

# Report - EP2510 - 2024-11-02

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):**

Panagiotis Papadimitratos, papadim@kth.se

---

**DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS**

**Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.**

---

We informed students from the opening lecture about the importance of the evaluation and on-going feedback during the unfolding of the course. We made information available early on in Canvas, reminded in several occasions in lectures/seminars and through the course evaluation system. The students were strongly encouraged to email or message in Canvas, talk in person, talk to the TAs, regarding any matter they needed to communicate. In all occasions conceivable, the student opinion was asked for course matters.

---

**DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS**

**Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)**

---

The course is designed around weekly 3-hour meetings, seminars (with breaks, in the usual format) along with discussion meetings, one workshop for mid-term project results, and one workshop for final project results. All were in person, allowing exceptionally for online participation only in case of need (i.e., hybrid only in a small number of occasions).

The format was chosen to give students flexible time for individual and small-group work, interactions with the teacher and the teaching assistants, and work on their course project. The meetings with the teaching team were frequent, at the pace the students requested, either in person or online.

---

**COURSE DESIGN**

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

---

The course provides in-depth coverage of selected topics on networked systems security, including privacy, revolving around five modules that require weekly assignments and participation in group discussions. At the same time, individual/project-driven consultations at a regular basis guide student project work. Progress is presented in two workshops and through several milestones with submissions via canvas. The participation, with submission in canvas, in discussions, two presentations, interim and final reports, are all taken into account towards assessing student performance.

This year a renewal of the material for the five modules and change in the format was undertaken, i.e., the course was significantly refreshed.

---

**THE STUDENTS' 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?**

---

There was no deviation from what was expected. The work load varied, from 12 to 27 hours per week, approximately as expected. One student reported 24-26 hours per week due to reading assignments. The nature of the course, the combination of in-depth treatment of topics and research-oriented project work, makes time investment necessary, especially as students progressively get engaged and more ambitious and do demonstrate deep understanding of advanced topics.

---

**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 results were very good, on par with previous years – if not better, given the renewed and extended assignments, along with the project work. Intermediate and final presentations were very good and the project work unfolded with very interesting results. Although the pace of the coursework increased, the individual attention to students, as in past years, was accompanied by an improved course structure and the renewal of material - these helped in having engagement from the first till the last week.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

**What does students say in response to the open questions?**

---

The students enjoyed the newly introduced elements in the course – notably, the active discussion that takes place one week after the material presentation in a seminar (quotation: "I enjoyed the discussion seminars. Very interesting to see how everyone interpreted the papers and their content.")

The research oriented character of the course and its project were also very much appreciated, e.g., quotes:

"The project has also been a lot of fun, being able to deep-dive into interesting problems.

"The best aspect of the course was the fact that we were presented with novel network security issues and solutions"

"Fun topics, and a lot of time for an individual project is good."

"Being able to discuss and meet up with TAs and Panos to discuss the research report!"

---

The last point shows the value of the course format and the regular interactions with expert researchers in the area.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

**Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.**

---

"Working with interesting issues" and "the course challenging in stimulating way" got +3 from 100% of respondents, perhaps the highest positive for teacher ever in his years at KTH. All other questions got scores of +2 and +3.

The atmosphere in the seminars was excellent, with a mix of MSc and PhD students and the extended participation of the teaching team (the teacher and two TAs in each weekly meeting and all TAs in the two workshops) - this is reflected in answers (e.g., in the above section) but also conveyed in person.

The students offered interesting, useful and much appreciated feedback: They felt that some participants were not active, they expressed the desire to extend the scope of the covered topics, and offer some recorded lectures/talks in lieu of some reading assignments.

---

**OVERALL IMPRESSION**

**Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.**

---

The results were very good, the changes were appreciated by students (and TAs too), and this version of the course shows the way forward to further improve.

---

**ANALYSIS**

**Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:**

- students identifying as female and male?
  - international and national students?
  - students with or without disabilities?
- 

There were no clear differences.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

**What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?**

---

It is appreciated the students thought truly well of the course and the efforts the teacher and TAs made.

We will continue with the new format and (i) will put emphasis on early start with the project, (ii) broaden the scope of the topics and (iii) identify online material that could in parts replace/add to reading assignments. We will introduce changes (ii) and (iii) in a moderate way, to ensure workload remains as planned/expected.

We will also look into how to work with MSc programs to ensure easy access to the course for interested students – notably those that took NSS (EP2500/FEP3200) and BNSS (EP2520/FEP3250) before, and of course any student that wishes to take an advanced course on network security.

---