



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: 2024 | Period: P2 | |
| Högskolepoäng: 7,5 | Antal studenter: 67 | Svarsfrekvens kursvärdering: 16% |
| Examinationsgrad/prestationsgrad: 91% | Läraktiviteter: Föreläsningar, seminarier, quiz, intervjuer, peer reviews. | |
| Examinationsmoment fördelade på högskolepoäng: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• UPP1 - Oral and written assignments, 2.0 credits, grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F• UPP2 - Oral and written assignments, 2.0 credits, grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F• UPP3 - Oral and written assignments, 2.0 credits, grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F• UPP4 - Oral and written assignments, 1.5 credits, grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F | | |
| Undervisande lärare: Ulrik Franke (RISE/KTH), Stanley Greenstein (SU), Liane Colonna (SU), Sally Longworth (SU), Sarah Backman (FHS), Alan Sewell (FHS). | | |
| Examinator: Mathias Ekstedt | | |
| Kursansvarig lärare: Mathias Ekstedt | | |

Beskrivning av eventuella genomförda förändringar efter tidigare kursanalys

This is the third time the course is given. The course was incrementally updated in a few places based on feedback from last year's student comments. The overall structure, ambition, and course design remains as we think it is good and appreciated. Biggest updates were made in module 1 and 2, that were extended a bit.

Sammanfattning av kursdeltagarnas svar på kursvärderingen

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



KURSANALYS

- kursansvarigs summering och reflektioner

I could not identify any comments specifically related to the updates made, so these I interpret as successful. In general, the comments seem to be coming back, and few new issues are raised. The most important comments this year I feel are:

- *Distribution of workload over time in the different modules could be better.*
This has been improved but could possibly be improved further. However, it is straight forward, enforcing a schedule with evenly distributed deadlines would greatly limit the flexibility for the students. Allowing students to plan their own time is something we consider positive in general (and something that is worth practicing if found difficult..)
- *Some people find it a very heavy workload while others think it is light.*
Since opinions vary a lot we see no reason to change really. The course design is also such that you work more for a higher grade so it should cater for all flavors.
- *The module 3 full day seminar is too long.*
This was restructured a bit this year. Probably worth returning to for next year. However, there is also a pedagogic thought around it. I get the feeling that it to a large extent boils down to that students are not used to spending that much time in a single seminar. So part of the solution seems to me to be to improve on motivation and expectation management. One concrete suggestion to take into consideration is to assign opponents (perhaps multiple) to the presentation.
- *Module 1 examination.*
There is a feeling that the quiz examination is not really examining the content (it becomes a search exercise). Also writing interview questions without asking them felt detached from learning. This was designed to provide a more integrated learning between mandatory and voluntary assignments which seem to also be positive, but could be reconsidered.
- *Module 2 learning objectives.*
The examination is perceived to be mainly related to the incentives ILO and little to human and process vulnerabilities. While this is certainly true for the voluntary seminar to earn a higher grade, the mandatory examination does not only concern incentives, but generally aims to position cybersecurity questions into a picture. This might be good to clarify.

Overall, the comments are really diverse and contradictory, making it hard to use student feedback as the main driver for change. In a nutshell here are two illustrative overall comments on the course: *"I am extremely happy with the course content."* and *"I'm definitely not happy, I hated the course, it's the reason I kind of regret coming to KTH and also not recommend it to other possible students. I could learn tons of important Cybersecurity stuff, such as penetration testing but instead I'm learning about the law."* Numerically almost all questions include answers of -3 and -2 as well as +2 and +3. One possible interpretation is that students with extreme opinions are overrepresented in the survey— so the full distribution would be more of a normal distribution. Either way the variance is high.

Overall, I am very happy to have gotten the following comment: *"The course broadens the focus from the more technically focused courses to a discussion on why cybersecurity is important, what the goal of cybersecurity is, and how cybersecurity work generally functions. On the surface it seems like on of those "boring, mandatory courses" but I found it to be very well put together and presented in a very good fashion. The flair of having lecturers from outside of KTH was both intimidating and exciting since it brought new academic challenges."* This essentially pinpoints the whole ambition of the course, so it is very satisfying to see that this was recognized by at least one (a few..? 🙌) students.



KURSANALYS

- kursansvarigs summering och reflektioner

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

- Interesting blend of non-technical topics with teachers from different areas.
- Course grade system is easy to understand and provides flexibility for students.

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

- Incremental improvement per module (in accordance with items above) should be done.
- Perhaps some form of course planning assistance could be developed.
- We should continue working with setting expectations right

Ansvarig lärares sammanfattande synpunkter

Overall, the course has improved also this year, we are on the right track, and improvements will continue incrementally.

Förslag på eventuella förändringar av kursen

See above.