

Previous year's course evaluation

**TDDE62 - Information Security:
Privacy, System and Network Security**

Gurjot Singh

*Division of Cybersecurity (CYBER) at the
Department of Computer and Information Science (IDA)*

Previous year's course evaluation

The course was offered for the second time last year.

- Overall score last year was 3.13 (out of 5)

Scores of all evaluation items available at:

<https://admin.evaluate.liu.se/search?lang=en>

Student Comments: Points of Concern

Course Content and Scope

“The course slides contain too much information and cover too many topics.”

- **Response:** The slides are intentionally detailed, as they also serve as the primary lecture notes and reading material for the course, avoiding the need for an extensive external textbook.

“It would have been more helpful to just focus on one aspect of each segment and dive deep into that aspect.”

- **Response:** The course is designed to provide a broad overview of multiple information security domains, in line with its scope covering privacy, system, and network security.

Student Comments: Points of Concern

Slide Quality and Language Issues

“The grammatical structure of most slides was either wrong or completely hard to follow.” and “The English on the slides is not always correct.”

- **Response:** These issues were mainly related to the privacy module; future lectures will be delivered by a different lecturer, who will also revise and update the slides to improve clarity and language quality.

“Things on the exam are not stated in the slides.”

- **Response:** The topic was covered verbally during the lecture; however, future examinations will avoid questions that are not clearly supported by the slides and the provided course literature.

Student Comments: Points of Concern

Privacy Section Needs Improvement

“The privacy part was the worst of them.”

“The privacy-related lectures were unclear.”

“The privacy part is the most difficult part on the entire exam.”

Response: The previous lecturer has been replaced, the slides will be revised for clarity, and the privacy lectures will now be delivered in person rather than through recordings to improve engagement and understanding.

Student Comments: Points of Concern

Laboratory Design and Relevance

“The labs were generally unbalanced.” and “The firewall lab is very time consuming.” and “The second lab is basically 4 lines of code that takes under one hour.”

- **Response:** *The firewall lab is inherently more extensive because it involves implementing a full firewall configuration and assessing it within a realistic network context, whereas the IDS lab focuses on writing and testing detection rules, tasks that are shorter by design but still central to understanding network intrusion detection.*

“It would be really fun to have a day of playing red/blue team.”

- **Response:** The course is designed to provide foundational knowledge for students with diverse backgrounds, while more advanced hands-on activities such as red/blue team exercises are offered in the Ethical Hacking course running this semester, which includes extensive laboratory work focused on practical attack and defence skills.

Student Comments: Points of Concern

Exam Structure and Alignment

“The examination was split into four parts... it felt more about luck.”

- **Response:** The exam structure reflects the equal importance of each course component and aims to assess learning outcomes across all key topics.

“Practically every year is a different exam.”

- **Response:** As the course evolves, the exam format may change, but the primary objective of assessing the intended learning outcomes remains consistent.

“The exam is a little bit of a side quest from labs.”

- **Response:** The exam focuses on assessing conceptual understanding, while the labs are designed to develop practical skills that support those theoretical foundations.

Student Comments: Points of Concern

Workload vs Credits

“For 4 ECTS on the exam it is too much mandatory literature to read.”

- **Response:** *This is a 6 ECTS course, and the literature is intended to support both the examination and the laboratory work by providing the necessary theoretical background. To better guide students, page numbers have now been added to the literature list to limit and clarify the expected reading.*

“Many students spent a lot of time for very little relevant learning.”

- **Response:** *The course is designed to balance theoretical knowledge and practical skills, and the course page specifies 114 hours of recommended self-study. At master’s level, additional independent study is expected to fully understand the concepts.*

Student Comments: Positive Feedback

Labs Were Useful (Overall)

- “The labs were good!”
- “The labs were pretty good for understanding the workings of network and TPM.”
- “Lab 1 and 2 were clearly formulated.”

Strong Lectures (Especially Networking / OS Security)

- “Some lectures were good, specifically networking and OS security.”
- “Ulf’s lectures were really good.”
- “Ulf’s slides are good and helped me learn a lot.”

Course Structure and Topic Flow

- “I liked the selected topics and how they worked together to expand on the basic security course.”
- “I like the course and dividing the lectures into three parts, containing different topics with their specific labs.”