



## KURSANALYS

- kursansvarigs summering och reflektioner

Denna blankett fylls i av kursansvarig efter avslutad kursomgång.

Kursanalysen anslås på KTH:s webb under rubriken Kursens utveckling och historik, på Kursinformationssidan

Kurskod: DD2510	Kursnamn: Cybersecurity in a Socio-Technical Context	
Läsår: 2022	Period: P2	
Högskolepoäng: 7,5	Antal studenter: 49	Svarsfrekvens kursvärdering: 18%
Examinationsgrad/prestationsgrad: 86%	Läraktiviteter: Föreläsningar, seminarier, quiz, intervjuer, peer reviews.	
Examinationsmoment fördelade på högskolepoäng: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• UPP1 - Oral and written assignments, 2.0 credits, grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F</li><li>• UPP2 - Oral and written assignments, 2.0 credits, grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F</li><li>• UPP3 - Oral and written assignments, 2.0 credits, grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F</li><li>• UPP4 - Oral and written assignments, 1.5 credits, grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F</li></ul>		
Undervisande lärare: Ulrik Franke (RISE/KTH), Stanley Greenstein (SU), Liane Colonna (SU), Sally Longworth (SU), Sarah Backman (FHS), Alan Sewell (FHS).		
Examinator: Mathias Ekstedt, Sonja Buchegger		
Kursansvarig lärare: Mathias Ekstedt, Sonja Buchegger		

### Beskrivning av eventuella genomförda förändringar efter tidigare kursanalys

This is the first time the course is given.

### Sammanfattning av kursdeltagarnas svar på kursvärderingen

Grafer och citat från kursvärderingen kan läggas som bilaga om så önskas

“What advice would you like to give to future participants? - This is not a technical course. Anyhow, it will open your mind to new stuff in IT security. Be prepared to have tons of law. Good course. Recommended.”



## **KURSANALYS**

- kursansvarigs summering och reflektioner

There is a quite large spread in the course evaluation results. From positive notes as above to very critical comments. The bulk of critical comments are of administrative nature (that we can improve) but there are also some more subject-related matters (that are harder to address).

### **Kursens starka sidor utifrån kursvärderingen och lärares reflektion, även i förhållande till de förändringar som genomförts inför kursomgången**

To our delight, it seems like at least some students really understood the purpose and ambition with the course as seen in the following statements:

- Having different lecturers with different backgrounds is a great idea that benefited the course immensely. The idea of combining together multiple different topics into an umbrella course also seems good.
- Very interesting topics and an interesting setup with the four different modules. I really liked that format!
- The difference in modules and professors give the course a broader field of knowledge where you can learn many things. The professors gave interesting and knowledgeable lectures regarding the topics. The topics were non-technical yet part of how the real world is.
- The atmosphere on the course was open and inclusive.

### **Kursens svaga sidor utifrån kursvärderingen och lärares reflektion, även i förhållande till de förändringar som genomförts inför kursomgången**

- Feeling of uneven workload
- Module 3 seminars were too close to (other) exams.
- Because there were limited opportunities for receiving feedback without getting graded, trying out own ideas is a risk in the assignments and may not receive any meaningful feedback afterwards.
- The expectations generally seemed to be that we would fully prepare on our own, instead of being able to learn on the fly.

### **Ansvarig lärares sammanfattande synpunkter**

The subject and teaching format is not the standard for KTH (or engineering education). It feels like students recognize this "inconvenience" but still also at the same time to a large extent appreciated this.

### **Förslag på eventuella förändringar av kursen**

On a general level we should try to prepare students better on the fact that this is not a standard type course (and that there is merit in terms of learning in this). Can we help them set their minds and expectations right?



## **KURSANALYS**

- kursansvarigs summering och reflektioner

Another general theme is to try to improve opportunities for receiving feedback without getting graded in the different modules.

Module-specific improvement ideas:

- Module 1 (Org)  
Raise the bar for a pass. As part of this effort increase the scope somewhat.
- Module 2 (Use)  
Raise the bar for a pass. Improve alignment between lectures/ILO and examination, in particular adding more examination coverage on process hacking.
- Module 3 (Threat)  
Clarify what the requirements are to pass the seminar. Clarify what is expected to be in the presentation and how it should be structured.

Reorganize so that there is less overlap in chosen cases.

In order to get more discussions going, perhaps assigning an opponent group per presentation group.

Revisit requirements for seminar attendance.

- Module 4 (Law)  
Revisit the balance between:
  - Awareness about cybersecurity related laws and regulations and approximately what they contain
  - Awareness about work methods in lawClarify communications around these two parts.

Clarify what the requirements are to pass the seminar.

Reduce the amount of content a bit (but not too much).

Try to reduce dependency between students in preparation work.