



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) | VT15 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, lektor | Stud.b: |
| | Sem: |
| | Number of registered students 19 |
| | 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 term project. 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. In order to really understand the content of the courses, there are role play exercises and also mathematical/model oriented lab activities that helps the students to learn not only how to calculate but also exposed to various different dilemma which various stakeholders face in daily basis.

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 are three folds. One is updating the teaching materials, including removing lab exercise (transport supply and cost models) which repetitively has not been considered useful by the student as relevant for their career. Some hot and contemporary topics, like air transport and the roles of land use planning in urban transport policy, are now added to the course material. Two, to increase the understanding of dilemmas that every stakeholder has, now we introduced a new two session labs which assign students to different role playings and to promote and debate each other according to the role that they were playing. This activity then followed by a self-reflection and essays on particular issues given their part in the role playing game. Third, the electronic feedback which was trialled last year (2013/2014) is changed since the students did not appreciate it as much as hand writing feedback. They felt there is a lack of feedback. Now the feedback system is a bit of both electronic and in handwriting.

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 role 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> |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Discussions and feedbacks were taken during the lecture time with the course leader and also via emails</p> | | |
| <p>Result of formative mid-course survey</p> | <p>To get more feedback, this year the mid-term evaluation was done in the one of the lecture times. 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.</p> | |
| <p>Result of course meeting</p> | <p>None was held.</p> | |

Contact with other instructors during the course

Comments

Nearly all of the lectures were presented by a single lecturer. Whilst the lab is led by teaching assistant. 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

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Period when the survey was active</p> | <p>For about 23 days, March 1 to March 23</p> |
| <p>Questions added to the standard questions</p> | <p>The same questions as last year were used</p> |
| <p>Response rate</p> | <p>36%</p> |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Changes since previous implementation | The course survey was conducted online with a follow-up email to encourage responses and also advance explanation of the use of survey on the last day of the lecture. This resulted in a 36% response rate (completed survey), which is significant less than last year (76% in 2014, and 100% in 2013). Another half of class (9 of 19) participated but did not complete the whole survey. This is perhaps because the teacher sent less reminder/encouragement to participate in the survey, compared to previous years. Furthermore, a better way to encourage students to participate in the survey should be sought for next year. |
| Overall impression | Overall the students really appreciated the content of the course and consider it as important/useful for their future work. The role playing activity receive much appreciation. Now one of the student even more inspired to become a transport planner. The quality of the teachers are also well praised, although the students' assesment towards which teachers are better are a bit mix. There is a concern on how the project group feedback has been given and how this has been graded. Seems somehow, the instruction and grading system are not really well understood or agreed by the student. An extra effort to clarify this would be taken next year. |
| Relevant web-links | Course materials are in Bilda |
| Course-responsible's interpretations of the survey | |
| Positive points | The content was well appreciated by the student. Some say 'perfect', 'one of the best courses in KTH', 'interesting', 'important', 'well relevant for their careers', 'it had a perfect mix of labs, role playing, discussions, lectures and proeject works', etc. The students also appreciate the way lab and term project are organised, but perhaps more clarification on expectation, grading and schedule would be needed. All the guest lectures and the teaching assistant have been well apreciated. Learning concept, interactive discussions, and role playing activity were the ones that mostly appreciated from this class. Group discussions during some of the lectures were really appreciated by the student. |
| Negative points | The project tasks and lab activities were considered as taking too much time by the students. Some of the students were not clear on the expectation of the lab reports. The instruction of lab 3 need to be improved. Due to some unexpected circumtances, there were some lectures which need to be re-scheduled to the last day. This make the location of 'Stockholm congestion charge' topic out of place and the students had a long day at the last day. This should be avoided next time. |
| Was the course relevant in connection to course goals? | Yes, the balance between labs, role playing, discussions, lectures and proeject works were considered correct (by the student). These enable the students to achive the learning goal. The overall view show that the stundent considered the course as useful 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. But an explanation that this course would cover a basic economic was suggested and will be carried out next year. |
| View on form of the course | Mostly positive and satisfy with the content of the course. CBA and Stockholm congestion charge are the most favourite topics for this year. |
| View on course literature/materials | The textbook was considered as very simple to read and easy to understand. |
| View on examination | The term projects and lab activities were generally seen positively as a way to apply knowledge from the course and to develop project management and similar skills. |
| Especially interesting comments | Clarification and consistency of grading scale and requirements across project works and lab reports should be improved. |

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 its creation, has settled to a good composition. The inclusion of role playing exercise this year has been a great success. Though a clearer labs' grading and instructions has been mentioned several times as a concern. |
| Positive points | The involvement of more interactive discussion and role playing exercise and involvements of real exercises were appropriate, and reflected in positive comments and praises from student. |
| Negative points | Better clarification in grading, expectation and report requirements are needed. |
| View on prerequisites | About right. |
| View on form of the course | About right |
| View on course literature/materials | About right |
| View on the examination | Positive |

Course's pedagogical development II ^{Mandatory}⁴

| | |
|---|--|
| How well did changes to the course work? | The improvements, especially the involvement of role playing exercise in the lab, have been well appreciated. |
| Changes that should be implemented for next time | Provide a clearer lab 3 instruction and make the grading system between project work and lab consistent to each other by giving the students a chance to rework their assignments based on the feedback that they have been given. |

Other

Comments

⁴ 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 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.