



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)	VT18 Period 3
Course-responsible and other instructors	Course hours, by F, Ö, Le, R, L, S
Yusak Susilo, professor	F:
Joram Langbroek, doktorand	Le: 30
Maria Börjesson, professor	Lab: 9
Albania Nissan, assoc. prof.	Stud.b:
	Sem:
	Number of registered students 21/22
	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 taught 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 at two fronts. One is updating the teaching materials. Some important and contemporary 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, new contents that is high in the government agenda, e.g. parking policy and cycling lane development in Stockholm city, were added to the syllabus.

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	None was held.
--	----------------

Result of course meeting	None was held.
---------------------------------	----------------

Contact with other instructors during the course

Comments

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

Period when the survey was active	For about 17 days, Feb 27 to March 16
--	---------------------------------------

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

Response rate	71%
----------------------	-----

Changes since previous implementation	<p>This year we are forced to move the course survey from Bilda to Canvas, which is less user friendly and less practical for analysis.</p> <p>That is said, we managed to have a slightly higher response rate, 71% (from 70%) than last year. This is perhaps because the teacher sent a number of reminders/encouragements to participate in the survey - and also information on burdens that may be caused by canvas, in advance.</p>
--	--

Overall impression	<p>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 (in particular on the readability of hand-writing feedback) 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) and this is the first year where the students suggested to have exam instead.</p>
---------------------------	--

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

Relevant web-links	Course materials are in Canvas
Course-responsible's interpretations of the survey	
Positive points	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. 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. The hand-writing feedback need to be more readable.
Was the course relevant in connection to course goals?	Yes, the balance between labs, role playing, discussions, lectures and proejct 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.
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 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. However, there are a number of students who prefer to have exam or presentation-as-an-exam as an alternative of the group project.
Especially interesting comments	nothing particular this year
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. Deeper (and perhaps more challenging) theoretical content can be given next year since there are demands from students to have them. Some students really grade oriented thus anything that is not directly linked to the exam/project content was unfortunately attract less attention. Some students surprised that they are really required to read the text book in advance.
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	More readable hand writing feedback, clearer link between reading materials and the lectures
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 Mandatory⁴	
How well did changes to the course work?	Reschedule of time, and bringing the coursework earlier, from the beginning of the course, works well.
Changes that should be implemented for next time	Inform the structure of the lecture better, provide a clearer link between reading materials and the course content, and find even better time arrangement for deadlines that can help the students further.

Other

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 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.

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