



Environmental assessment MX0152, 40080.2122

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


Evaluation report

Evaluation period: 2022-05-25 - 2022-06-12

Answers 12
Number of students 28
Answer frequency 42 %

Mandatory standard questions

1. My overall impression of the course is:




Answers: 12
Medel: 4,2
Median: 4

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 8
5: 3

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 12
Medel: 4,2
Median: 4

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 7
5: 3

No opinion: 1


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



Answers: 12
 Medel: 3,9
 Median: 4

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 3
 4: 7
 5: 2
 No opinion: 0


4. The information about the course was easily accessible.



Answers: 12
 Medel: 4,3
 Median: 5

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 3
 4: 2
 5: 7
 No opinion: 0


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



Answers: 12
 Medel: 4,4
 Median: 5

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 2
 4: 3
 5: 7
 No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 12
 Medel: 4,8
 Median: 5

1: 0
 2: 0
 3: 0
 4: 2
 5: 10
 No opinion: 0




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



Answers: 12
Medel: 4,8
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 0
4: 2
5: 10
No opinion: 0


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



Answers: 12
Medel: 4,5
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 3
5: 7
No opinion: 1


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



Answers: 12
Medel: 4,8
Median: 5

1: 0
2: 0
3: 1
4: 1
5: 10
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: 12
 Medel: 4,0
 Median: 4

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

No opinion: 1

11. The course covered international perspectives.




Answers: 12
 Medel: 3,6
 Median: 3

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 12
 Medel: 31,8
 Median: 26-35

≤5: 0
 6-15: 0
 16-25: 1
 26-35: 7
 36-45: 3
 ≥46: 0

No opinion: 1

13. If relevant, what is your overall experience of participating in all or part of your course online?



Answers: 12
 Medel: 3,8
 Median: 4

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

No opinion: 3




14. If relevant, please share what worked well when participating in teaching on distance

15. If relevant, please share what worked less well when participating in teaching on distance

Additional own questions

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




Answers: 12
Medel: 2,4
Median: 3

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

No opinion: 2

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



Answers: 12
Medel: 2,2
Median: 1

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

No opinion: 6

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

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

Course leaders comments

On the whole, the students were satisfied with the course even if the question about general opinion scored somewhat lower (about 0.3 points) than usual. One issue that several students mentioned in the comments was the inconsistency in the two versions of the schedule. From this year we used the schedule on TimeEdit as the primary schedule where some late changes were published, but some students used the pdf schedule on the public web page, which was not updated. We apologise for this and will take measures to make sure all students look at the same schedule next year.

Apart from this comment, other comments were quite contradictory. While one students found the course very though and with too little scheduled time for assignments, another student wrote that it was a "chill course". Looking at the question about time spent on the course, it looks like most students anyway found the work load within acceptable limits.

Another question that was brought up was the unequal gender balance among the teachers. This was brought up by the course leader already on the course introduction. There are few female teachers available, and that is reflected in the unequal balance. However, from next year the week with geostatistics will be taught by a woman.

There were some comments that the course did not have an international perspective. Only Sweden and the EU. I agree that we do not go into details about monitoring systems in the whole world, but covering the EU is indeed international. Moreover, a lot of the course material is irrelevant for a question about international perspectives, e.g. statistics, how an indicator is constructed or how a monitoring program can be designed.

The questions about distance teaching were a remnant from the previous years with only distance based teaching during the pandemic, not really for the few Zoom lectures we had during this course. It was anyway interesting to see that those that answered preferred class room teaching.

Finally, this was the second year we tried to have R as the main software for statistics and given the comments, we will continue to use R but add more comments in the scripts to help the students understand the R code.

Student representatives comments

In general, the impression of the course was good. The many and varying field days were much appreciated by the students as well as the variety of teaching elements, and professors encouraged questions and discussion, contributing to a good social learning environment. The student choir consisted of many different backgrounds regarding both nationality and previous academic knowledge. On one hand, this further led to interesting discussions and inputs, while it on the other hand made it a challenge for all to embrace the full extent of course material (e.g. agricultural vs social science background) where information/assignments occasionally was repetition for some, and too advanced for others. This issue will prevail as long as there is diversity among participants, but in all, the course leaders have done a good job to establish a fair degree of difficulty.

As in previous years, many participants felt that the workload was quite large, but that all parts were important and interesting. Some lecturers included study questions which facilitated in narrowing down where to focus ones learning. It may be beneficial if all lecturers had this as a standard practice. There was also some suggestion to use modules in Canvas for the different topics, which would include all relevant files and information for that topic, making it easier to navigate and to study.

Some students felt that the assignments in e.g. R-script did not contribute much to their learning, as it was pre-scripted and only used to look at the graph and results. A more interactive approach could be more beneficial, e.g. writing parts of the code by one self, have some questions relating to the code itself, discussing the results in depth together with peers or teachers etc.

During lectures, we talked about different objectives and regulations in Sweden and the EU, and few students could fully grasp their differences and relations to each other. As these are important to have a basic understanding of, it has been suggested to implement some exercise or seminars with these, and to clarify the reason for their specific origins.

One suggestion was to have one last assignment that incorporated all/most moments to really get the holistic perspective the course aims to give.