COURSE ANALYSIS: AG2144 SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY, HT 2023

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS
Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

The post-course evaluation rendered 29 % (12/42) participation. Course contents, structure and methods were also discussed informally with students at various occasions during the course, such as after lectures and seminars.

No students with stated disabilities responded to the online course evaluation. With respect to gender, only 2 out of 21 questions in the questionnaire differed more than one (1) at the scale of 1–7 between the male and female respondents. The male respondents agreed to a lower degree (5.0 compared to 6.3 for female respondents) with the statement that they had sufficient previous knowledge to benefit from the course (5.3/6.0), while female students agreed to a lower degree (4.8 compared to 6.0 for male respondents) with the statement that they regularly reflected on what they had learned. The few comments with respect to gender and disability support the teacher team's understanding that there is no reason to comment any further on aspects of gender or disability.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS
Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion.

No special meeting has been held with students to discuss the course.

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

The course consisted of nine lectures organised in three "blocks", each block finalized with a short literature reflection (P/F) and a seminar (mandatory attendance). Midway through this rather intense period of lectures and seminars, students started working on a written group assignment (graded A-F). The course ended with an individual written assignment (also graded A-F).

Two out of nine lectures were new compared to last year, depending on small changes in content and availability of lecturers. Based on the course analysis from last year (HT 2022) we rewrote the instructions for written assignments for more clarity, prepared a bit more organised seminars (pre-defined themes for discussion), and opened up for students to select their case to work with in the group and individual assignment.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

This is a 7.5-credit course running during one period, which means students should ideally work half-time with the course, or ca 20 hours/week. While 33.3 % of the students estimated that they spent more than this (21–26 hours/week) a sizeable percentage spent less (50 %: 12–17 hours/week) and some considerably less (16.6 %: 6–11 hours/week) time working with the course. In the open responses, a few students (also those reporting that they spent little time with the course) state that the course readings were substantial and that the many reflections before seminars were demanding. Compared to previous course rounds, however, the responses suggest that students find the workload manageable. As in previous years, we suspect that at least some students may have reported the number of hours spent in class (lectures, seminars, workshops), but not those spent on reading course literature and writing seminar reflections and the group and individual assignments. Alternatively, students are unaware about the amount of time they are expected to spend on the course. This can be made more explicit to the students at the beginning of the next course round.

THE STUDENTS' RESULTS
How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

The students' grades on the overall course (graded A-F) were: 7 A, 10 B, 10 C, 10 D, 3 E (40 students with a final grade in total). One student has not yet delivered the re-assignment on the final individual assignment. (38 students in total.) The grades were insignificantly lower than last year.

STUDENTS´ ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

Among the pros with the course, students mentioned that lectures and literature were varied (yet with a "red thread") and rewarding; many commented positively about the seminars and feedback on reflections, which helped to digest the readings and probe deeper in the topics. Several students commented that the course was valuable in how it made them think about the topic of urban mobility in new ways, see "the big picture" and social and political sides of what might appear as "technical" issues.

Things that the students thought could be improved included clearer of instructions and better separation between the group and individual assignments; more tutoring of the group project; to reduce reading and preparation for the seminars to enable deeper engagement; and to include tasks other than writing in order to facilitate different learning styles.

Regarding advice to future course participants, several students stress the importance of getting started reading the course literature early on as well as choosing the case for the assignments with care because they make up a big part of the course.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

The students who responded to the questionnaire (12 out of 42), gave average scores between 4.8 to 6,4 on the 22 included statements (where 1 refers to total disagreement, 4 neutral, and 7 strong agreement). These students particularly agreed (score 6 or higher) with the statements that they worked with interesting issues; that the atmosphere on the course was open and inclusive; that they understood what the teachers were talking about; that they I received regular feedback that helped them see their progress; and that the assessment on the course was fair and honest.

The lowest scores (ranging from 4.6 to 5.4, which is still considerably higher than a "neutral" 4) were given to statements that they had opportunities to influence the course activities; that they regularly spent time to reflect on what they learned; that the course was organised in a way that supported their learning; and that they felt togetherness with others in the course.

Taken together this suggests that the students felt the course stimulating and that they received constructive feedback and fair treatment from teachers, while they graded course structure, time for reflection and opportunities to influence course content lower.

OVERALL IMPRESSION
Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

Our overall impression is that students appreciate the course, and it attracts an increasing number of students who take it as an elective course. This is reflected in the questionnaire responses and our informal talks with the students. Students also perform well in terms of grades, which suggests that there is clarity in terms of expectations and that students are motivated to learn.

Based on the responses, it appears as if the more structured seminars tried out in this course round turned out well, with many students specifically mentioning the seminars as a rewarding element of

the course. The efforts to make the assignment instructions clearer do not seem to have been as successful, however, with some students still finding the instructions hard to comprehend. Despite being given the choice, only one of 12 groups selected a case of their own to work with as part of the written assignments, and students still report on limited opportunities to influence the course activities.

ANALYSIS
Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason be? Are there significant differences in experience between:
- students identifying as female/male?
- international/national students?
- students with/without disabilities?

We will here focus of the weaker areas with room for improvement. As in the previous course round, students express some limitations in terms of own reflection and ability to influence the course activities (among lowest scores but above "neutral"). We will continue to discuss ways to develop the course in this regard until the next course round, yet feel that it is challenging to design a course that allows students to influence course activities to any large extent; and also, that the course actually allows for quite some degree of reflection (in seminars and in preparing for them, not the least). While we this year allowed students to select cases for the written assignments more freely, few took the chance to do so. With respect to own reflection, a possibility might be to have students write a short note on Canvas about what they learned after a few of the course activities.

We don't see any significant differences in experiences of different students but note that one international master's student from outside of Europe found it challenging to comprehend the political and social aspects as course content is somewhat skewed towards the Global North. While we find this focus being reasonable, we will seek to include more examples from the Global South.

Finally, we became aware during this year's course round about the challenge with written home exams considering the proliferation of the use of Chat-GPT and similar tools among students. As all examination in the course is carried out in this form, we will likely need to adjust or revise the examination forms of the course.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

The following adjustment will be made or considered in the short term:

- Develop the forms of examination to assure student learning in the new context of AI.