



## Geographic information systems for environmental and natural science studies

TE0017, 20094.1920

7.5 Hp

Pace of study = 100%

Education cycle = Advanced -

Course leader = Anders Larsolle

### Evaluation report

---

Evaluation period: 2020-01-12 - 2020-02-02

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: 4,3  
Median: 4

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

No opinion: 0

**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: 4

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 4  
 Medel: 4,5  
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 4  
 Medel: 4,0  
 Median: 4

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 4  
 Medel: 4,3  
 Median: 5

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



No opinion: 0


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



Answers: 4  
Medel: 4,5  
Median: 4

1: 0  
2: 0  
3: 0  
4: 2  
5: 2  
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: 3,0  
Median: 3

1: 1  
2: 0  
3: 2  
4: 0  
5: 1  
No opinion: 0


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



Answers: 4  
Medel: 3,3  
Median: 3

1: 0  
2: 1  
3: 1  
4: 0  
5: 1  
No opinion: 1

**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: 3,7  
 Median: 4

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

No opinion: 1

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




Answers: 4  
 Medel: 3,7  
 Median: 3

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

No opinion: 1

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



Answers: 4  
 Medel: 18,1  
 Median: 16-25

<=5: 1  
 6-15: 0  
 16-25: 2  
 26-35: 1  
 36-45: 0  
 >=46: 0

No opinion: 0

**Course leaders comments**

This was the second year of educating GIS after the SLU 15-credit reform, which not only has resulted in at average increased credits per course, but also in additional logistics where four GIS-courses are provided in parallel through a single educational period of approximately ten weeks. The teacher's impression from this is an increased opportunity for synergy across courses, which has been actively explored and evaluated with mainly positive results. Apart from the positive evaluation responses reported with the student representative's summary, the more difficult side of teaching involves the application of pedagogical methods that generate positive feedback from the students through all the different lines of education implemented in a single course. This is particularly important in otherwise passive educational components like the important series of lectures. From the teachers point of view, the students response was very good this particular year of education, which we interpret as being the result of a well-functioning pedagogical methodology.

## Student representatives comments

---

The evaluation is written based on the written evaluation, comments students gave during the oral evaluation and in class. The written evaluation was answered by 4 of the 22 students (18%). The grade for the overall impression was a 3,8.

### Good aspects

- Exercise were very good and structured
- Good level of difficulty in the exercises
- Theoretical aspects well covered in lectures
- Choice for your own level of exercises (grade)
- Good organization on CANVAS and public web page
- Access to GIS both at school and on home computer

### Improvement points

- Availability of the teacher during the workshops
- Amount of text on the ppt slides
- Separate workshops with project groups and individual students
- Lecture sometimes too philosophical
- Add some small tasks or assignments in lectures
- The course did not feel like advanced level
- Level of the exam
- Gender equality aspect needs improvement since teachers and authors of literature are mainly male

The course was divided in lectures and workshops. The lectures gave a good theoretical background but were found at some points to be too philosophical. There was a lot of text on the slides what made it hard to choose whether to listen to Thomas or write what was on the slides. It would be good to have the slides with text as lecture notes and slides with bullet points and figures as ppt during the lectures. Some small tasks or assignments during the lectures would be recommended to help to get a better understanding of the theory.

The workshops were organized to work on GIS exercises and receive help where needed. The exercises started simple but became soon more complicated. Some exercises were created by Anders and some exercises could be done on ESRIs website (extra exercises were available here as well). Exercises B2 and C2 were appreciated by quite some students. The workshop hours in the schedule however were with several courses at the same time, of which some were working on projects. This caused some conflicts between students and it took often a long time to have a simple question answered. For next time it would be good to separate individual students and project groups. The GIS software used was well accessible at school but was also available for home computers (Windows).

Students could make a choice themselves about the level of grading they wanted for the exercises, which was dependent on the amount of exercises in the different levels. This was much appreciated by students. The examination for the theory was a copy of different questions of previous exams. It would be nice to have some new questions.