



Report - IK1203 - 2018-05-23

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):

Peter Sjödin, psj@kth.se

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 10 lectures, four home assignments, three lab assignments, and one project assignment.

The project assignment is new for the year. It is an entirely new assignment that consists mainly of Java programming, something that has not been part of the course before. So it is both a new component and new course content.

To make room for the project assignment, other course content was removed. Previously the course had an introduction to network security, which has been taken away. It was felt to be too short (one lecture) to make any substantial contribution to the course content, and nowadays there is a complete course on the topic: IV1013 Introduction to computer security.

The examination consists of three parts: a written exam (TENA, 3 hp); lab and project assignments (LABA, 3 hp), and home assignments (UPG1, 1,5 hp).

THE STUDENT'S 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?

According to the LEQ there is a large span in workload. By a general assessment, it seems that the amount of workload is fair and corresponds to the scope of the course.

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 regular exam in March 2018 was passed by 83.1% of the first-time registered students. For the other course components, 95.5% passed the lab and project assignments, and 98.9% passed the home assignments. Total, 75.3% of the first-time registered students passed the course after the first exam. There is no notable difference compared to previous years.



OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

What is your overall impression of the learning environment in the polar diagrams, for example in terms of the students' experience of meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability? If there are significant differences between different groups of students, what can be the reason?

On the whole, the course seems to be functioning well. The scores on the polar charts are in the 5–7 range. There are no clear differences among student groups, although it is nice to see that the atmosphere in the course is perceived as open and inclusive, in particular by female students.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Can you identify some stronger or weaker areas of the learning environment in the polar diagram - or in the response to each statement - respectively? Do they have an explanation?

The course gets good score in general in areas concerning structure, learning expectations and constructive alignment. There is a clear structure to the course with internal milestones and subgoals as mandatory assignments intended to support students towards examination. Therefore it is logical that the course gets lower score on areas related to individual freedom; the course is designed to steer students towards course goals and learning outcomes, and it has a low degree of freedom for individual choices.

ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What emerges in the students' answers to the open questions? Is there any good advice to future course participants that you want to pass on?

Many of the student remarks concern the project assignment. This is expected, since the assignment was entirely new and it was the first time it was given to students. The assignment is intended to scale to a course with many students, and it is a relatively comprehensive programming assignment. Therefore it has been designed for automatic grading where students' submissions are tested by tools. This was new to many students, who expressed a desire for manual grading with human feedback to allow for larger variations in interpretation and for student to make their own designs. Students were also asking for more continuous access to the grading tool, so that students can submit frequently and in that way use the grading tool as a way of testing their code.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should primarily be developed? How could these aspects be developed in the short or long term?

Course development for the next time will be focused on improving the project assignments. The instructions should clarify the testing procedure and the grading process clearly, and the instructions should be made available sooner in the course planning. The automatic testing will be developed, but the student requests for frequent access to the grading tool will not be granted - it tends to encourage unsound programming habits with trial-and-error approaches instead of structured testing. To weed out small errors, though, we could offer a few (one or two) pre-runs of the grading tools, perhaps with limited scope to check basic functionality.

Parts of the lab assignments, which had overlap with the project assignment, were removed for this course round to make more room for the project assignment. In hindsight, this probably wasn't necessary. In fact, keeping those parts of the lab would actually have helped the students in the project work. Therefore, for next year, those parts could be put back.

It was felt that the students were lacking skills in basic Java I/O programming. Even though it is slightly out of scope for this course, to help for the project assignment a course component that gives an introduction to Java I/O would be useful.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Several of the students made comments that the home assignments and lectures are really helpful in order to pass the course. This is very positive, as it indicates that the course design does indeed work, and that there is constructive alignment of course components leading towards examination.

Kursdata 2018-10-24

IK1203 - Nätverk och kommunikation, VT 2018

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2018 v.3
Kursen slutar:	2018 v.11
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	LABA - Laborationer, 3,0, betygsskala: P, F TENA - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F UPG1 - Uppgift, 1,5, betygsskala: P, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Peter Sjödin <psj@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Peter Sjödin <psj@kth.se>
Lärare:	Peter Sjödin <psj@kth.se> Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se> Voravit Tanyingyong <voravit@kth.se>
Assistent:	Yuxin Cheng <yuxinc@kth.se> Michail Xirouchakis <michailx@kth.se> Huseyin Kayahan <kayahan@kth.se> Mohammad Istiak Hossain <hossain7@kth.se>

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	21
Totalt registrerade:	50

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad ¹ [%]	66.70%
Prestationsgrad ² [%]	81.00%
Betygsfördelning ³ [%, antal]	A 21% (3) B 43% (6) C 21% (3) D 14% (2)

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter

IK1203 - Nätverk och kommunikation, VT 2018

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2018 v.3
Kursen slutar:	2018 v.11
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	LABA - Laborationer, 3,0, betygsskala: P, F TENA - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F UPG1 - Uppgift, 1,5, betygsskala: P, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Peter Sjödin <psj@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Peter Sjödin <psj@kth.se>
Lärare:	Peter Sjödin <psj@kth.se> Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se> Gunnar Karlsson <gk@kth.se>
Assistenter:	Yuxin Cheng <yuxinc@kth.se> Michail Xirouchakis <michailx@kth.se> Huseyin Kayahan <kayahan@kth.se> Mohammad Istiak Hossain <hossain7@kth.se>

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	67
Totalt registrerade:	95

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad¹ [%]	89.60%
Prestationsgrad² [%]	93.10%
Betygsfördelning³ [%, antal]	A 28% (17) B 15% (9) C 25% (15) D 28% (17) E 3% (2)

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter