# 9 responses

View all responses     Publish analytics

## Summary

### How did the course meet your learning objectives?



| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Not met: 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **6** | 66.7% |
| Fully met: 5 | **3** | 33.3% |

### Comments and suggestions

Very good course. I enjoyed it.

more topics and slides, less time on labs (provide partial solutions to complete, instead of empty templates)

Excellent pacing, packed with useful material, enjoyable labs

### How was the duration of the course?

## Comments and suggestions

Perfect duration. More than five days would have been too long

The first day could absolutely be shortened down...

## How useful was the lecture document?



| Not useful.: 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **1** | 11.1% |
| 4 | **1** | 11.1% |
| Very useful: 5 | **7** | 77.8% |

## Comments and suggestions

I'll keep it on my desktop

Great slides and labs, will keep for future reference

It could include more code examples, but at the same time you have to learn more how to look at the sources..

## How knowledgeable was the instructor?

|  | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **4** | 44.4% |
| More than enough: 5 | **5** | 55.6% |

## Comments and suggestions

Instructor was knowledgeable about a wide range of fields

## How much value did the instructor add to lecture materials?



|  | | |
|---|---|---|
| Not much added value: 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **4** | 44.4% |
| A lot of added value: 5 | **5** | 55.6% |

## Suggestions and comments

The instructor is passionate about Linux and open source software, and it showed in his depth of knowledge and experience

The lecturer had a tendency to be derailed by non relevant questions at times.

## Was the instructor helpful with practical labs?

| Not much: 1 | **0** | 0% |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **3** | 33.3% |
| Very helpful: 5 | **6** | 66.7% |

## Comments and suggestions

We received ample assistance during the practical labs

## How useful were the training labs?



| Not useful: 1 | **0** | 0% |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **4** | 44.4% |
| Very useful: 5 | **5** | 55.6% |

## Comments and suggestions

The hands on experience was useful

## How difficult were the training labs?

| Too easy: 1 | **0** | 0% |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | **2** | 22.2% |
| 3 | **4** | 44.4% |
| 4 | **2** | 22.2% |
| Too difficult: 5 | **1** | 11.1% |

## Comments and suggestions

provide partial solutions instead of starting from scratch

The labs could be increased in difficulty; perhaps it would be useful to have one very long lab instead of several short ones

I would have liked a bit more "If you have time, look at this" materials in the labs. I liked that the labs were not just a list om instructions, but forced you to search in the documentation and kernel source.

## Was enough time dedicated to practical labs?



| Definitely not enough: 1 | **0** | 0% |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | **2** | 22.2% |
| 3 | **4** | 44.4% |
| 4 | **3** | 33.3% |
| Definitely too much time for labs: 5 | **0** | 0% |

## Comments and suggestions

There was a good balance between labs and lectures

in case there are participants with different starting knowledge, I recommend to have different levels/difficulties like basic/medium/advanced. in cmay case, making the exercise with the solution (the code) would have been however very good.

## How do you rate training conditions (room size, equipment, environment)?



| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Poor: 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **3** | 33.3% |
| Very good: 5 | **6** | 66.7% |

## Comments and suggestions

Conditions were good

## How do you rate the training equipment (mainly computers)?



| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Poor.: 1 | **0** | 0% |

|   |   |   |
|--:|:-:|--:|
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **1** | 11.1% |
| 4 | **3** | 33.3% |
| Very good.: 5 | **5** | 55.6% |

## Comments and suggestions

| |
|---|
| kind of low resolution laptops |
| Computers were fine |
| Some minor hardware issues with the usb-hub. |

## How well was the course organized (program, registration, schedule...)?



|   |   |   |
|--:|:-:|--:|
| Not well: 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **1** | 11.1% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **1** | 11.1% |
| Very well: 5 | **7** | 77.8% |

## Comments and suggestions

| |
|---|
| good to have an open end to complete labs if required |
| -1 for the registration procedure. I had expected an on-line form and a credit card. Not 2-3 forms sent via e-mail and a bank transfer. |

## How much did you learn?

A lot: 5 **4** 44.4%

## Comments and suggestions

I could have learned even more if I knew less beforehand

## How useful should this course be in your daily job?



| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Not useful: 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **3** | 33.3% |
| 4 | **4** | 44.4% |
| Very useful.: 5 | **2** | 22.2% |

## Comments and suggestions

I wish I could spend more time on linux at work

## What part(s) of the course did you like most?

first part starting the board :)

All Parts was good

presentations

Kernel building and loading, serial, I2C

the labs

## What part(s) of the course did you like least?

Thursday and Friday had some idle time (more presentations, please)

Some topics were glossed over but not actually put to use (threading for example). This is an important topic which should probably be added to the labs

that the trainer should not always answer all questions directly. Some, more of topic, should perhaps be answered afterwards.

## Overall rating



| Very disappointing: 1 | **0** | 0% |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **0** | 0% |
| 5 | **1** | 11.1% |
| 6 | **6** | 66.7% |
| Excellent: 7 | **2** | 22.2% |

## Comments and suggestions

## Further training needs?

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| No: 1 | **0** | 0% |  |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |  |
| 3 | **2** | 22.2% |  |
| 4 | **3** | 33.3% |  |
| Yes, definitely: 5 | **4** | 44.4% |  |

## Comments

1. Kernel debugging and instrumentation (lots of ways to get debugging and performance info from the kernel, would like to know which) 2. Kernel security (LSM, permissions, roles) 3. Android kernel development and security

## How far do you come from?

|  |  |  |
|---|---|---|
| From less than 100 km / 60 miles | **0** | 0% |
| From more than 100 km / 60 miles, same country | **1** | 11.1% |
| From a foreign country | **8** | 88.9% |

## What reasons prompted you to choose Free Electrons?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Geographi... | 5 | 55.6% |
| Availability... | 0 | 0% |
| Trainer | 2 | 22.2% |
| Open traini... | 7 | 77.8% |
| Language | 5 | 55.6% |
| | 3 | 33.3% |
| Hardware... | 1 | 11.1% |
| Access to f... | 0 | 0% |
| Cost | 0 | 0% |
| Not applic... | 1 | 11.1% |
| Other | | |

0.0    1.5    3.0    4.5    6.0



22.2%

77.8%

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Course recommended by previous participants | 0 | 0% |
| Internet search engines | 7 | 77.8% |
| Technical resources on the Free Electrons website | 2 | 22.2% |
| Presentations in conferences | 0 | 0% |
| Free Electrons chosen by my management | 0 | 0% |
| Other | 0 | 0% |

**Interested in other types of embedded Linux / Android engineering services?**

## Comments and expectations

# Number of daily responses