



Silviculture in forest and landscape SV0022, 10334.2324

15 Hp

Pace of study = 100%

Education cycle = Basic

Course leader = Urban Nilsson

Evaluation report

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


Answers 16

Number of students 20

Answer frequency 80 %

Mandatory standard questions

1. My overall impression of the course is:



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,5

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 6

5: 9

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,7

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 3

5: 11

No opinion: 1

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



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,5

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 2

4: 4

5: 10

No opinion: 0

4. The information about the course was easily accessible.



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,4

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 3

4: 3

5: 10

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,7

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0

3: 0

4: 5

5: 11

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,6

Median: 5


1: 0

2: 1

3: 1


4: 2

5: 12



No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,5

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 6

5: 9

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,5

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 6

5: 8

No opinion: 1

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



Answers: 16

Medel: 4,5

Median: 5

1: 0

2: 0


3: 1

4: 6

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: 16
Medel: 4,7
Median: 5

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

No opinion: 3

11. The course covered international perspectives.




Answers: 16
Medel: 4,6
Median: 5

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

No opinion: 0

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



Answers: 16
Medel: 33,0
Median: 26-35

≤5: 0
6-15: 1
16-25: 3
26-35: 4
36-45: 5
≥46: 3

No opinion: 0

Course leaders comments

This was the first time this course was given, and I think that there could be lots of improvements. However, in general terms, I am very pleased with how the course was received and the engagement from students. From reading the evaluation I would like to highlight the following:

1. Power-Points need to be more informative. I think it is disturbing with too much text on the slides when presenting them in the classroom. One possible solution would be to have two versions of slides. One version with little text that is presented in class and one version with more explanatory text that is published on Canvas.
2. The literature should be better connected to the course schedule. One good suggestion is to have suggested reading material for each week of the course. We will also revise the literature list and make sure all literature is relevant.
3. The R-module is a challenge. I agree that the best solution would be to have one or two weeks for learning

basic R, but I do not foresee this to happen. If we will continue with R next year, it is not decided yet, we certainly must put more effort into teaching the basics. I agree that it was too much of running code without understanding what was happening.

4. The Heureka exercise was mostly appreciated but hopefully we will have Heureka installed in the student computers in the computer-rooms next year. If we have that, also Mac-users can run Heureka which will be a big improvement.
5. Next year we will have excursions to Västerbotten in the same way as this year. However, it is a challenge to fit this trip into the course-budget. I think it is very important that Forest & Landscape students get to see forests and forest management in northern Sweden.
6. The landscape level exercises need to be developed. Because of late cancelation from lecturers, this part of the course did not end up as it was intended. Thinking silviculture on landscape level is an important part of the course.
7. There have been multiple complaints about the physical environment in Silvicum. We can only hope for improvements in the future.
8. The final exam only stands for 40% of the grade. It is of course not possible to cover everything that was discussed during the course in one four-hour exam. Performance during group-works and excursions are also important for the final grade.
9. The self-evaluation of time put into the course indicates that it is possible to add content to the course.

Student representatives comments

There were 16 students from 20 that filled up the course evaluation. Overall, the course has positive comments and compliments to the course team, the gained skills and knowledge acquired and the possibility to get to see forestry in the North of Sweden and broadleaf in the South. One student even said that this course has been the favorite of the program so far. Even though the course has been a challenge, the course team worked well and that it delivered the learning objectives that promised. With enough knowledge prior to the course, students felt comfortable and also said that would be even better if they could have been even more challenged. About the information that the course provides some comments rise about schedule mistakes and lack of clear description and last-minute changes that could be avoided for the next time, also the canvas page could have been more organized.

About the methodology of teaching some students mentioned that overall, the lecture, course literature and exercises had supported their learning, however some students mentioned that would be better to have key points in the graphs that are presented in the power points in a way that enlighten them into understanding better what it stands for. Moreover, another student raised a request to have a pre-reading before the lecture - mentioning that that would be indicated by the teacher previously. The material given on how to manage a clearcut was extremely handy, and so would be the same material for thinning. Having these physical papers of management makes us see how our theoretical knowledge is going to be used in practice. Most of the students agree on having an inclusive learning environment. The physical environment has displayed to be not optimal for students, that had highlighted complaints about the chairs and the silvicum lecture hall.

About the examination there was a division in opinions, some students said that they thought it was enough and some felt that much of what was thought was not in the exam, which had strangely formulated questions and mathematics that was not very much delve into in class. About sustainability, the majority said it was present and some said was close to be good but was not completely fulfilled. Also, the environment has been inclusive and respected gender differences, it covered international perspectives in a great extent (with a positive comment about the comparison with Poland and Lithuania) and had a mean of 26-35 hours per week of hours spent in studying/dedicating to the course. The course was overall very time-consuming, and the students had given much of their energy to the excursion and the literature, I would personally say that more than any other course this far. About the literature I would agree, and I dare to say that most of the students agree on this comment "If the power points were more informative, the literature could be used as a support. It ended up that the power points were not supportive, but the literature was necessary to achieve the knowledge for many details/aspects that had been briefly seen in class", the power points could have been much better create and the content could have been better delivered. Media of the students' grade for the literature was 3 out of 5. Another comment of the student that I believe that was something reported from the classmates "perhaps giving recommended literature for each week/connect literature to the lectures and mentioning it during class would be a good incentive for students to read more", to be honest, for me specially the literature could have been used more during the lectures and having direct linkage in the power points of what was in the literature, I felt that there was a disconnect in both to be honest.

Comments about the additional questions- about R: students present a dissatisfaction with the way the program is deliver to them, since seems like they want to be skilled in it (meaning being able to code) or at least understand the logic behind, instead of having to only run a written code. By doing this methodology many students have complained about getting lost and to lose the focus on the lecture. Perhaps it is necessary to have a course only to teach this program if the goal is to use that in forestry in the future, so the students are skilled enough for the market. About Heureka: students seem to be comfortable with the software, not presenting frustration when having to use the program, however still displaying discontent with how much the software is used and how easy it is to forget the knowledge about how to master. Students have complained about the lack of clarity in the mathematics for the group assignment and the difficulty in checking if it was right or wrong what they were working on. About the excursions in Skane: the majority was extremely content with the exercises that taught practical measurements and were focused on broadleaf management like Oak. About the excursions to Vindeln: most students were content and thought that that was the highlight of the course and in fact it was really a privilege to be able to go, to meet with professionals, to see forestry "on act". It was an extremely rich experience, and it would be even better to create this course soon after the silviculture 2, so it is really like an continuation of what you see. About the landscape level

exercise: although very short (perhaps only approached in one lecture) students have shown themselves to be content with the exercises, in exception on one student that said that was useless and did not seem like a tangible content.

Kontakta support: support@slu.se - 018-67 6600