Report - IK2217 - 2019-04-04

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):
Marco Chiesa, mchiesa@kth.se

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.
This year the course has been redeveloped to include advanced topics such as programmable switches. The course has reduced the number of papers to read from 8 to 6. The papers were also spread across all the different modules and not concentrated in one single module. The students' paper presentations have been replaced with frontal lectures. The slides of each module has been either improved or created from scratch. The examination format was left unchanged though the topic have radically evolved with respect from last year.

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 average workload has been around 12 hours/week according to the course evaluation. This means the workload has been 50% of the intended one. Given the course has been given for the first time, we expect to increase the workload for the next year by adding a more intensive project.

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 Pass/Fail ratio is comparable to IK2215.

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?
It seems that bachelor students had experienced a lack of background when attending the course (as evidenced in the course evaluation). The course was easy to manage as the class counted 25 students on average per lecture.

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?

Lack of more practical projects has been the main concern from the students. We plan to add a new project on programmable networks that will bridge theory and practice.

All students have agreed on the usefulness of recording video lectures, which were always available during the class.

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?

Devote enough time to learn all the concepts and techniques explained in the course.

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

We will add a new practical project on programmable switches. The teaching material will be revised to incorporate this year feedback

Course data 2019-04-09

IK2217 - Advanced Internetworking II, VT 2019

Course facts

Course start:	2019 w.3
Course end:	2019 w.11
Credits:	7,5
Examination:	LAB1 - Laboratory Work, 3.0, Grading scale: P, F
	PRO1 - Project, 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:	Dejan Kostic <dejanko@kth.se>
Course responsible teacher:	Dejan Kostic <dejanko@kth.se>
Teachers:	Dejan Kostic <dejanko@kth.se>
	Markus Hidell <mahidell@kth.se>
	Voravit Tanyingyong <voravit@kth.se>
	Marco Chiesa <mchiesa@kth.se>
	Robert Olsson <roolss@kth.se>
Assistants:	

Number of students on the course offering

First-time registered:	0
Total number of registered:	34

Achievements (only first-time registered students)

Pass rate[1] [%]	*There are no course results reported*
Performance rate[2] [%]	*There are no course results reported*
Grade distribution[3] [%, number]	*There are no course results reported*

1 Percentage approved students
2 Percentage achieved credits
3 Distribution of grades among the approved students