


# Food waste - current situation and future opportunities LV0123, 10400.2324

7.5 Hp Pace of study = 100% Education cycle = Advanced Course leader = Mattias Eriksson

## **Evaluation report**


Evaluation period: 2023-09-20-2023-10-01Answers18Number of students20Answer frequency90 %


# Mandatory standard questions



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


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






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


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





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



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









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


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




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




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).



#### 11. The course covered international perspectives.



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



#### **Course leaders comments**

The course evaluation clearly indicates that the course continue to be very popular among the students. The course team will therefore be causius to make changes to the course.

Based on the comments in the evaluation we plan to change the quantification report task from pass/fail to a graded task. We will also evaluate if the report can replace the written exam compleatly, but such change should be thought through carefully before implementation.

Some students also comment the lack of sufficient WiFi-connection. Even though the course team cannot influence the infrastructure at the university, it is obviously probblemtic when the infrastructure is not working sufficiently.

### Student representatives comments

#### General thoughts of the course

Generally, the course and the syllabus were perceived as very good and scored a high rating of 4,7/5. The students generally put 26-35 hours study hours per week. Most students found that the course had a clear connection to the learning objectives and syllabus. The students' previous knowledge was sufficient enough to understand the contents of the lectures and literature. Course information and canvas page were perceived to be well organized and easy to navigate. The lectures and the course literature were also perceived to have supported learning. However, there was a wish to have seminars in connection to readings/lectures to complement learning. The overall impressions of the social and physical learning environments were good.

The course is perceived to have covered international perspectives on the food waste problems and also touched upon equality issues with the global food systems. Issues of environmental, economic, and social sustainable development has been included in the lectures throughout the course. However, there is a wish to include more social sustainability topics in connection to the food waste problem and food systems. Also, students thought that it would have been rewarding to discuss more of their own thoughts surrounding food systems, rather than "only" official and international agendas and definitions of the problems.

#### Examinations

In order to pass this course, there were four mandatory assignments, whereof one was a written exam on school grounds. There were concerns about four assignments being to many, and that it would have been better to focus more on fewer things.

Only the written exam was graded U-3-4-5, and the other ones were pass/fail. A wish to include the other assignments in the grading as well was lifted in the student evaluations. Some comments on the written exam included it being somewhat difficult to understand the questions because of the way they were formulated. Also, that some questions in the written exam were to detailed and not broad enough for the students to present their knowledge.

Furthermore, one of the assignments was a study visit that the students had to arrange for themselves. In the evaluation there were some concerns surrounding these study visits. Many students thought that it would have been better to have an organized study visit that all the students went to together, rather than them having to find their own places to visit. However, the student generally thought that the four different assignments provided space for them to show what they had learned during the course.

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