



## Course Analysis - KTH<sup>1</sup>

Form for course-responsible.

Course analysis is performed during the course.

Nomenclature: F – lectures, Ö – exercises, Le – mixed lectures, R – math tutoring, L – laboratories, S – seminars)

### Course Information Mandatory <sup>2</sup>

<b>Name of course</b>	<b>Course number</b>
Transport Policy & Evaluation	AH2301
<b>Course points and points by examination parts</b>	<b>When course was implemented</b>
7,5hp (4hp laboratory report with grades A-F, 3,5 hp project reports with grades A-F)	HT12 Period 1
<b>Course-responsible and other instructors</b>	<b>Course hours, by F, Ö, Le, R, L, S</b>
Yusak Susilo, bitr lektor	F:
Joel Franklin, bitr lektor	Le: 30
Tom Patersen, forskare	Lab: 9
Qian Wang, doktorand	Stud.b:
Jonas Westin, doktorand	Sem:
	<b>Number of registered students</b> 10
	<b>Performance level after 1<sup>st</sup> examination, in %</b>
	<b>Examination level after 1<sup>st</sup> examination, in %</b>

### Goals

#### State the overall goals for the course

The overall goals of this course are that students become able to identify, evaluate, implement, and monitor a variety of types of transport policies, building from a sound foundation in economic theory, environmental justice, sustainability, and public involvement.

#### State how the course is formed in pursuit of that goals

The course combines interactive lecture sessions, laboratory exercises, and a project term. Laboratory exercises and project terms are designed to be coincided and linked with the lecture materials. These exercises would be opportunities for the students to learn and implementing the concepts that were thought on lecture sessions. The first part of the course focused on fundamental microeconomic principles, which form the basis of the evaluation methods used later. In the middle of the course, the economic basis and application of benefit cost analysis was taught, with additional focus on the case of congestion pricing, non-marketed goods and externalities. The last part of the course covered equity analysis, market deregulation, benefit cost analysis in Sweden and other possible tools to influence the behaviour such as behavioural economics.

### Participation in a link-meeting before course start (if applicable)

#### Comments from that

No such meeting occurred.

### Course's pedagogical development I

Describe the changes that were implemented before this instance of the course. (Also tell the students at the beginning of the course)

<sup>1</sup> Instructions for the course analysis form are at the end of the document

<sup>2</sup> Dean's decision: <http://www.kth.se/info/kth-handboken/II/12/1.html>

This year, the course has been changed by involving more contents on the concept of transport policy, management and "soft-tools" in changing individual travel behaviour. As requested by last year's feedback, the discussed examples have been diversified with the inclusion of examples and cases from European countries (as where the majority of students came from) and economy emerging countries. Based on a good feedback from last year, this year Mallard and Glaister book is still used as the text book and again, this year the book has been praised by a student as a 'perfect book'. Nevertheless, for some materials, still copies of chapters from other sources are provided as additional reading. Finally, as last year, the project played a good roles in helping students to keep up with the teaching and lab materials as it is required them to have a staged initial submission of parts of the report, culminating in a final revised version assembling all the parts.

## Contact with students during the course

**Students in the year's course committee:**

**Name**

**E-mail** (leave blank when web-publishing)

**Discussions and feedbacks were taken during the lecture time with the course leader**

**Result of formative mid-course survey**

To get more feedbacks, this year the mid-term evaluation was done in between the lecture time (on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2012). 15-30 minutes discussion on the class was carried out. Most of them were happy on the way lectures were carried out. The only improvement requested was to provide a better description of the term project in advance.

**Result of course meeting**

None was held.

## Contact with other instructors during the course

**Comments**

Nearly all of the lectures were presented by a single lecturer. Ongoing discussions occurred between the principal lecturer and the course assistants, who led laboratory sessions.

## Course survey; Students' comments Mandatory<sup>3</sup>

**Things to remember:**

- 1) Encourage especially the course committee to fill out the course survey in connection with/just after the final exam
- 2) Inform course committee of the survey
- 3) Publish the survey during a shorter time

**Period when the survey was active**

For about 17 days, March 6 to March 23

**Questions added to the standard questions**

The same questions as last year were used

**Response rate**

80%

**Changes since previous implementation**

The course survey was conducted online with several follow-up emails to encourage responses. This resulted in a good response rate, much better than last year. Though this may also be due to the smaller group size.

**Overall impression**

The students well appreciate the content of the course and consider it as important/useful for their future work. However, the quality of the teacher are mixed and so as the variability of the required knowledge backgrounds between students. The instruction of one of the lab exercises is really need to be improved and more in class exercises are expected.

**Relevant web-links**

Course materials are in Bilda

## Course-responsible's interpretations of the survey

<sup>3</sup> Rektors beslut: <http://www.kth.se/info/kth-handboken/II/12/1.html>

<b>Positive points</b>	The contents are interesting, important and relevance for careers. More applied oriented lectures received more praises from students. The students also appreciate the way lab and term project are organised.
<b>Negative points</b>	Lab 3's instruction has been heavily criticised by students. Beside that, there is a disagreement on the quality of the lectures. Some students said the teachers were 'perfect' whilst others said 'poor'. Perhaps this due to differences of expectations between student and teachers on how the knowledge transfer should be delivered. Some students seemed expect the lecturer to be more active in providing them with answers on their lab exercises - but these exercises are a crucial part of students' final course marks. The organisation of the lectures also received comments from students. This comment may due to few sickness of lectures which makes the course leader need to reschedule some teaching.
<b>Was the course relevant in connection to course goals?</b>	The overall view seems to be positive that the course was important and relevant.
<b>View on prerequisites</b>	Nearly all students felt they were somewhat or strongly prepared. There was one exchange student who did not have any background in basic economic principles and there is another one who has a stronger economic backgrounds than average. An extra exercises was given to the student who have not learned economics perviously, but this highlights the difficulties of having a group of students from various different backgrounds
<b>View on form of the course</b>	Mostly positive on the course content and some (not all) are satisfy with the lab 1 and 2 exercises.
<b>View on course literature/materials</b>	The textbook received a good comment and extra reading materials on bilda were appreciated.
<b>View on examination</b>	The term project was generally seen positively as a way to apply knowledge from the course and to develop project management and similar skills.
<b>Especially interesting comments</b>	CBA definitely a favourite topic of the students, whilst the views on 'deregulation'and 'cost factors' topics are mixed. This may due to the variability of the knowledge backgrounds of the students.

### Comments from other instructors after the course end

#### What worked well

#### What worked not so well

### Result of course committee's meeting after the exam

#### Students' summary

#### Proposed changes

#### Link to course committee

### Course responsible's summarized statement

<b>Overall impression</b>	The basic form of the course, since it creation, has settled to a good composition, but some aspects of delivery need to be improved, such as more interaction in teaching, involvement of in-class exercises, reflections on labs, etc.
<b>Positive points</b>	The involvement of more policy discussions and involvements of real exercises were appropriate, and reflected in more positive comments.
<b>Negative points</b>	The lectures delivery can always be improved and the lab 3 instruction definitely need to be revised.
<b>View on prerequisites</b>	About right.
<b>View on form of the course</b>	Mostly right, but could use more time doing exercises in class and talking about labs afterward.

<b>View on course literature/materials</b>	About right
<b>View on the examination</b>	Clearer lab exercise instruction would help the student prepare the report better.

### Course's pedagogical development II Mandatory<sup>4</sup>

<b>How well did changes to the course work?</b>	The use of the newer textbook were appropriate, and reflected in more positive comments. The involvement of more diverse Swedish, EU, US and emerging countries examples have been well appreciated by the students. The proportion of the personal work on the term project has been increased significantly and highlighted since the beginning. The team works have been working very well and all students provide good reflections of the activity.
---	--

<b>Changes that should be implemented for next time</b>	Clarify the instructions and questions for the lab assignments, especially the lab 3.
---	---

### Other

#### Comments

The class schedule has been clashed with a Swedish language course. Therefore some students 'need' to miss the class at least once a week (usually either Thursday or Friday). This is not helpful for both students and the teaching team. A student even did not aware and requesting a mid-term feedback opportunity which was actually has held in mid February 2012. This clashes may also contribute to students confusion to the organisation of the course materials.

Having a same room for the same course throughout the term would help a lot. In this course we have been moving around a lot to different buildings and this is not good in maintaining a good learning experience.

<sup>4</sup> Rektors beslut: <http://www.kth.se/info/kth-handboken/II/12/1.html>

### **Instructions for the course analysis form**

- 1) The course analysis form is interactive; fields expand automatically.
- 2) Fill in the fields within a month after the end of the course (Important requirement from KTH!)  
Then send to the study director (who forwards it to the department head and program coordinator).
- 3) Try to give as complete answers as possible.  
Consider that the course analysis is meant to help not only the students, but also You as the instructor.
- 4) By “performance level”, is meant the number of performed points in the course up to now (submitted assignments, project assignments, laboratories, etc.) divided by the number of points possible for the registered students. With “examination level” is meant the number of registered students who fulfill the course requirements. The course secretary should help here.
- 5) Contact with the students:
  - Establish a course committee during the course’s first week (at least two students, preferably gender-balanced).
  - An appropriate bonus for the course committee members is free course literature.
  - If the course committee can not be established, the section’s study committee chair should be contacted immediately (see [www.ths.kth.se/utbildning/utbildningsradet.html](http://www.ths.kth.se/utbildning/utbildningsradet.html) for contact information).
  - The course committee shall meet during the course, for example halfway through. If the mid-course evaluation has been implemented, it shall be discussed then.
  - The course committee shall also have a meeting after the students have answered the course evaluation and the course committee’s students have received access to the results. An exception is courses in Period 4, where the meeting should happen directly after the examination is completed so that the analysis can be completed before summer.
  - During the final course committee meeting, the students should take minutes. The course-responsible should receive these minutes at most one week after the meeting
  - It is the course-responsible’s responsibility to call for a course committee meeting.

### **Finally, think about:**

- It is important that the course analysis clearly *demonstrates the development of course quality* from one year to the next.
- The possibility to publish the course analysis on the course web page.
- Save the course analysis in preparation for the next instance of the course.