



Advanced animal welfare and animal protection HV0196, 10012.2324

15 Hp
Pace of study = 100%
Education cycle = Advanced
Course leader = Anette Wichman, Johan Lindsjö


Evaluation report

Evaluation period: 2023-10-23 - 2023-11-13

Answers 6
Number of students 10
Answer frequency 60 %

Mandatory standard questions

1. My overall impression of the course is:




Answers: 6
Medel: 3,3
Median: 4

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

No opinion: 0

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




Answers: 6
Medel: 3,8
Median: 4

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

No opinion: 0


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



Answers: 6
 Medel: 4,0
 Median: 4

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


4. The information about the course was easily accessible.



Answers: 6
 Medel: 3,8
 Median: 4

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


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



Answers: 6
 Medel: 3,2
 Median: 3


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

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




Answers: 6
 Medel: 4,0
 Median: 4

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



No opinion: 0


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



Answers: 6
Medel: 4,2
Median: 4

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


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



Answers: 6
Medel: 3,8
Median: 4

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


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



Answers: 6
Medel: 4,2
Median: 4

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

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

No opinion: 0

11. The course covered international perspectives.




Answers: 6
 Medel: 4,0
 Median: 4

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

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 6
 Medel: 34,3
 Median: 26-35

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

No opinion: 0

Course leaders comments

In addition to the written course evaluation the course leaders had a brief on site evaluation with the students the last time we met during the course. Thus, these comments are partly based also on what came up during that evaluation.

This year a majority of the students in the course came from the same bachelor program and had a similar background and previous knowledge, whereas the rest of the students had different backgrounds and previous experiences. This made the balance in the course a bit shifted and might have led to that some aspects brought up during the discussions were more clear for some students than for others. However, as course leaders our aim was to be aware of that and clarify things if needed and include all students in the discussions. Our impression was that in general the discussions were held on a good level and contributed a lot to the learning in the course. As for most

of the master courses at the program where we have students with varied previous knowledge it is a challenge to find the right level for all students. A large part of the course is based on self-studies and student presentations with discussions between themselves and with the teachers. Thus it is also up to the students to identify their knowledge gaps and take initiative to learn more in those areas.

The first two weeks of the course provide basic introduction to the subjects of the course and are more aimed for students with less previous knowledge to reach a level where they can follow the rest of the course. In line with this year's evaluation we will consider to only have that as pre-reading and exchange some of the recap lectures with more advanced level lectures and more in depth work-shops on for example legislation EU with an international perspective. Although, since the course is based in Sweden (and we are members of EU) the expertise of the teachers is naturally greatest for those countries and will also be the main focus of the course. However, international perspectives are to some extent covered in the course but could perhaps be more clearly presented.

As far as the course leaders remember we did not speak Swedish during class but might have done so during breaks while talking to individual students.

Student representatives comments

Overall Impression of the course: 3.3

Students felt as though there was repetition in the course when compared to previous courses taken. The students would prefer if communication was done through English, as communication through Swedish during the classes was confusing for non-Swedish speakers.

Course Content having clear links to the learning objectives: 3.8

The overall course content is clearly linked to various issues related to the current developments and issues related to animal protection and welfare in society. The course helped broaden the understanding of animal protection problems and expand on varying ethical and cultural perspectives that may complicate potential solutions.

Prior Knowledge: 4.0

Nearly all students found their prior knowledge to be more than sufficient to benefit from the course. It may be useful in the beginning of the course to determine how many students have a strong background in animal welfare to adjust basics of the lectures. For example, if every student is an MSc in Animal Science student, lectures would not need to include defining 'stereotypic behaviour' or Fraser's 'three major animal welfare concepts', rather the lecturer could go straight into the issue or topic at hand.

Accessible Course Content: 3.8

Students would like to have more information from the start of the course in order to have more or less time to pace their own work. As many students are working on various projects simultaneously, it would be helpful to be able to anticipate due dates earlier on in order to space out work accordingly.

Learning support: 3.2

Students would like to have more varying lectures on relevant and different topics related to animal welfare. Lectures that were meant to inspire did not feel as helpful as many students wanted to know what change was realistically possible to implement rather than how they may imagine a perfect world. Lectures that contained basics already taught in previous courses felt redundant (of course, if the course is primarily made up of students that have had very little animal welfare background, then the lectures that address the basics would be useful). There was interest in current research that is being conducted, both within SLU departments and internationally.

Social learning environment: 4.0

The social environment appeared to be respectful of differences in opinion. Peers were respectful of one another and were willing to share opinions stemming from different backgrounds. The openness of the class allowed for peaceful discussions even during disagreements.

Physical learning environment: 4.2

The classroom was acceptable as there was not a lot of students in the course. If this number goes up, this

classroom may be too narrow.

Examinations: 3.8

The exams were able to allow students to demonstrate what they had learnt during the course. This course was helpful in developing independent study skills, as the course was based heavily in self reading. The exam then reflects the ability of the student to do their own research in order to write an exam that reflects their own knowledge gained. However, more support during the course would be appreciated prior to writing the exam. As the written exam topic can be chosen by students, this provides the opportunity of having a question that may have too large of a scope. This makes it difficult for the student to know where to best focus their research when looking for information. Some may find it confusing on how to start as the topics are broad. Students may find it useful if the lecturers would be able to provide more guidance regarding topic summaries and analysis. It would have been useful if lecturers could aid in students' understanding of systematically understanding the process of information collection and reporting.

Sustainability development: 4.2

This course did cover sustainability aspects, especially during the last presentation when the projects involved how to approach issues in a sustainable manner. Moreover, there were lectures that examined world issues and how important sustainability was when considering solutions.

Gender and equality aspects: 4.0

There did not feel as though there was a skew in the gender and quality aspect. This course felt well-rounded in regards to gender perspectives.

International perspectives: 4.0

The students felt that majority of the perspectives centred on Europe, therefore there was not necessarily an international perspective. Although different countries were chosen to be discussed, these still tended to be European countries. The international perspective also felt lost a little when students were able to choose their own countries, as it often ended up being about Sweden or a nearby country. Little was covered on other countries. It would be helpful if the lecturers could provide more information on other international perspectives. These perspectives do not need to be provided in detail as there is recognition that there is a language barrier, but a general overview on varying countries outside of Europe would aid in having a more well-rounded perspective.

Average hours spent: 34.3 hours

This course varied between students for how long they spent a week on the course. If a student had less background on a topic that they were researching, then more time would have been put into the reading, therefore the course. The hours spent on the course would increase exponentially when a project was due, but large time gaps between projects led to more of a lull in how much time was put towards the course. While discussions increased the hours spent on the course, the weekly hours still depended on what was expected in the week (i.e. if there were no discussions and solely lectures, much less time was spent on the course). As many lectures were not mandatory, some students may have spent less than 15 hours a week on the course, especially if there was only one mandatory lecture consisting of 2 hours and nothing was due that week.

Overall:

The amount gained from this course really depends on how much work the student is willing to put into it. If a student chose not to do any further readings, this course may have felt more lacking. The course projects aided in student learning as many different topics were covered, therefore preparing the presentation and listening to peer presentations all lead to increased knowledge.

While it is understandable that lecturers want to ensure that all students are at the same level of understanding prior to delving into a topic, it appeared to be highly frustrating to students that are beyond a basic level. Based on the nature of where this course is placed in a Master's program, lecturers should assume that students do not require basic information. If there are students that require the basics, reading materials should be provided in the beginning of the course to allow for those students to catch up. This would reduce the time spent on aspects of welfare and protection the majority of students already know, leading to a more efficient use of time.