



---

## Report - ID2010 - 2020-05-18

---

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):**

Fredrik Kilander, fki@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.**

On the first lecture, students were actively encouraged to form a course council. However, no council was established.

At the end of the course, an automated LEQ survey was sent.

---

**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.)**

Since no course council was formed, course administration affairs with students took place during lectures and through email. These came to focus on the inconvenient situation that for 9 students the closed exam overlapped with the exam of another course.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

The course consists of 8 lectures, a literature list, and two programming assignments. The literature is examined in a closed exam. In the programming assignments the students work individually or in pairs. The examination is oral, and includes a lab report and a demonstration of the working assignment.

Changes in 2020 replaced a paper in the literature list. There was also a JSON parser added to the code examples, and a module demonstrating a client-server implementation with both JSON and Java RMI.

---

**THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD**

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

Many students work significantly less than the nominal time due to having read part of whole of the subject matters in previous courses.

---

**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?**

18 out of 29 (62%) completed the course. Compared with previous years, the grade distribution on the closed exam shifted somewhat from A-B towards A-C. The reason for this is most likely a somewhat stricter approach in assessing and grading the exams, compared to previous years.

---



#### **STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

##### **What does students say in response to the open questions?**

Some respondents (correctly) identify that the lab software material is dated, and would like to see more modern counterparts instead.  
More lectures are asked for, and lectures to be moved away from Monday morning 08:15.  
Some presentations were seen as redundant, given the respondent's previous experience.  
Teacher presentations and the clarity of the given code were appreciated.  
The labs were perceived as "challenging and good".

#### **SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

Mixed reception: much is already known by some student groups.

#### **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 students performed well, and did good work. The double-booked exam caused some unexpected problems, in that an extra exam had to be arranged in some haste.

#### **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?

Student with a good background knowledge in networking and distributed systems find the course easy, although they are not the primary target group.

#### **PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

The course should be developed in a direction to give it a more distinguished profile and reduce overlap with other courses in the vicinity.