Report - IK2206 - 2022-02-21

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

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.

There was no course committee, since no students volunteered. A course survey has been conduced, 11/61 students participated. It is clear from the comments though that at least one student has mixed up the courses and is really giving feedback on a different course (a math course).

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.)

Supervision meetings have been held in Zoom.

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

Labs: two lab assignments, which are digital and done individually online.
Project: a programming project assignment, where students develop a secure communication application based on a skeleton framework.
Exam: three partial exams, organised as digital exams in computer rooms (which was new arrangement 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 perceived workload seems fine, according to survey answers. The average is below the nominal (less than 20 hours per week).

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 results are very good. Some are having a difficult time with the project assignment, mainly because the students lack the necessary background in programming.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

The responses are positive. The project assignments is well-received, and some comments are appreciative of the mix of theory and practice. All parts of the course design seem to be well-received.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Most scores are in the range 5-6, which is good. Question 5 "I felt togetherness with others on the course" received a lower score, which is expected due to the course being given mainly online due to the pandemic. Question "17. My background knowledge was sufficient to follow the course" receives lower score than would be expected, given that the course require only basic knowledges in networking and programming. The explanation is likely that some student lack the required background in computer science subjects.

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 course seems to be functioning well, many students pass and the grades are good. There are a few comments about workload and deadlines, although the answers to the questions about estimated workload indicate that the workload is reasonable, perhaps even a bit on the light side.

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?

No significant differences identified.

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

The experiences from introducing digital partial exams in computer rooms are encouraging, so this will most likely be continued next year.

The project is intended for bring theoretical knowledge gained in the course into practical problem solving. According to the feedback, this works well. There are more topics that could be brought into the project assignment, such as integrity and authentication, so the project assignment can be developed further.