



Course Analysis - KTH¹

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 ²

Name of course	Course number
Transport Policy & Evaluation	AH2301
Course points and points by examination parts	When course was implemented
7,5hp (4hp laboratory report with grades A-F, 3,5 hp project reports with grades A-F)	VT14 Period 3
Course-responsible and other instructors	Course hours, by F, Ö, Le, R, L, S
Yusak Susilo, lektor	F:
Joram Langbroek, doktorand	Le: 30
Joel Franklin, lektor	Lab: 9
Maria Börjesson, forskare	Stud.b:
	Sem:
	Number of registered students 17
	Performance level after 1st examination, in %
	Examination level after 1st examination, in %

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 behavioural impact analyses.

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)

¹ Instructions for the course analysis form are at the end of the document

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

This year the improvements focused on refreshing the contents of some topical lectures, such as deregulations and market interventions. Further, electronic feedback on weekly group works was also trialed this year. Based on previous year feedback, the laboratory instructions are further improved. Based on a good feedback from last year, this year Mallard and Glaister book is still used as the text book, though, for some topics, 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 <small>(leave blank when web-publishing)</small>
--	------	---

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 12 th February 2014). 15 minutes discussion on the class was carried out. However, no critical comments received. All of the students who attended the class were happy on the way lectures were carried out. No improvement suggestion 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 ³ 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 21 days, March 1 to March 21
--	--

Questions added to the standard questions	The same questions as last year were used
--	---

Response rate	76%
----------------------	-----

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 76% response rate, which is less than last year (100%). A better way to encourage students to participate in the survey should be sought for next year.
--	--

Overall impression	Overall the students appreciated the content of the course and consider it as important/useful for their future work. The quality of the teachers are also well praised, especially for Joram, the new TA. However, there is a concern on how the project group feedback has been given. This may be because, unlike the previous years, the feedback was given on electric form, thus less comments written on the student works (because the ones that already on the right track were left as they were. Next year, the feedback will be given on hand writing again.
---------------------------	--

Relevant web-links	Course materials are in Bilda
---------------------------	-------------------------------

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

Course-responsible's interpretations of the survey

Positive points	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 and the teaching assistant have been well appreciated.
Negative points	The group feedback were considered not enough by the students - this need to be addressed for next year.
Was the course relevant in connection to course goals?	The overall view seems to be positive that the course was important and relevant.
View on prerequisites	Most of the students think the course is on the right level, though there are some who thought the course were either too easy or too difficult. Need to find balance on this.
View on form of the course	Mostly positive and satisfy with the content of the course. CBA has been the most favourite topic this year again. Some students think there is a degree of repetitiveness on the materials, especially on measuring travel time value.
View on course literature/materials	The textbook received a good comment and extra reading materials on bilda were appreciated.
View on examination	The term project was generally seen positively as a way to apply knowledge from the course and to develop project management and similar skills.
Especially interesting comments	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.

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

Overall impression	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 feedback provisions and clearer lab exercises.
Positive points	The involvement of more policy discussions, improvement on course teacher and topic and involvements of real exercises were appropriate, and reflected in more positive comments.
Negative points	The experiment with electronic group work feedback did not received as good as I expected.
View on prerequisites	About right.
View on form of the course	Mostly right, but could use more time doing exercises in class and talking about labs afterward.
View on course literature/materials	About right
View on the examination	Positive

Course's pedagogical development II Mandatory⁴

How well did changes to the course work?	The course topic refreshment, with a new TA, was well received, whilst the electronic group feedback was poorly received by some.
---	---

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

Changes that should be implemented for next time

Will return to hand writing feedback for group project and provide a clearer lab 3 instruction

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 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.