



Environmental assessment MX0134, 40101.1819

15 Hp

Pace of study = 100%

Education cycle = Advanced

Course leader = Ulf Grandin

Evaluation report

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


Answers 4

Number of students 22

Answer frequency 18 %

Mandatory standard questions

1. My overall impression of the course is:




Answers: 4
Medel: 3,8
Median: 3

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 4
Medel: 4,0
Median: 4

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

No opinion: 1

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




Answers: 4
Medel: 5,0
Median: 5

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

No opinion: 1

4. The information about the course was easily accessible.




Answers: 4
Medel: 4,3
Median: 4

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

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 4
Medel: 3,5
Median: 3

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


No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 4
Medel: 4,5
Median: 5

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



No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 4

Medel: 3,0

Median: 3

1: 0

2: 1


3: 2

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: 4

Medel: 4,0

Median: 3

1: 0

2: 0


3: 2

4: 0

5: 2

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 4

Medel: 4,0

Median: 4

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 2

5: 1

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: 4
Medel: 4,0
Median: 4

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

No opinion: 1

11. The course covered international perspectives.




Answers: 4
Medel: 3,5
Median: 3

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 4
Medel: 27,5
Median: 26-35

≤5: 0
6-15: 1
16-25: 0
26-35: 2
36-45: 1
≥46: 0

No opinion: 0


Additional own questions

13. Were there disturbing overlaps between teachers at the course? If yes, please specify!



Answers: 4
Medel: 3,0
Median: 3

1: 0
2: 0
3: 3




4: 0

5: 0

No opinion: 1

14. Were there disturbing overlaps with other SLU courses? If yes, please specify!



Answers: 4

Medel: 3,5

Median: 3

1: 0

2: 0

3: 1

4: 1


5: 0

No opinion: 2

15. Were there any parts of the course that you would say were extra fruitful?

15. Were there any parts of the course that should be removed or heavily modified for the course next year?

15. The lecture and exercise given by Foon Yin Lai (week 17) have helped me to know what environmental organic contaminants are as well as their sources, distribution and bioaccumulation.



Answers: 4

Medel: 4,0

Median: 3.5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 2

4: 0

5: 2

No opinion: 0

16. The lecture and exercise given by Oksana Golovko (week 18) have helped me to know what organic micro pollutants are as well as their sources and removal efficiency.



Answers: 4

Medel: 4,3

Median: 4.5

1: 0

2: 0

3: 1

4: 1

5: 2

No opinion: 0



Course leaders comments

How to comment on a course evaluation answered by 4 out of 23 students? Overall, it anyway seems like the course was well received.

There were some problems during the course due to a long sick leave for a key teacher, and additional sick leave for one of the deputy teachers that stepped in with a short notice. However, this is not commented on in the evaluation, so it seem like the deputy teachers did a good job.

On comment was about the information about the report in the project. Most of the things asked for in the comment were included in the introductory lecture to the fieldwork and the project. But, I can add a little more about the requirements for the report. We have already considered the option of having the exam before the field week and come to the conclusion that it is best to have the exam after. A written exam before the field week would give less time for studying for the exam and prevent the teachers from the option of having exam question on the field techniques.

The only question with a mark less than 3 was the one about the lecture room. We were not happy either with the lecture room, but it is out of our control which room that gets allocated to the course.

We will definitely revise the lectures on liming so that liming policy is not repeated in every lecture!

We will also look at how the different topical weeks are introduced so we do not repeat the same introduction each week.

We are happy to see that the field week was appreciated, even if there were lot of waiting time during the lake day. One full day at the lake was new this year and we are already working on way to eliminate the waiting time.

In essence, given that we got a relatively positive evaluation we will build next years course on the same structure, but deal with the problems brought up in the comments in the evaluation.

Student representatives comments

4 of the 23 students evaluated this course. I am not entirely sure this gives a good evaluation of the course. During the course there were quite a few points that bothered the students.

During the course we had several topics, pretty much every week we focussed on another environmental topic. Which was interesting but there was a main focus on Sweden and with a topic like WFD it might have been nice to see how other EU countries deal with the different aspects of the WFD. I think this was a missed chance especially when you have a group of international students. But overall a good choice of topics. Many students complained that there was a lot of overlap or repetition in the lectures, sometimes the same thing was explained 2 or 3 times. In some of the lectures the pace was also way too slow. Also the lectures were much shorter than originally planned in the schedule which resulted in super long lunches. Maybe next year start at 9:00 or 9:15 instead and plan the lectures better.

A part of the course that was well received were the mandatory course assignments. To put into use what was taught in the lectures. We learned to run statistics with different programs like excel, R and G-power. During some assignments you should also make an assessment of the results and come up with a monitoring plan or evaluation, which makes you think more of the implications of the results which would have been nice to have with more of the assignments.

The field week was interesting but felt for some days really unorganized. One of the teachers was on sick leave so the stream and lake sampling were especially really messy. During the stream sampling we sat on the side of the stream for 2 hours when the teacher was explaining what we were going to do. We did not receive the field protocol till then so we couldn't prepare. During the lake sampling day most students just sat by the side of the lake doing nothing. Time wise it was impossible to all go on the lake which was really a shame. Groups that went on the lake were gone for 1,5 to 2 hours. For most this was a wasted day just before the exam. Maybe next year make a schedule when each group needs to be at the lake. Also a lot of samples taken during the stream and lake sampling were not analysed which was really discouraging, like why would we do it if we are not going to do anything with it. The zooplankton and phytoplankton were sampled but thrown back into the lake, we could have easily brought some microscopes and at least see if there was a possibility to analyse them.

The discharge sampling, soil sampling and the vegetation sampling were well organized. For the discharge sampling

we used 3 different sampling measurements and the protocol was given well in advance to prepare for it. During the soil sampling both teachers shortly and clearly explained on side what we were going to do. For the vegetation sampling there was a lecture of half an hour before explaining what needed to be done and it was easy to do it after by ourselves with some help here and there.

The exam was right after the field week and with some schedule changes there was barely any time to prepare for the exam. It would have been nice to have had the exam before the field week as well for a lot of students. So you don't need to stress over it during the field week. It felt kind of unclear what to expect on the exam as well since there were no practice questions from all the teachers. But overall the exam gave a good overview of all the topics.

The last week of the course was for the project on the field week. Each group wrote a report and did a presentation on one of the topics. There was no guidelines for either the report or the presentation. So every group simply wrote what they thought was enough. Also till we met the PhD student that would evaluate the presentation we did not know how long the presentation should be. Next year just give a clear guideline on the report and the presentation because now it felt the effort input was uneven.