



Animal environment, welfare and housing HV0165, 30242.1920

15 Hp

Pace of study = 100%

Education cycle = Advanced

Course leader = Anna Wallenbeck, Torun Wallgren

Evaluation report

Evaluation period: 2020-03-09 - 2020-04-07


Answers 15

Number of students 22

Answer frequency 68 %

Mandatory standard questions

1. My overall impression of the course is:



Answers: 15

Medel: 4,6

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 4

5: 10

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 15

Medel: 4,9

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 0

5: 14

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 15
Medel: 4,9
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 0
4: 2
5: 13

No opinion: 0

4. The information about the course was easily accessible.




Answers: 15
Medel: 4,7
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 2
5: 12

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 15
Medel: 4,6
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 0
4: 6
5: 9


No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 15
Medel: 4,9
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 0
4: 2
5: 13



No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 15

Medel: 4,6

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 1


3: 1

4: 1

5: 12

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 15

Medel: 4,5

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 2

4: 4

5: 9

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 15

Medel: 4,3

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 1


3: 2

4: 4

5: 8

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: 15
Medel: 4,8
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 1
5: 10

No opinion: 3

11. The course covered international perspectives.




Answers: 15
Medel: 4,2
Median: 4

1: 0
2: 0
3: 3
4: 6
5: 6

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 15
Medel: 30,0
Median: 26-35

≤5: 0
6-15: 0
16-25: 5
26-35: 3
36-45: 5
≥46: 0

No opinion: 2

Course leaders comments

The 2020 version of the course worked well during 2018-2019. The student group was international and the exchange and cooperation between students has worked well.

A fair proportion of the students answered the written course evaluation (65 %, 15/23 students) and the scores in the evaluation were high (= students were pleased with the course), with mean scores of 4.5 or higher on all questions except the questions on sustainable development aspects (4.3) and International perspectives (4.2). As the course is built on the Swedish example we try to build the international perspective on comparing legislation and taking in examples from the international students experiences, which we will continue with. We will try to extend the part about sustainable development in next years course. The average number of hours per week students have worked with the course were 30, which is low (should be 40) and give us opportunity to extend the included activities in next year's course.

The comments in the oral course evaluation and the written course evaluation matched well and the major take-home messages were:

- Keep the layout of the course, good mixture of activities and links between activities
- Increase time for technical workshops
- Improve laying hens lecture and study visit (go to a commercial farm)
- Improve horse study visit at Ultuna
- Increase time for the home exam

The students performed very well on the home exam and this has proven to be a great learning opportunity and we will have basically the same format next year.

Student representatives comments

Representing the students, I very much agree with the comments of the course leader. The course has been working very well, the lectures and workshops have been well performed and the home exam had a good format. The main issue with the course was probably the lack of time to write the home exam, but the course leader solved this fairly and with good communication with the students. The lectures were sometimes a bit too focused on cows and could have included other animals such as poultry to a larger extent. The poultry study visit could also be improved with a visit to a commercial farm. The workshops could take up more time in the schedule. The double presentations of the project were appreciated and gave us the opportunity to improve the project as well as clarifying general questions about the layout before having done "too much" of the project.

One aspect that is not connected with the course itself but with the building in which the course took place, is that we filled half the lecture room with students and the ventilation did not have the capacity to keep up even for the first 45 minutes. This gave the students headaches, made them tired and made it difficult to focus on the lecturer. I know that SLU is very much aware of this problem and would like to remind and stress the fact that this is still an issue in Biocentrum, room C216 and other similar lecture rooms.

Overall, the course was really appreciated by the students and it followed the learning objectives of the course very well.