

COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

The course report is a summary of the course evaluation. The course evaluation takes into account the students' course evaluations, the study administration's views, the teachers' views, and the course outcome - ie the students' actual results, course completion, and conditions for course implementation such as teaching and supervision time, premises and support functions. The course report also contains an analysis and development/action plan for the course.

The course report forms the basis for feedback to students and follow-up in quality dialogues both in the education-centered and in the university-wide quality work.

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: BY247E	Scope (hp): 15
Course title: Built Environment: Climate Neutral and Zero-emission Neighbourhood	
Course coordinator: Marwa Dabaieh	Number of registered students: 39
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT25	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. TGHAU23h	

Administration's perspective (To be completed by the course administrator)

The administration's views:

Forms of evaluation and feedback (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Formative course evaluation: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed) A formative evaluation was conducted informally through supervision sessions and discussions during the course to gather ongoing feedback.	Number of students who participated in the course evaluation: 15
Summative course evaluation: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed) A formal digital questionnaire was distributed at the end of the course. It included both quantitative and qualitative feedback and addressed the university-wide evaluation criteria.	Number of students who participated in the course evaluation: 15
Feedback to students: (Describe how and when the feedback will be given to the current student group) Feedback will be shared with students via course communication platforms Canvas after the completion of the course report. Key highlights and	

planned actions will also be summarized during a final session or posted online.

Student's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Summary of the students' course evaluations: (The five university-wide questions should be included. Compilation from digital questionnaires can be appended.)

1. **Achievement of Learning Objectives:**
Mean score was 4.4 out of 6. Most students (80%) felt they had achieved the learning objectives to a moderate or large extent. Comments indicated good breadth of content, although some felt the depth was lacking.
2. **Supportive Learning Methods:**
Mean score was 4.1. Students appreciated workshops and simulations, especially by Pasha. However, some noted that lectures were insufficient to support individual work and suggested a better-aligned timeline between group and individual assignments.
3. **Assessment Methods:**
Mean score was 4.4. Students generally felt assessments allowed them to demonstrate learning outcomes, especially due to the diversity of deliverables. A few suggested more clarity and support for the individual assignment.
4. **Course Fulfillment of Expectations:**
Mean score was 4.1. While several students were satisfied and noted a high tempo and practical skills gained, others expected a stronger focus on neighborhood-level analysis.
5. **Responsibility for Own Learning:**
Mean score was 5.5. Students appreciated the autonomy and project-based structure. Some mentioned this came with limited support, particularly regarding access to necessary software and technical tools.

Highlights from free comments:

- Strong praise for guest lectures, study visits, and Pasha's workshops.
- Appreciation for learning parametric tools like Grasshopper.
- Students valued the creative freedom in design and portfolio development.
- Criticism regarding group size, workload distribution, clarity of individual assignment, and supervision dynamics.
- Several technical and licensing obstacles were noted for tools like EnergyPlus and LCA software.

Teacher's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Summary of the teacher's views/Results: (The comments on the course's implementation and the results based on an assessment of the students' actual learning outcomes in relation to the intended learning outcomes, are summarised here. Both success factors and problems are identified).

The course showed good engagement with most students achieving the learning outcomes. The integration of parametric design, simulations, and sustainability themes created a comprehensive learning experience. Pasha's contributions were a notable success factor.

However, the course experienced challenges with:

- Coordination between group and individual assignments even with several reminders given to students to plan ahead the time for the individual assignment.
- Licensing and access to certain digital tools.
- Varying levels of preparedness among students due to inconsistencies in prior courses.

Analysis and action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Analysis: (The course coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the analysis is based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from relevant teachers and course administrators, knowledge development in the field of research and that this analysis is done in collaboration with the teaching team.)

The course was generally well-received, with praise for guest lectures, simulation workshops, and software training. Students reported solid learning gains but also pointed to issues around course structure, workload, and supervision tone. Group size and software accessibility emerged as recurring concerns.

Action plan: (The changes planned to be made in the short and long term are stated here, as well as the timetable for when the actions are planned to be carried out and who is responsible for the implementation. If identified problems are left without action, this should be justified. The follow-up of proposed measures according to the previous course report(s) is presented here.)

Short-term actions (to be implemented in the next course iteration):

- Restructure the timeline so that the individual assignment aligns better with workshop phases.
- Reduce group sizes where possible to improve individual learning.
- Provide clearer instructions and expectations for the individual project.
- Offer a lecture or workshop on lesser-known tools like EnergyPlus, DesignBuilder, and LCA software.

Long-term actions:

- Review and coordinate curriculum progression to ensure consistent preparedness across linked courses.
- Consider introducing portfolio-based assessment options for individual work.

Responsible parties:

Course coordinator and teaching team, in collaboration with administration and IT support.

Publishing and archiving (To be handled by the course administrator)

The course report is published and archived according to the university's instructions.

The students are informed about the publication.

The course report is shared with the programme coordinator (if applicable) and saved according to any additional requests on behalf of the department.

