



Report - IK2215 - 2019-02-05

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.

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 good. The examination grade was somewhat lower than in earlier course offerings (~70% compared to above 80%). However, there was a higher amount of top grades (A and B) this time.

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 20 (opportunities to influence course activities) were somewhat lower, around 5 in average. The explanation to 14 is probably that the regular feedback during labs is given to groups rather than to individual students. The explanation to 20 is likely that it is only in the project assignment this opportunity is given and that the groups this year turned out to be somewhat too large. Accordingly, it becomes difficult for individual students to influence the activity.



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?

In general, the different 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.

A drawback that was concluded from the course panel meeting is that the groups in labs and in the project are sometimes too large. It would be beneficial from a learning perspective to have smaller groups.

It was also clear that some of the lectures covered too much material (content and number of slides), which made it difficult for students to follow and digest the information. The explanation is that these lectures were significantly changed this year and given for the first time.

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?

The lectures that were too comprehensive will be reworked for next course round.

Some basic lecture material will also be reduced in favor for more elaboration around more advanced topics (this is something that was brought up in the course panel meeting).

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

Course data 2019-02-13

IK2215 - Advanced Internetworking, HT 2018

Course facts

Course start:	2018 w.35
Course end:	2018 w.43
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	LAB1 - Laboratory Work, 3.0, Grading scale: P, F PRO1 - Project work, 1.5, Grading scale: P, F TEN1 - Examination, 3.0, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F
Grading scale:	A, B, C, D, E, FX, F

Staff

Examiner:	Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se>
Teachers:	Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se> Voravit Tanyingyong <voravit@kth.se> Marco Chiesa <mchiesa@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	0
Total number of registered:	70

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate ¹ [%]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>
Performance rate ² [%]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>
Grade distribution ³ [%, number]	<i>There are no course results reported</i>

1 Percentage approved students

2 Percentage achieved credits

3 Distribution of grades among the approved students