



## 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)	VT17 Period 3
<b>Course-responsible and other instructors</b>	<b>Course hours, by F, Ö, Le, R, L, S</b>
Yusak Susilo, professor	F:
Joram Langbroek, doktorand	Le: 30
Joel Franklin, lektor	Lab: 9
Maria Börjesson, professor	Stud.b:
	Sem:
	<b>Number of registered students</b> 17
	<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 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)

<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 improvements are at two fronts. One is updating the teaching materials. Some hot and contemporary topics, like promenad stad concept and also various projects in Stockholm city were discussed in the class. Two, the schedules were re-arranged by introducing the project and group works earlier, with earlier deadline to reduce the students' pressures at the end of the course in delivering the final report. Further more, some relevant courses (e.g. congestion charges) now are put adjacent each other, as suggested by previous years' students. to increase. As previous years, 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 students appreciate both project and role playing exercises since both were found helping students to understand the course materials much deeper in a much fun way.

## 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 and also via emails**

**Result of formative mid-course survey**

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.

**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. 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 <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 21 days, March 1 to March 21

**Questions added to the standard questions**

The same questions as last year were used

**Response rate**

70%

**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 70% response rate, which is double previous year response rate (36% completed survey). This is perhaps because the teacher sent a number of reminders/encouragements to participate in the survey, compared to previous years. Furthermore, shifting some group workloads earlier may reduce the stress among students during the final week of the course, which may increase the students' willingness to participate in the survey.

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

<b>Overall impression</b>	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 so as interactive teaching style and the use of different level of text books. 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 time schedule can be arranged better (more time between deadlines).
---------------------------	--

<b>Relevant web-links</b>	Course materials are in Bilda
---------------------------	-------------------------------

### Course-responsible's interpretations of the survey

<b>Positive points</b>	The lecture content was well appreciated by the student. The students also appreciate the way lab and term project are organised. All the guest lectures and the teaching assistant have been well appreciated. Joel Franklin in particular has received a praise. 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.
------------------------	--

<b>Negative points</b>	The project tasks and lab activities were considered as taking too much time by the students. Some of instruction seem need to be improved.
------------------------	---

<b>Was the course relevant in connection to course goals?</b>	Yes, the balance between labs, role playing, discussions, lectures and proeject works were appreciated by the students. These enable the students to achive the learning goal. The overall view show that the student considered the course as useful and relevant.
---	---

<b>View on prerequisites</b>	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.
------------------------------	--

<b>View on form of the course</b>	Mostly positive and satisfy with the content of the course. CBA and Stockholm congestion charge are the most favourite topics for this year.
-----------------------------------	--

<b>View on course literature/materials</b>	The textbook was considered as very simple to read and easy to understand.
--	--

<b>View on examination</b>	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.
----------------------------	---

<b>Especially interesting comments</b>	nothing particular this year
--	------------------------------

### Comments from other instructors after the course end

<b>What worked well</b>	
-------------------------	--

<b>What worked not so well</b>	
--------------------------------	--

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

<b>Students' summary</b>	
--------------------------	--

<b>Proposed changes</b>	
-------------------------	--

<b>Link to course committee</b>	
---------------------------------	--

### Course responsible's summarized statement

<b>Overall impression</b>	The basic form of the course, since it creation, has settled to a good composition. Deeper (and perhaps more challenging) theoretical content can be given next year since there are demands from students to have them.
---------------------------	--

<b>Positive points</b>	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.
------------------------	--

<b>Negative points</b>	Better time arrangement would reduce the students' stress further.
------------------------	--

<b>View on prerequisites</b>	About right.
------------------------------	--------------

<b>View on form of the course</b>	About right
<b>View on course literature/materials</b>	About right
<b>View on the examination</b>	Positive
<b>Course's pedagogical development II</b> Mandatory <sup>4</sup>	
<b>How well did changes to the course work?</b>	Reschedule of time, and bringing the coursework earlier, from the beginning of the course.
<b>Changes that should be implemented for next time</b>	Provide a clearer instruction and find even better time arrangement for deadlines that can help the students further.
<b>Other</b>	

#### Comments

#### 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>