



Report - IK2215 - 2018-01-10

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):

Markus Hidell, mahidell@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN

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

We use a mix of learning activities in the course, something which has worked really well over several years now. The learning activities are based on 10 lectures, 5 teacher-lead networking labs, and one project assignment during the later parts of the course where all different topics are brought together in practice. The course ends with a final written exam, graded A-F. A major change for this year is that the topic MPLS (Multi-protocol Label Switching) has been replaced with a new topic, Internet-of-Things (IoT). Accordingly, a new lecture has been developed on this topic and one of the labs have been replaced with a new IoT-lab this year. All learning activities have also undergone a yearly revision since the last course offering.

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?

The workload seems to be reasonable, according to the LEQ and the discussions during the course panel meeting.

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 students' results after the exam were very good. The examination grade was higher than last year (87.5%), but there were somewhat fewer top grades than normal. There were however no significant differences to previous course offerings.

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?

The general impression is that the course works well from a learning perspective. Most of the responses are rated as an average around 6 out of 7. Meaningfulness and comprehensibility are slightly higher than manageability. Question 14 (regular feedback) and 17 (background knowledge) were somewhat lower, slightly below 5 in average. The explanation is probably that the regular feedback during labs is given to groups rather than to individual students, and that the background knowledge in networking varies quite much between the international students. This is the first course they take during their master level studies.



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?

All course parts (project, labs, and lectures) seem to have been very well received. The students reported that they knew from start what was expected from them and goals were clear. The mix between lectures and practical assignments was balanced and created good learning opportunities.

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?

There is a lot of positive feedback on labs and project assignment, which indicates that the students really appreciate these hands-on learning activities where the theoretical concepts are put into practice. It is also quite clear that the labs and the project require rather thorough preparation to become meaningful as a learning experience, in particular for students with limited practical experience with networking equipment.

PRIORITY COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

Several students would like to have more access to the lab facilities, outside the regular class hours. This is difficult to arrange. However, we do plan to introduce more on-line lab assignments where students can experiment with networking equipment in a virtualized environment.

Kursdata 2018-02-14

IK2215 - Avancerad internetteknik, HT 2017

Kursfakta

Kursen startar:	2017 v.35
Kursen slutar:	2017 v.43
Antal högskolepoäng:	7,5
Examination:	LAB1 - Laboration, 3,0, betygsskala: P, F PRO1 - Projekt, 1,5, betygsskala: P, F TEN1 - Tentamen, 3,0, betygsskala: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Betygsskala:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Bemanning

Examinator:	Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se>
Kursomgångsansvarig lärare:	Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se>
Lärare:	Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se> Voravit Tanyingyong <voravit@kth.se> Björn Knutsson <bkn@kth.se>
Assistenter:	Huseyin Kayahan <kayahan@kth.se> Jimmy Fjällid <jfjallid@kth.se>

Antal studenter på kursomgången

Förstagångsregistrerade:	49
Totalt registrerade:	55

Prestationer (endast förstagångsregistrerade studenter)

Examinationsgrad ¹ [%]	77.60%
Prestationsgrad ² [%]	91.00%
Betygsfördelning ³ [%, antal]	A 5% (2) B 29% (11) C 24% (9) D 34% (13) E 11% (4)

1 Andel godkända studenter

2 Andel avklarade poäng

3 Betygsfördelning för godkända studenter