Report - AI2154 - 2021-06-16

Respondents: 1
Answer Count: 1
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):
Sviatlana Engerstam, sviatlana.engerstam@abe.kth.se

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS
Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

The course evaluation was done online by sending out LEQ questionaire. The questionaire was available to all students registered in the course during 3 weeks (20/03-02/04/2021). In total 14 out of 85 students have responded, which corresponds to 16,47% response rate. The questionaire included questions regarding students' gender, background and disability. No big spread in answers between different groups were found.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS
Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

The ongoing short conversations were held with students in class during the whole course period. Meeting with 2 student representatives was held on April 13, 2021.

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

The aim of the course is to provide students with the advanced theoretical and practical knowledge of the valuation and analysis by enabling them to:
• Apply and analyze traditional and advanced real estate valuation methods.
• Describe and analyze real estate market data challenges.
• Explain and analyze changes in market conditions for real estate valuation services.
The course design includes lectures, exercises and seminar aimed to discuss deeper the main issues covered in lectures. The aim of the lectures is to make students familiar with the latest research issues and modern approaches in valuation and analysis. In addition to lectures, students read several research articles that cover the main issues discussed in the class. Mandatory course activities include exercises that cover both theoretical and practical aspects of the course content. Results of the exercise work is finalized in a form of two written "Analytical summaries" presented in class (the second one as a panel debate).
This year the course was held completely online due to COVID19 restrictions. Since course went well last year, there were no any major changes in course design that were introduced this year.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

The average number of hours that students worked in the course is 15 hours per week (including scheduled hours), which corresponds to 150 hours per course in total or 30 hours/1,5hp. This is lower than expected (40 hours/1,5 hp). However, at least 30% of the students have worked about 20 hours per week, which implies in total 200 hours for the course, which corresponds to 40 hours/1,5hp. It is in line of what it is expected (40 hours/1,5hp).

THE STUDENTS' RESULTS

How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

The overall perfomance of students is good. 46% of students have received grades A (45% in previous year), 39% grade B(29% in previous year), 10% grade C(15% in previous year), 6% grade D (0% in previous year), 0% grade E (2% in previous year). All students who have submitted and presented the exercise work received the Pass grade. There are no large differences in students perfomance in comparisson with the previous year, but there is a slight improvement in final result grades.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

According to students' comments inspiring core and guest lectures was the best aspect of the course. Some examples of students feedback:
-"Various issues discussed from different perspectives was very interesting. Sviatlana was very clear and structured in her lectures and even for the exams. The additional lectures from external people was very interesting. The course was very well structured."
-"Very interesting guest lectures."
Students also liked to work with practical issues, like large public tenant relocation case study and RICS seminar discussion. Some examples of students feedback:
-"Assignment on SIDA, it gives the best practice on how to analyse the market. Both project assignments were interesting.It was clear and concise."
-"That the project work was related to a real life example and covered many concepts that had been in focus during previous lectures."
-"The seminar is good, we can share with others and listen to other groups' excellent idea."

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

The course is well structured and have a reasonable mix between theoretical part and practice with good level of workload distributed evently throughout the course. The course also covers resent research issues and aspects of future development in real estate valuation and analysis. Students learned in a natual way starting from theory discussed at lectures and later practicing their valuation and analysis skills at the exercises. One of the students wrote: "I liked that the content was recorded. This helped to learn complex topics in my own pace or repeat analysis in Excel.The intented learning outcome was covered.The sum up and good to know was very helpful. I really started to like the topic."
It provides evidence that the overal goal of the course is reached and intended learning outcomes (ILOs) are achieved to a great extent.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

The teachers' overall impression of the course in relation to student results and their evaluation of the course is very good.
However, there is a request from students for including more challenges into the practical assignments, i.e. more advanced valuation techniques and applications using Excel or other software. Lecture on project development valuation should be extended and explained more in details and an excercise on this topic should be added to the course content.

ANALYSIS

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:
- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

The overall impression of the learning environment is very good. The response to LEQ statements lies between 5,4 (4,8 in previous year) and 6,8 (6,3 in previous year). It implies that the respondents evaluate the learning experience in a very positive way. Strong aspects of the learning environment were found on:

1.Meaningfulness - emotional level: Students worked with interesting issues (6,3), the course was challenging in a stimulating way (5,4).

2.Cognitive level: Students could practice and receive feedback without being graded (6,0), the assessmnt of the course was fair and honest (6,8).

3.Instrumental level: Students were able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others (6,2), they were able to get support if needed it (6,7).

No significant difference in experience was found between students identifying as female and male, except the answer on question 15 related to the ability of students to practice and receive feedback without being graded. Female respondents gave 5,0 points, while male respondents gave 6,3 points out of 7.

Unfortunately it is not possible to discover the reason for this difference since comments in course evaluation does not contain any clarification and student representatives were not able to give it either.

No significant difference in experience was found between international students and national students, except the answer on question 4 related to the statement that the course was challenging in a stimulating way . International students gave 5,0 points, while Swedish students gave 6,3 points out of 7. Comments in course evaluation does not contain any clarification for this difference, but student representatives said that students would like to have more challenging tasks to practice in the course.

No any respond from students with disabilities were received. However, their rights and support for them is emphasized by the course responsible during the introductory lecture and is clearly stated in the course PM.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

The course went well in general, which implies that there is no need in major changes in next course round. Several steps towards further develoment:

1. More challenging tasks should be imlemented for practical assignments.

2. Lecture on Development project valuation should be extended since the topic should be exlained more in details. A practical task on this topic should be added to course content.

3. Course literature is to be updated. A new course book should be introduced if possible.