systems and conservation agriculture. Since I am the teacher of one lecture with focus on mechanization, I will try to decrease the weight of mechanization in my lecture and shift the focus to the above mentioned techniques. The later are already part of the same lecture, but received too little attention to a lack of time (due to earlier changes to well-appreciated discussion rounds).

Some students requested a lecture on agricultural policy and its effect on production systems. The newly added lecture on the renewable energy directive (RED) was however seen as too abstract and not very helpful in that matter. I will try to book in a lecture that shifts focus to agricultural policy instead of RED.

Workload in course week 8 was perceived as high, which was reflected in very low attendance to lectures that week and which I experienced similarly in 2018. I will try to keep that week free of lectures.

This year again, a point made by some students was that the course's focus was on problems, not on solutions. I have requested changes from all teachers already for the 2019 course, but this is a process that takes longer to implement. There were examples of lectures that very much had adopted a focus on solutions, which was highly appreciated by most students. But there were also (new) lectures, where presentation of solutions was absent.

The e-case examination task was experienced as rather limited in scope, due to the limitations to the short farm descriptions. The students would have liked to ask questions to the farmers. A solution to that problem that the students found interesting was to allow spinning the tale further, i.e. to let the students fill in the gaps by making reasonable assumptions. This possibility existed already in 2018 and 2019, but I will add an encouragement to the instructions.

Unfortunately, only two out of eleven students chosen to answer the online course evaluation. This leaves me with an insufficient basis for an evaluation, since it cannot be guaranteed that the answers are representative of the student group. I will still comment in cases where answers reflect a negative view.

Question 1: My overall impression of the course is:

Number of answers: 2
Average: 3,5
Median: 3

1: 0 (Very poor)
2: 0
3: 1
4: 1
5: 0 (Very good/well)

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

Average: 4,0
Median: 3

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 0
3: 1
4: 0
5: 1 (I completely agree)

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

Number of answers: 2
Average: 5,0
Median: 5

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 0
3: 0
4: 0
5: 2 (I completely agree)

Question 4: The information about the course was easily accessible.

Number of answers: 2
Average: 4,0
Median: 4

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 0
3: 0
4: 2
5: 0 (I completely agree)

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

Number of answers: 2
Average: 3,5
Median: 3

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 0
3: 1
4: 1
5: 0 (I completely agree)

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

Number of answers: 2
Average: 4,5
Median: 4

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 0
3: 0
4: 1
5: 1 (I completely agree)

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

Number of answers: 2
Average: 3,0
Median: 2

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 1
3: 0
4: 1
5: 0 (I completely agree)

Comment by the course leader: Without a comment given I can only speculate about which facilities were not considered satisfactory. In earlier course evaluations, room Articum 4 has been pointed out as a makeshift room for teaching. I will try to avoid booking this room for the next course given in 2020.

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

Number of answers: 2
Average: 3,0
Median: 2

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 1
3: 0
4: 1
5: 0 (I completely agree)

Comment by the course leader: In the oral course evaluation, several student pointed out the report to be submitted for the examination on production systems to be too limited. Currently the maximum report length is 2 pages, which has been frustrating for some of the students, since it felt unnecessarily short relative to the task at hand. I still think it is good to limit the report length (and students agreed on that with me) but will extend the report to maximum 3 pages for 2020.

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

Number of answers: 2
Average: 3,5
Median: 3

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 0
3: 1
4: 1
5: 0 (I completely agree)

Question 10: The course covered international perspectives.

Number of answers: 2
Average: 5,0
Median: 5

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 0
3: 0
4: 0
5: 2 (I completely agree)

Question 11: On average, I have spent ... hours/week on the course (including timetabled hours).

Number of answers: 2
Average: 35,0
Median: 26-35

≤5: 0
6-15: 0
16-25: 0
26-35: 1
36-45: 1
≥46: 0

Question 12: 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).

Number of answers: 2
Average: 4,0
Median: 3

1: 0 (I completely disagree)
2: 0
3: 1
4: 0
5: 1 (I completely agree)

Student representatives comments

The overall impression of the course was good. All students had the experience of having sufficient knowledge for the course, many even felt that it was sometimes too basic. For example the reading on the blue planet report was a frustration for many students, since it felt a bit repetitive. A general request was more solution orientation, instead of presentation of problems that we in some cases have talked about in elementary school (greenhouse gases, eutrophication etc), or at least less course elements where these problems were mentioned without a context. The students agreed that the information about the course was easily accessible and that the social learning environment has been inclusive and respectful. There was always a good discussion climate during the discussion elements of the course, where students were focused on learning from another rather than trying to convince each other. However there has been some situations with teachers where it has been difficult to question their viewpoint without the teacher becoming defensive. This also applies to the only study visit. Otherwise the study visits were a popular part of the course. The "glimpses of the world" lectures were appreciated and the students agreed on that the course covered an international perspective. For the rest, the course leaders' notes are very representative for the students' opinions.

Kontakta support: it-stod@slu.se - 018-67 6600