

# Report - IL1333 - 2023-11-07

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.**

In the beginning of the course, we selected two course representatives. I also encouraged the students to contact me by email if they have any questions or concerns, comments on the lectures, labs, etc. At the end of the course, the students were asked to fill a course survey form. I also had a meeting with the course representatives.

---

**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 at the end of the course.

---

**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 2023 was the same as in 2022: 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 and labs were given in the classroom. Videos of lectures from the previous year were made available to the students in the beginning of the course. We also provided video tutorials for the labs. The final exam was carried out in the classroom.

One essential difference from 2022 is that the content of the Lab two was changed. We purchase ChipWhisperer equipment for capturing power traces and were able to give the student a chance to do a real power analysis using this equipment.

---

**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 seems to be in line with the expected level. A comment of a student: "Perfectly acceptable workload that was distributed sensibly across the entire period. The amount of lectures was also appropriate."

---

**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?**

Overall, the results were similar to previous years.

---

**STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS**

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

The students were happy with the course overall. Here are some comments:  
- Elena is an excellent teacher and has a great way of giving lectures. Her enthusiasm is infectious and made me want to learn more about the topics that she talked about. I also greatly enjoyed the ability to perform practical work, instead of just focusing on the theory. Being able to perform actual measurements using a device was a great learning experience.  
- Outstanding teacher, great lab tutorials.  
- Over all, one of the best courses I had.

---

**SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS**

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

The overall impression is very positive. The students found the course very interesting, as demonstrated by the average score 6.7 on question 1 (I worked with interesting issues). The students evaluated the course as challenging in a stimulating way (question 4) with the average score of 6.7. The students confirmed that they could practice and receive feedback without being graded (question 15) with the average score of 5.3. The students considered the assessment of the course to be fair and honest (question 16) with the average score of 7. The students answered that they were able to learn by collaborating and discussing with others (question 21) with the average score of 6. The students answered that they were able to get support if I needed it (question 22) with the average score of 6.7.

---

**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 was happy to see from the survey results that students liked the course.

---

**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 seems to be no significant differences between different groups of students.

---

**PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

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

Next, we plan to update both labs. In the long term, we will keep updating the course material with the new developments in the area of hardware security.

---