



## 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)	VT13 Period 3
<b>Course-responsible and other instructors</b>	<b>Course hours, by F, Ö, Le, R, L, S</b>
Yusak Susilo, lektor	F:
Joel Franklin, lektor	Le: 30
Carl Hamilton, forskare	Lab: 9
Maria Börjesson, forskare	Stud.b:
Masoud Fadei Oshyani, doktorand	Sem:
<b>Number of registered students</b> 23	
<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 wider economic and social impacts, different market system and application of benefit cost analysis were 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 previous improvements that have been started last year, which are involving more contents on the concept of transport policy, management and "soft-tools" in changing individual travel behaviour, are continuously strengthen this year. Wider examples and cases from different European and Far East countries (as where the majority of students came from) were integrated further to the lecture materials. Based on previous year feedback, the laboratory instructions and the selection of guest lectures now have been improved. 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 14<sup>th</sup> February 2013). 15 minutes discussion on the class was carried out. However, all of the students of them were happy on the way lectures were carried out. No improvement was proposed by the students.

**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 and project feedback sessions.

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

**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 19 days, March 1 to March 19

**Questions added to the standard questions**

The same questions as last year were used

**Response rate**

100%

**Changes since previous implementation**

The course survey was conducted online with a couple of follow-up emails to encourage responses and also advance explanation of the use of survey on the last day of the lecture. This resulted in a 100% response rate, much better than last year (80%), especially because we are dealing with a significantly higher group this year.

**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 teachers are also well praised and so as the delivery of the lectures. However, there is a repetitive concerns on the performance of the teaching assistant and the request of having feedback on laboratory works as well. The improvement of the lab exercises seems working well, since now there is a student who even complain that the instruction is too clear and can be followed without thinking.

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

<b>Relevant web-links</b>	Course materials are in Bilda
<b>Course-responsible's interpretations of the survey</b>	
<b>Positive points</b>	The contents are interesting, important and relevance for careers. The students also appreciate the way lab and term project are organised. All the guest lectures have been highly praised, and said better than other courses' lectures.
<b>Negative points</b>	This year teaching assistant has been heavily criticised by students. Beside that, there is a need among students to also get immediate feedback from the lab exercises - but these lab exercises are a crucial part of students' final course marks, therefore it is difficult to give them immediately clues and answers. Some powerpoints are also not really ready to be printed as references. Some students who missed the class has difficulties in understanding the slides.
<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. Though reading from their final project report, I am wondering the understanding and language skill of some Chinese students.
<b>View on form of the course</b>	Mostly (if not all) positive and satisfy with the content of the course. CBA has been the most favourite topic this year again.
<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 'equity' are mixed - but this is not because the topic is less appreciated, but some students prefer the class to focus more on CBA and examples from real projects.
<b>Comments from other instructors after the course end</b>	
<b>What worked well</b>	
<b>What worked not so well</b>	
<b>Result of course committee's meeting after the exam</b>	
<b>Students' summary</b>	
<b>Proposed changes</b>	
<b>Link to course committee</b>	
<b>Course responsible's summarized statement</b>	
<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 better teaching assistant, more feedback on lab exercises and simpler copy of the class' presentation file .
<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>	Teaching assistant effort in helping student in lab time.
<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

---

**View on the examination** Positive

---

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

**How well did changes to the course work?** 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 improvements of the lab exercises' instructions has been working well. All the guest lectures were very well appreciated. The team works among students have been going very well and all students provide good reflections of the activity.

---

**Changes that should be implemented for next time** Fine a better teaching assistant, provide more immediate feedback on lab exercises, and provide a simpler pdf copy of lecture materials for students to study at home

---

**Other**

**Comments**

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. Further, we were allocated to a bigger (hall) computer room, which is not really conducive to teach and study.

**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.

---

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