



Vegetation design LK0423, 10170.2223

7.5 Hp

Pace of study = 100%

Education cycle = Basic

Course leader = Anders Folkesson

Evaluation report

Evaluation period: 2022-09-21 - 2022-10-12


Answers 20

Number of students 25

Answer frequency 80 %

Mandatory standard questions

1. My overall impression of the course is:



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,5

Median: 4

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 9

5: 10

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,7

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 0

4: 6

5: 13

No opinion: 1

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



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,2

Median: 4

1: 0

2: 1


3: 4

4: 6

5: 9

No opinion: 0

4. The information about the course was easily accessible.



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,8

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 0

4: 4

5: 16

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,5

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0

3: 3

4: 5

5: 12

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,8

Median: 5


1: 0

2: 0

3: 0


4: 3

5: 16



No opinion: 1

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



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,1

Median: 4

1: 0

2: 0


3: 5

4: 7

5: 7

No opinion: 1

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



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,6

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 1


3: 0

4: 6

5: 13

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 20

Medel: 4,3

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 4

4: 5

5: 10

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: 20
Medel: 4,7
Median: 5

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

No opinion: 5

11. The course covered international perspectives.




Answers: 20
Medel: 3,5
Median: 3

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

No opinion: 1

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




Answers: 20
Medel: 32,9
Median: 26-35

≤5: 0
6-15: 1
16-25: 2
26-35: 7
36-45: 8
≥46: 1

No opinion: 1


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



Answers: 20
Medel: 3,8
Median: 4

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

No opinion: 7



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

Question 1: My overall impression of the course is:

Only 1 student responded with a 3, all others responded with 4 or 5 (average 4.5), which can be seen as a good result for a course that is being run for the first time. From comments it seems that the course has been generally well run, but that there are a few things that can be improved. As course leader I agree with the comment that the last days were too stressful, compared to other parts of the course – this will be altered next year. I also agree that there could have been a more extensive introduction to sketch techniques and design methods. In addition, I agree that the two shorter intro exercises were not very useful – they will be improved next year! One comment wishes for more knowledge about how to mix species in a stand – if possible more time will be spent on this issue next year.

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

With an average of 4.5, this seems to have been the case to a high degree. The only negative comment is about the course literature – which I as course leader partly agree with. Perhaps the literature will be altered until next year. One comment gives an idea about letting “visual force” be a mandatory part for the last assignment. I don’t really agree, as I see it as an opportunity for each student to voluntarily address this aspect, if and when they find it relevant.

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

Most students agree with this statement, but there are several comments about wishing to have more prior knowledge about design and sketching techniques. Probably there are few courses during year 1 that could have provided with this, so instead there obviously has to be a more thorough introduction to these issues within this course.

Question 4: The information about the course was easily accessible.

With an average of 4.8, students seem to be very pleased with this aspect – which is also reflected in the positive comments. The only critical comment is stating that the link to the SLU page for this course from the Forest and landscape webpage didn’t work so it was hard to access the schedule before the Canvas page opened. As course leader I can do nothing about this link, but I can arrange that the Canvas page is opened earlier next year.

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

With an average of 4.5, this seems to have been the case to a fairly high degree. The only critical comment states that some lectures could have been replaced with more design issues. Next year, I think there can be more about design, without having to take away any lectures!

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

With an average of 4.8, students seem to be pleased with this aspect – which is also reflected in a positive comment.

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

This question has rendered some critical comments:

The classrooms/lecture halls have not always been good: As a course leader I totally agree, but unfortunately this is out of the hands of the course leader. Especially it is a problem getting good lecture rooms, if any at all, the day of the course start.

For the printing of the A0 posters the school should have printed them: As a course leader I was unaware how expensive it is to print an A0, so next year I will prepare the students for this earlier. The course budget is already constrained, so probably the students have to take this cost also next year. I don’t find this more strange than that

students have to buy their course literature.

Frustrating to work with the digital tools without any prior experience: I understand this, but all students obviously have succeeded with this anyway. Learning always demands something from the student. But anyway, I will try to include a little more teaching about the digital tools (InDesign) next year.

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

Most students seem to be content with the examinations (average 4.6), but I note that one student answers with a 2. Unfortunately this student does not give any comment. Another student states that it was hard to demonstrate the knowledge, as it was not fully clear where the focus should be during the poster presentation. As a contrast, another student was very content with the poster presentation.

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

Average is 4.3. One student states there was no specific consideration of sustainability.

My comment as a course leader is that sustainability is an issue throughout the whole course, as we more or less constantly discuss and address issues of biodiversity, recreation etc and how these aspects can be balanced against production.

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).

Average is quite high (4.7) but the answers are being spread along the scale and several students have answered "no opinion". The course does not address gender and equality in the course content, but as course leader I am pleased that one of the comments state that "...I have not felt that we have focused on one gender or that it has in any way been unequal."

11. The course covered international perspectives.

The answers to this question has a quite low average (3.5). As one comment states; "the literature covered the international aspect but the lectures has mostly been based on Swedish

landscapes". This latter is also the case with exercise 2 and 3. I will have a discussion with the program rectors if they have expectations on more international perspectives, and if so I will change that for next year.

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

The average here is 32,9 hours, which is less than is expected from the students. It is notable, that 10 students have spent less than 36 hours per week, and that one students has used as little as 6-15 hours. This indicates that the demands on the students can be somewhat heavier next year. I agree with the comment that the first assignment required less time than the third. So for next year, I will shorten the time for the first assignment and expand the contents of the third part – not least give more time for sketching techniques and digital tools.

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

One of the students (see the first comment) seems to have misunderstood the question. There has been very little online teaching. At one of the two occasions there were some technical problems.

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

There was almost no distance teaching (only two very short introductions), which the students in general state as something positive

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

There were technical problems at one of the online lectures, which some students point out. Hopefully, next year there will be no online teaching at all in the course.

Student representatives comments

1. Overall impression of the course.

The course has shown an overall response of satisfaction, rating 4.5 out of 5. The students have said that they liked the pace of the course, affirming that it has the right amount charge of assignments. Also, they have liked that the assignments were diversified in (writing, excursions, individual and group work).

2. Learning objectives were accounted during the course.

The response was quite high, with a mean of 4.7 of 5, where only one student has disregarded the question marking that it had no idea. The students were content with the knowledge provided by the course affirming that this is what most of what they expected. Few have criticized the literature as irrelevant or that they could not assimilate the literature with the rest that was taught.

3. Prior knowledge was sufficient to benefit from the course.

With a mean of 4.2 out of 5. The reason for the rate is that some students felt that they lack skills in architectural drawings (scale was a subject that was repeated mentioned that was missing in the prior knowledge of most of the students). They asked for more exercises and ways to explore the sketching skills. Another comment that was raised is that the students would like to know for drawing the project is species composition in the landscape.

4. The information provided by the course was easily accessible.

Overall, the students said that they were prepared by rating 4.8 out of 5. Complimenting the canvas page, affirming that provided clear information that helped the student to be guided in the modules. One student said that there is a need to updating the SLU program page with new information and fix errors and bugs.

5. The lectures, course, literature, and exercises were enough to support the learning.

The mean for this was 4.5 out of 5. The students said that the excursions were a positive point, providing good exercises and interactions with the forest structure and landscape features. There was difficulty with the Adobe software and printing machine.

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

With a majority of 5 answers and a mean of 4.8. One student has no idea. A student comment is that "everyone's opinion is accepted, and we have had some interesting discussions".

7. The facilities to learning had been satisfactory.

With a mean of 4.1 out of 5, the students have displayed some dissatisfaction with the infrastructure that was provided to have classes. The fact that the room lack of tables, it was small or noisy made it difficult to take notes and to be comfortable in the study place.

8. The examination provided opportunity to demonstrate what was learnt during the course.

The students have rated a mean of 4.6 out of 5. The first and second assignment (writing about the literature) was liked by some students. The final project, nonetheless, is where the students felt they were able to highlight their skills and what they have learnt (with the course and without). They said that the course as an overall gave them the ability to explore creativity and they believe that this is important for creating landscapes.

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

The mean is 4.3 out of 5. Meaning that the students were partially satisfied, and they missed more examples or practices in field or theory. landscapes that would be considered sustainable. Maybe it needs to be slightly better explored.

10. 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).

The mean for this answer is 4.7 out of 5. With 5 students stating that they have no idea on the subject. The professor has given space to speak and to interesting discussions.

11. The course covered international perspectives.

For this one the mean was low, with 3.5 out of 5. Most of the students have not felt that the international perspectives were taken in consideration in the lectures. However, since the course is short – it must have a clear goal (Swedish Landscape and forest) and not exactly which specimens can be used worldwide. The time frame is too short to add information. For the next course, maybe it can be mentioned more.

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

The students have stated that they have spent in media 26-35 hours per week working for the course. The mean is 32.9, with one comment that state that the workload was low in the beginning, but that escalated to another level when developing the final project, in which was more time-consuming.

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

The general answer was 3.8 out of 5, because it was not relevant. The lecture held online had problems in the transmission and therefore did not happen as it should.

14. Space for comments