Report - IL1333 - 2021-10-20

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):
Elena Dubrova, dubrova@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.
At the end of the course the students were asked to fill a course survey form. In the beginning of the course, I encouraged them to contact me by email if they have any questions or concerns, or want to give a feedback.

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.)
In the beginning of the course, two student representatives were selected. I had discussions with them during the course, and a meeting after the course competition.

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.
The course has 12 lectures, two 4-hour labs, and an individual project. A new thing during 2020 course offering was that the examination was changed to the labs 2.5 cr for the labs (grade scale P/F), 4.0 cr for the final exam (grade scale A, B, C, D, E, F), and 1.0 cr for the project. Earlier, the project was non-compulsory and did not contributed to the course examination. The change was suggested by the students taking the course in earlier years. The project is intended to give the students a deeper knowledge of some selected course topics. In addition, we re-designed the labs to extended them from 1.5 cr to 2.5 cr. This, again, was suggested by the students.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?
The results of the course survey form show that the student's workload corresponds to the expected level of 40 hours.

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?
Similarly to previous years, the course results are close to a normal distribution with the mean being around the grade B. This is not surprising, given that this course is selective and only students motivated to study hardware security are attending it.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

The majority of students seem to be very happy. Here are some comments which make me very happy as well:

Elena's genuine passion for the subject makes her a shining example for what the very best teachers at KTH should strive for. Her strong integrity and diligence in everything she does makes her a role model for students in being the very best engineers they can be.

Elena is an excellent lecturer! Her enthusiasm and knowledge on the subject is very inspiring

Really interesting topic. The way Elena presented the content of the course is impressive. One of the best lecturer I have had during my years at
KTH.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

The overall impression in very positive.

The students found the course very interesting, as demonstrated by the average score 6.7 for the question 1 (I worked with interesting issues).
The students found the course challenging in a stimulating way (question 4) with the average score of 6.3.
They confirmed that they could practice and receive feedback without being graded (question 15) with the average score of 5.0.
They found the assessment of the course fair and honest (questions 16) with the average score of 5.2.
The students answered that they was able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others (question 21) has the average score of 6.5.
They said that they were able to get support if I needed it (question 22) with the average score of 6.2.

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 changes we made into the course examination for 2020 (extended labs and individual project) seem to work very well.

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?

In the suggestions section, some students suggest slower tempo for the lectures, which I will take into account:

Sometimes Elena should talk 25% slower, other than that she is amazing!

Another student says that there is a need for more clear requirements on the project report, which I will take into account as well:

The project reports need more supervision. I understood what the projects were about but not what the reports required. Would be good if report requirements were established.

Yet another student proposed theory tests:

I would suggest that we have internal theory tests to monitor our confidence and ability to answer questions.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

In the short term, we will consider various options of improving feedback to the students. In the long term, we will keep updating the course material with the new developments in the area. I would also like to write a textbook for the course after several years.