



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.

The year 2021 was special due to covid and the course was given digitally, through zoom. In the beginning of the course, I encouraged the students to contact me by email if they have any questions or concerns, comments on the video recordings of the lectures, etc.

At the end of the course, the students were asked to fill a course survey form, as usually. Unfortunately, in spite of multiple reminders, only 2 out of 18 students filled the survey form. Therefore, no feedback from the survey is available.

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 zoom discussions with them during the course, and a zoom 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. The examination scheme in 2021 was the same as in 2020: 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. All lectures were recorded and made available to students. The labs were adopted "do-at-home" format, e.g. for the FPGA lab, the FPGA boards were given to students to make the lab at home and then present the results to the TAs in a zoom meeting. We also recorded video tutorial for the labs. The final exam was given digitally, as a zoom meeting.

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?

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?

Unfortunately, no feedback from the survey is available.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

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

From the course examination results and email exchange with students, I got the impression that the students learned a lot from the course and the majority are happy with the way the course was given.

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.

I hope I will never have to give this course again digitally. It was more difficult than other courses which I am teaching because hardware security is a very "young" area, there are no good textbooks, so the pressure on lectures is very high. In all previous course survey forms, the advice students give to the students who plan to take this course is "Attend all lectures". I was missing contacts with students to convey the material in the best way and not sure if I was able to give them as much as I usually give.

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?

Unfortunately, no feedback from the survey is available.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

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

In the short term, we consider various options of recording and collecting course material (lectures, lab tutorials, related presentations). 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.