



Fakulteten för hälsa, natur- och teknikvetenskap

Kursanalys

Kursanalysen ska genomföras inom 3 veckor efter avslutad kurs. Lämnas till prefekt eller den som prefekt delegerar till.

OBS! För kurser inom lärarutbildningen och läraryftet används speciellt framtagna enkäter. Administreras av lärarutbildningen kansli.

Datum 2016-02-29			
Kurs Datasäkerhet I (Computer Security I)		Hp 7.5	Kurskod DVGC19
Programkurs X	Termin i program 7	Kursdatum/läsperiod LP4, 2015	
Fristående kurs			
Uppdragsutbildning	Sätt kryss!		
Antal registrerade på kurs 43	Antal besvarade kursvärderingsenkäter/deltagande vid muntlig kursutvärdering 24		
Hst 5,375	Hpr (efter 1 tentatillfälle) 4,03	Genomströmning (%) 75 %	Har kursens mål examinerats? Ja

Förändringar till detta kurstillfälle

Förändringar som planerats och genomförts sedan föregående kurstillfälles kursanalys

The course content was better coordinated with DVGC19 (Data Security I) and new labs were introduced.

Detta kurstillfälle, uppföljning

Studenternas synpunkter och sammanfattning av resultatet från kursvärdering (enkät samt ev muntlig)

The workload required for the course was fair.

Completely agree. Right as expected.	20,8%
I agree. The effort was just about right.	58,3%
I disagree. The effort was much higher than expected	20,8%

I disagree. The effort was much less than I expected.	0%
I don't know. I can't really say.	0%
I had a clear idea of the objectives of the course and what was expected from me.	
Completely agree. I was told at the start of the course.	16,7%
I agree. I have a good idea of the objectives of the course and its organization.	45,8%
I disagree. Sometimes I didn't know where I was heading to.	33,3%
Completely disagree. I had no idea of what I was doing.	0%
I can't really tell.	4,2%
The course content was relevant and interesting	
Completely agree. This course is really necessary.	37,5%
I agree. I understand why it is needed.	45,8%
Neutral. I don't know how this course could help my future.	8,3%
I disagree. I don't think it is relevant.	0%
I disagree. I don't think it is interesting.	8,3%
The lectures were at the right level.	
Completely agree. The level of detail on each lecture was close to perfect!	4,2%
I agree. Most lectures were at the right level.	66,7%
I don't agree or disagree.	8,3%
I disagree. Most lectures were too difficult to follow.	16,7%
I disagree. Most lectures were too easy and not challenging at all.	4,2%
The teachers were good at explaining things!	
Completely agree. They were very good at transmitting their knowledge.	12,5%
I agree. They are good teachers.	25%
I partially agree. Some were good but some were not.	58,3%
I disagree. Most teachers couldn't really explain the topics.	0%
Completely disagree. Going to lectures was a waste of time.	4,2%
I like the idea of muddy cards (the cards that you filled in the end of the lecture)!	
Completely agree! They offer a good way to get feedback!	16,7%
I agree. It is a good way to ask questions and get answers.	62,5%
I partially agree but the teachers spent too much time addressing these questions.	4,2%
I disagree. The teachers mostly ignore our feedback.	0%
Completely disagree. It is a waste of time.	12,5%
Not answered.	4,2%

What do you think about the difficulty of the five crypto lectures?

They were too hard, the material was too difficult to understand.	4,2%
They were hard, but I could understand the material with some effort.	29,2%
They were about right.	50%
They were easy, the lectures were enough for me to understand it all.	12,5%
They were too easy, the material was too basic.	4,2%

The assignments were helpful for understanding the course topic better

Completely agree. They were fundametal!	54,2%
I agree. They helped me.	45,8%
I disagree. Not really necessary.	0%
Completely disagree. They were a waste of time.	0%
I can't really say.	0%

The lab exercises were helpful for training my practical skills in Computer Security.

Completely agree. Hands-on exercises help me to better understand the theory.	33,3%
I agree. I could learn from doing it.	50%
I disagree. It don't think it is helpful.	8,3%
Completely disagree. I didn't learn anything.	4,2%
I can't really tell.	4,2%

Overall, I am satisfied with the course.

Completely agree!	12,5%
I agree.	66,7%
I don't agree or disagree.	12,5%
I disagree.	0%
No. I am not satisfied.	8,3%

What do you think was the best thing about this course? (all answers are anonymous)

- Getting to learn computer security.
- To get the general education on security
- The pragmatic approach - learning how to handle security instead of delving into the details of various encryption algorithms. Although that might had been interesting in itself, it would have been the wrong way to spend the time. So - I am really happy you made this change!
- For me this course was in the middle between applied and abstract but not enough to be truly applied in real world application or provide enough abstract content for useful theoretical analysis. Yet, I understand it is a step toward a 'bigger goal'. Regarding the evaluation, the grading of the assignment and/or labs could be better explained. I was nevertheless and overall good experience.
- I think it was that the course focuses on modern security and not the origin.

- There were a lot of helpful practical tips
- Learning important terminology
-
- The best with this course was the assignments!
- The assignments being related to the exam.
- Assignments were good because they reflected the exam.
- The assignments are a good idea
-
- The labs were very interesting and I would like to have more focus.
-
- Crypto revamp
- Hard problem is hard.
-
- Good teachers and reasonable assignment deadlines. Talking about morals and responsible use.
- * Great teachers --- very helpful/friendly and know their stuff
- * Interesting material (esp. crypto + networking tools)
- All the teachers in this course are great! Really learn a lot from those assignments! Great job!!

What do you think is most in need of improvement? (all answers are anonymous) (some names and expletives were replaced by text in italics and marked between "<<" ">>" signs).

- First of all i would like to see more examples on a whiteboard during lectures, it is much easier to understand in pictures instead of just the lecturer tells in words. Second the labs, this might be the worst labs during my time at this university. There was no time disposed for the labs, i mean lab 2, the deadline was the day after we got the specification. It wasn't that hard, but i don't think its ok that <lab supervisors> say the same day, "Oh, don't forget the deadline is today". The deadline wasn't specified in the specification! So the labs needs better specifications. Lab 1, have been good for DH, and crypto, but the most of the lab has been about to make library work (programming in c). On the school computers we can't install, which have lead to problem with the libraries.
- <lecturer> should make his slides available before lectures. His argument that it would ruin the learning is <not good>. Apart from that, he made a very good contribution to the course!
A little more structure to Simone's lectures would be a good thing.
Then there is the course book. It was said that it is very difficult to change the literature of a course. I don't accept that. It is your job, for God's sake, to see to that this is in order! I am not happy having spent that amount of money on a book that is not used. Stop being careless with other peoples money! What book should be used instead? It is your job to decide that - do it.
- More lab time in the lab rooms.
- More lab time. Maybe some more practical things on cryptography and hash functions.
- The labs and the exam must be communicated about much, much more clearly. For example, the assignments deal with some tasks that are pure discrete mathematics, how are we supposed to know to what extent this is part of the course? This kind of thing may make some people very deterred and nervous for the exam.
- A lot of things. Especially <lecturer's> lectures, they were totally terrible. I'm not a superstar on English but a lot of times I really could not understand a word what she said. Not much to do about the accent is really hard to understand. I did not learn much at all from them, better staying home and study by yourself. Lab1 client/server crypto sucked. I really mean it, it was terrible. If you want to test us/makes us learn crypto. Then don't tell us that "we should already know how to install multiple crypto libraries on lab computers that we do not av admin access on" when we have never done such thing in any course... The lab supervisors told us different things which made us change the code multiple times. The crypto part of the lab was only a very small thing. Not much u need to understand there. For me it was more about installing libraries and getting the client/server to work properly. Yet to this day were not finished with the lab. And worked on the lab until 15 minutes before the exam started. I mean... This lab is really a hell. So please, if we have done the crypto part which i think is most important, that should be it. Right now were working on to make the client rebootable while the server is running. We have worked on it for about 6 hours right after the exam, and we cannot solve it. My summary of this

lab is, this *<a bad>* lab.

- * better planning, upload the labs in the beginning of the course so you know how to use your time from the beginning. * it wasn't clear whether the labs and assignments were mandatory or not. * some labs required sitting on our own computers, but the lab spec didn't cover that. That made us sit and try with the lab computers in school just wasting time. * The lab spec were sometimes hard to understand and didn't cover things that was required from you.* Had a hard time understanding *<lecture's name>*'s English.
- * More exercises to process the material. * Always upload assignments directly after lectures
* Upload lab specification at least one week before the lab starts, such that one can plan his/her time better
- More detailed answers on the assignments/old exams.
- The first lab was a real pain. The crypto libraries was extremely hard to use in c, which we are used to code in. My suggestion is to either show exactly how you use the library or recommend us (students) to use a higher coding language like c++ or python.
- The moral talk can be a bit boring for those who never had any intention of using it for evil. It's a very important topic though and it wasn't bad in any way. I mean this in a "I got a free ice-cream, but it wasn't my favorite flavour" kind of way
- Would prefer to have a set hour in which the lectures start, instead of some days starting at 8:15 and others as late as 13:15.
- Install some encryption libraries on the lab computers. You shouldn't be forced to bring your own laptop to be able to do a lab.
- For me, the theory wasn't enough, but I guess that wasn't the focus of the course. Otherwise I enjoyed it.
- The privacy lectures, they need something more, an involving element or something like a lab but not a lab. The privacy lecture had the usual "any questions", which to be fair almost never works, which is on the students, but anyway.
- Explanation regarding the grading of labs.
- Lab came out same day as the deadline which was announced later that day. So information need to be sooner. Assignments 2. The assignments came out too late, I had to stress to get them done. So information need to be sooner. Assignments 1 facit. the facit was in such bad quality it was unreadable. There was too few labs with teachers/lab assistants. Also I think that I should state for lab 1 in the lab that do not do it in C because you need to download and install libraries that you don't have permission to do on school's computer. Also I think that the "client-server" code should be given. The lab is not about implementing that part right? Language and pronunciation. I'm having trouble to understand *<lecturer>* because of their english. I think they are good teachers but I'm having trouble understanding, and yes I know I can ask I did not hear you but that would result in me doing it constantly.

Den kursansvarige lärarens egna synpunkter och kommentarer på kursvärderingen

The course introduced completely new crypto lectures with a focus on modern and practical crypto, which was a good addition to the course and also well evaluated. The muddly cards were used once again. The positive response to the muddly cards of close to 80%, from 67% in the last sampling, indicates that they help the students. New labs were introduced and more thoroughly corrected. It created some tensions regarding the infrastructure of our lab, the version of the installed software, and the programming and troubleshooting skills of the students. The result was that some groups were delayed in handing in their lab exercises. The course book is indeed not ideal. The assignments proved very popular among the students.

Förslag till förändringar inför nästa kurstillfälle och förväntad effekt

Continuing to improve the coordination between Data Security I and II. Emphasize the security roadmap at the beginning of the course to show the students the links between the course topics to demonstrate the course

structure. Better explain the role of the assignments, the importance of attending and its mandatory character. Also, better communicate the structure of the labs in the introductory lecture and the importance of planning it well.	
Kursansvarig lärare, underskrift	Namnförtydligande
Student har beretts möjlighet att delta / har deltagit, student/ lärares underskrift	Namnförtydligande
Examinator har deltagit/taget del av, underskrift	Namnförtydligande