



## Production and quality evaluation of forages BI1327, 40054.2223

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

### Evaluation report

---


Evaluation period: 2023-05-28 - 2023-06-22

Answers 13  
Number of students 14  
Answer frequency 92 %

### Mandatory standard questions

---

#### 1. My overall impression of the course is:




Answers: 13  
Medel: 4,5  
Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 13  
Medel: 4,9  
Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 13  
 Medel: 4,5  
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 13  
 Medel: 4,6  
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 13  
 Medel: 4,5  
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 13  
 Medel: 4,8  
 Median: 5

1: 0  
 2: 0  
 3: 0  
 4: 2  
 5: 11

No opinion: 0



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




Answers: 13  
Medel: 4,8  
Median: 5

1: 0  
2: 0  
3: 0  
4: 3  
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: 13  
Medel: 4,6  
Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 13  
Medel: 4,7  
Median: 5

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

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: 13  
 Medel: 4,8  
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 4

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




Answers: 13  
 Medel: 4,0  
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 13  
 Medel: 25,4  
 Median: 26-35

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

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 13  
 Medel: 4,4  
 Median: 5

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

No opinion: 6



**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**

## Course leaders comments

This course was given for the fourth time as a 15 credits course. Fourteen students have participated, and 13 students answered the course evaluation that is very good (92 % in 2023 compared to 84 % in 2022, 50% in 2021 and 100 % in 2020). The overall impression was 4.5 out of 5.0, a very nice result. Due to unfortunate crashes in the frame programme for the crop & soil students, these students had to make special arrangements to have the possibility to follow this course. The participating students, including one student from the animal programme and three Erasmus students (NL, DE and FR), were very motivated to take this course, and apparently they were happy with the outcome.

The mixture of various course components to facilitate learning was appreciated. Some positive comments are listed below as well as some modification that can be done:

- the Group Discussions was a good tool to facilitate learning, activating self-studies by the students stimulated by the teachers. It is important to focus on discussions on each theme, not only answer the given questions,
- a lecture about grazing will be included in the next course before the Group Discussion C about grazing,
- the different background of the students – animal and crop & soil, respectively – has upsides and downsides. On one hand, good trans-disciplinary discussions takes place in the course, on the other hand, it is a challenge to meet the different knowledge levels and even more efforts will be made on this issue,
- the social learning environment has been inclusive (4.8), the course has increased the students' interest in grassland production and utilisation (4.7) and made the students more confident in this area (4.8),
- the scientific writing was an appreciated part of the course and the careful review and feedback from the supervisors was good (4.4),
- all three excursions (overwintering, farm visit and semi-natural grasslands) were highly appreciated. It is desirable to have a look at some forage machineries at the farm visit. In the semi-natural grasslands, it is important to continue with a floristic perspective combined with an animal perspective.

The overall impression from the course leader's perspective is that this course fills an important gap between the animal and crop disciplines, also existing in the advisory service in Sweden today. It is urgent to continue to give the course. A good balance between the different categories of students is important to create a good learning environment. More efforts will be done to market this course for students from other countries.

## Student representatives comments

The course had a response rate of 92% (13 out of 14 students responded) and can be considered representative of the student population. In general, the course received a high overall rating (4.5). The course had a good structure and was well planned in the layout of the different parts of the course. The lecturers during the course also received good marks and comments.

However, there is one recurring opinion that drags down the grade for the course and that is the level of the crop science section. Here we can see that the soil/plant agronomy students find the crop science too repetitive from previous courses and wish for more advanced lectures/exercises. However, there are students taking this course with a background other than plant science who do not share this opinion.

The opinions about the coordination with HV0166 is also with different opinions for the students, and this is for the same reason as before, with the different previous knowledge, some students find it too repetitive and basic.

The proposed changes to the course include:

- Moving the written exam earlier in the course
- More lectures and more advanced lectures
- More grazing management lectures
- More animal science

---

Kontakta support: [support@slu.se](mailto:support@slu.se) - 018-67 6600