



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: EP2790	Kursnamn: Security Analysis of Large-Scale Computer Systems	
Läsår: 2019	Period: P4	
Högskolepoäng: 7,5	Antal studenter: 24	Svarsfrekvens kursvärdering: 38%
Examinationsgrad/prestationsgrad: 21/24	Läraktiviteter: Föreläsningar, gästföreläsningar, formativa inlämningar, handlednings/frågestunder.	
Examinationsmoment fördelade på högskolepoäng: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PRO1 - Project work, 6.0 credits, Grading scale: A, B, C, D, E, FX, F• SEM1 - Seminars, 1.5 credits, Grading scale: P, F		
Undervisande lärare: Robert Lagerström, Mathias Ekstedt, Simon Hacks, Fredrik Heiding		
Examinator: Robert Lagerström, Mathias Ekstedt		
Kursansvarig lärare: Robert Lagerström, Mathias Ekstedt		

Beskrivning av eventuella genomförda förändringar efter tidigare kursanalys

This was the first time the course was given.

Sammanfattning av kursdeltagarnas svar på kursvärderingen

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

Most students overall liked the course design, course activities, and the topic as such.

The average response for all questions was above 4 (neutral) in the LEQ.

International students are more positive than Swedish students.

Spent working time is below expected working time on average.

Some people (not all) found it difficult to understand the expectations and how they would be evaluated.

Some felt it would have been more rewarding to work in groups.

Peer reviewing could have been more constructive with better instructions.



KURSANALYS

- kursansvarigs summering och reflektioner

Draft hand ins were to many and too tightly scheduled.

It was difficult for several students to know how to prioritize their time over various parts of the content.

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

The course has the right overall design. Students think the topic is interesting and relevant and they agree with the overall idea of much own work, and freedom in terms of learning, and that teachers should spend time on coaching and guiding rather than lecturing.

Perhaps the thing to be most proud of is the very positive answers to the question “I could practice and receive feedback without being graded”. This is interpreted that students really had the opportunity learn if they wanted. A key property in the course design philosophy. They were also positive to “I was able to get support if I wanted to”.

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

More time needs to be spent on guiding the students on how to approach the course and what attitude they should in the course work. I feel several “disappointments” are due to misunderstandings. So the teacher communication needs to be clearer. Just because a thing was communicated it is not certain that it was understood...

The course material this year was really in a “beta stage”. The criticism against it was surprisingly mild. However better material is a key development activity for next round.

There was a high spread in the answers on if students understood how they were being graded. Some very critical. On the question if the grading was fair and honest some were neutral and some were positive. This might be ok but we as teachers also felt that grading was a weak point. And already now during this year’s grading we have ideas on how to make the grading better.

Ansvarig lärares sammanfattande synpunkter

For being a course given the first time we must be content. However, there are many details that can and should be improved.



KURSANALYS

- kursansvarigs summering och reflektioner

Förslag på eventuella förändringar av kursen

The following are ideas of improvements on the course from the students that are worthwhile considering:

- Split slides in several files. In particular phase 5 needs improvement.
- Provide different types of examples: “what it should look like” , “what it might look like”, “what it should not look like”.
- Better overview of how the reading material is related to each other and when in the course to read what links, etc.
- On peer review: First get feedback from teachers. That feedback can then be used to give feedback to peers.
- Offer opportunity to do mid term presentation. Voluntary.
- Voluntary seminars reflecting on the hand ins and peer reviews. (Have several phases on the same seminar.)
- Provide a set of “anti-patterns” from student hand ins (and previous reports) on the lectures

Kursansvarig: Mathias Ekstedt & Robert Lagerström