

Energy Forum Learning Diary Feedback

- Overall many of you did an excellent job in providing a detailed reflection on your thoughts about the seminar
- This week's assignment was graded leniently, so even if you got a 5 this does not mean there was no room for improvement.
- Most were, more or less, appropriate length, but a handful were clearly longer than requested (more than twice the suggested maximum length). These were not penalised, but may be in the future (the extra length needs to feel justified to the marker)
- Points gained:
 - reflecting on WWTP's energy efficiency/biogas usage/market potentials and real world impacts today;
 - asking thought provoking questions beyond those asked by fellow students;
 - reflecting on a Q&A question even further than at the seminar;
 - linking seminar topic with climate change challenges and reflections of how to address them;
 - being critical and analytical of the data provided.
- Points lost:
 - providing 90% summary with 10% reflection;
 - summarizing the speaker's conclusion;
 - not discussing the topic at hand;
 - writing a reflection text based directly on Q&A and not your own thoughts
 - Instead of reflecting what was presented, focus was on doing additional research on the topic

Seminar 2 Feedback

- An improvement on many assignments after last week, most of you did a really nice job improving your reflections. Example of 5/5 reflections
 - focused on problematic H2 energy storage;
 - questioned the lack of policy thought and end-user acceptance;
 - questioned if ABB's imagined vision for the future would in reality play out;
 - questioned why Finland and why not Germany (or other European countries) for wind power capacity.
- Some wrote that you were very familiar with the talk topic + ABB, and did not therefore write much beyond this. I would encourage you to be more critical about the message given from the company and to push your thinking beyond what you already know.
- Many also focused on discussing the limitations of the talk or topics they had wished the speaker would cover. This was really excellent to see, this is another way to reflect on the seminar.
- There were still some of you who focused too much on summarizing and not enough on reflecting (eg 80/20). If you did a partially good job on reflection, you were given a better mark. In the upcoming weeks this will begin to change.

Seminar 4 Feedback

- As before, many of you have done an excellent job
- As also before, those who did not get a 5/5 grade almost always spent too much of their text in summarising what was said, rather than their own thoughts
 - Some spent 80-90% summarising, and then adding e.g. a single, concise thought on top. This will get you a 1 or 3.
 - Pure summarising, i.e. just reporting what was said will lead to a 1
 - Adding e.g. “I agreed with the speaker that [...]” and then writing a paragraph of summary - still summarising
 - Instead e.g. explain why do you agree, what in your prior knowledge leads you do so? What could be the counterarguments and why don't you agree with them?
 - Repeating what was said during the seminar, but presenting it as your own though “I feel that [what the speaker said]” – still summarising
- We're looking for evidence of your own thoughts and thought processes, you will not get the best score if these can't be found in the text (beyond an “agree”)
- Sometimes, very rarely, the problem is the opposite: The text doesn't directly link to any specific elements said during the seminar and could've been written without attending it at all
- Texts that are nearly pure summaries will now score a 1