Report of evaluation: FS17 Programmierung 2 (2417)

Dear Prof. Dr. Nierstrasz

Please find here the results of the evaluation of your course Programmierung 2. Following the scanning of the questionnaires, this report was automatically generated and mailed to you.

The questionnaire used was PN-P2.V1. In the report, you first see the mean values of the following dimensions:

- Planning and Presentation (Skalenbreite: 4)
- Manners with Students (Skalenbreite: 4)
- Interest and Relevance (Skalenbreite: 4)
- Complexity and Scope (Skalenbreite: 5)
- Overall Assessment (Skalenbreite: 6)

In the second part of the report, you see the answers to all the questions. The number of answers, the mean value and the values differing from it are also given.

Grade 1 equals the lowest grade given by the students, grade 4 or more the highest grade (unless a question is reversed). In 'complexity and scope' grade 3 corresponds to 'exactly right' and is therefore the best grade. In the overall assessment of the Course, grade 6 means the best result.

We hope that this report helps you to analyse your course. Please briefly discuss the results with your students before the end of the semester.

In case you wish to learn more about how to improve your teaching, you might want to discuss the results with the staff of the 'Hochschuldidaktik' (mail address: hd@zuw.unibe.ch). Please bring a copy of the report with you, since the staff of Hochschuldidaktik do not have access to evaluation results.

You might find guidelines, regulations and information about the process under www.lehrveranstaltungsevaluation.unibe.ch (documents in German).

Should you need more information, you may also contact us by e-mail.

Kind regards
Daniela Wuillemin
Vice-rectorate of quality
Overall indicators

Planning and Presentation (Skalenbreite: 4) ($\alpha = 0.84$)

Manners with Students (Skalenbreite: 4) ($\alpha = 0.66$)

Interest and Relevance (Skalenbreite: 4) ($\alpha = 0.76$)

Complexity and Scope (Skalenbreite: 5) ($\alpha = 0.74$)

Overall Assessment (Skalenbreite: 6) ($\alpha = 0.66$)

Survey Results

Legend

Question text

Absolute Frequencies of answers

Relative Frequencies of answers

Scale

Histogram

Planning and Presentation

1 The course follows a coherent structure.

2 The wider context of the subject matter is sufficiently elucidated.

3 The lecturer expresses him-/herself clearly and comprehensibly.

4 The course provides an adequate overview of the subject matter treated.

5 The design of the course contributes to an understanding of the subject matter.

6 There is overall enough material provided to assist the learning process (slides, course material, hand-outs, etc.).
The course materials (slides, course manuals, handouts, etc.) are overall of sufficient quality.

Manners with Students

The lecturer takes students seriously.

The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students.

The lecturer addresses questions and suggestions from students adequately.

The lecturer seems to care about his/her students' progress.

Interest and Relevance

The lecturer succeeds in making the course interesting.

The course is probably very useful for my future professional life.

The applicability and relevance of the subject matter is sufficiently clarified by the lecturer.

The lecturer fosters my interest in the subject.

Complexity and Scope

The degree of complexity of the course is:

The scope of the course is:

The pace of the course is:
19 The amount of knowledge presupposed by the course is:

- far too low/narrow: 4.5% (2)
- far too high/wide: 63.6% (28)
- too low/narrow: 4.4% (2)
- too high/wide: 27.3% (12)
- too low/narrow or too high/wide: 4.5% (2)
- neither too low/narrow nor too high/wide: 0% (0)

n=44
av.=3.32
md=3
dev.=0.64

Overall Assessment

20 How would you grade the course as a whole?

- 1: 2.2% (1)
- 2: 2.2% (1)
- 3: 2.2% (1)
- 4: 33.3% (15)
- 5: 62.2% (28)

n=45
av.=5.09
md=5
dev.=0.85

21 How would you grade the lecturer with regard to subject expertise?

- 1: 0% (0)
- 2: 0% (0)
- 3: 0% (0)
- 4: 20% (9)
- 5: 80% (36)

n=45
av.=5.8
md=6
dev.=0.4

22 How would you grade the lecturer with regard to teaching methods?

- 1: 0% (0)
- 2: 2.2% (1)
- 3: 2.2% (1)
- 4: 33.3% (15)
- 5: 62.2% (28)

n=45
av.=5.56
md=6
dev.=0.66

23 The course has taught me

- very little: 0% (0)
- little: 0% (0)
- this or that: 0% (0)
- a lot: 30% (30)
- an awful lot: 8% (8)

n=45
av.=4.02
md=5
dev.=0.58

Socio-demographic Data and Background Variables

24 How many hours per week did you invest in preparation and revision for the course (on average)?

- 0h: 0% (0)
- less than 2h: 0% (0)
- 2 to 4h: 4% (1)
- 4 to 6h: 42% (18)
- more than 6h: 42% (20)

n=42

25 Was the topic of interest to you?

- not at all: 0% (0)
- slightly: 4.8% (2)
- fairly: 30.4% (14)
- quite a lot: 64.4% (28)

n=42

26 How many lectures did you miss?

- none: 29.5% (13)
- 1 - 2: 22.7% (21)
- 3 - 4: 13.6% (6)
- more than 4: 8.9% (4)

n=44
27 If you missed more than 2 lectures, please give one reason:

- lack of interest: 1
- course overlap: 3
- illness etc.: 1
- course manual/required reading suffices for exam preparation: 2
- other reasons: 8

28 Allocation of the course in your study programme:

- mono subject/Major/Hauptfach: 25
- Minor/Nebenfach: 16
- complementary or specialization course: 1

29 Your current number of semesters?

- 1: 3
- 2: 20
- 3: 3
- 4: 10
- 5: 1
- 6: 1
- 7: 0
- 8: 3
- 9: 1
- 10: 1
- higher than 10: 1

30 Sex

- female: 14
- male: 26
- n/a: 1

Assessment of Individual Lectures

8.1 Introduction

- strongly disagree: 9.1%
- strongly agree: 54.2%

8.2 OO Design Principles

- strongly disagree: 2.8%
- strongly agree: 38.2%

8.3 Design by Contract

- strongly disagree: 0%
- strongly agree: 50%

8.4 A Testing Framework

- strongly disagree: 0%
- strongly agree: 68.6%
8.5 Debugging and Tools

8.6 Iterative Development

8.7 Inheritance and Refactoring

8.8 GUI Construction

8.9 Advanced Design Lab

8.10 Guidelines, Idioms and Patterns

8.11 A bit of C++

8.12 A bit of Smalltalk

8.13 Einblicke in die Praxis
## Profile

**Subunit:** Phil.-nat. Fakultät  
**Name of the instructor:** Prof. Dr. Oscar Marius Nierstrasz  
**Name of the course:** Programmierung 2

Values used in the profile line: Mean

### Planning and Presentation

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | The course follows a coherent structure. | not true | true | n=46  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.61 md=4.00 dev.=0.54 |
| 2 | The wider context of the subject matter is sufficiently elucidated. | not true | true | n=41  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.59 md=4.00 dev.=0.59 |
| 3 | The lecturer expresses him-/herself clearly and comprehensibly. | not true | true | n=44  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.73 md=4.00 dev.=0.54 |
| 4 | The course provides an adequate overview of the subject matter treated. | not true | true | n=43  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.44 md=3.00 dev.=0.59 |
| 5 | The design of the course contributes to an understanding of the subject matter. | not true | true | n=44  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.45 md=4.00 dev.=0.66 |
| 6 | There is overall enough material provided to assist the learning process (slides, course material, hand-outs, etc.). | not true | true | n=44  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.59 md=4.00 dev.=0.62 |
| 7 | The course materials (slides, course manuals, hand-outs, etc.) are overall of sufficient quality. | not true | true | n=45  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.60 md=4.00 dev.=0.62 |

### Manners with Students

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8 | The lecturer takes students seriously. | not true | true | n=45  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.93 md=4.00 dev.=0.25 |
| 9 | The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students. | not true | true | n=44  
|   |   |   |   | av.=4.00 md=4.00 dev.=0.00 |
| 10 | The lecturer addresses questions and suggestions from students adequately. | not true | true | n=44  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.95 md=4.00 dev.=0.21 |
| 11 | The lecturer seems to care about his/her students' progress. | not true | true | n=45  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.82 md=4.00 dev.=0.44 |

### Interest and Relevance

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12 | The lecturer succeeds in making the course interesting. | not true | true | n=46  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.50 md=4.00 dev.=0.66 |
| 13 | The course is probably very useful for my future professional life. | not true | true | n=42  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.67 md=4.00 dev.=0.65 |
| 14 | The applicability and relevance of the subject matter is sufficiently clarified by the lecturer. | not true | true | n=46  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.54 md=4.00 dev.=0.66 |
| 15 | The lecturer fosters my interest in the subject. | not true | true | n=45  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.51 md=4.00 dev.=0.69 |

### Complexity and Scope

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16 | The degree of complexity of the course is: | far too low/ narrow | far too high/ wide | n=44  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.39 md=3.00 dev.=0.58 |
| 17 | The scope of the course is: | far too low/ narrow | far too high/ wide | n=41  
|   |   |   |   | av.=3.29 md=3.00 dev.=0.56 |
18 The pace of the course is:

- far too low/narrow
- far too high/wide

n=42  av.=3.26  md=3.00  dev.=0.54

19 The amount of knowledge presupposed by the course is:

- far too low/narrow
- far too high/wide

n=44  av.=3.32  md=3.00  dev.=0.64

Overall Assessment

20 How would you grade the course as a whole?

1  6

n=45  av.=5.09  md=5.00  dev.=0.85

21 How would you grade the lecturer with regard to subject expertise?

1  6

n=45  av.=5.80  md=6.00  dev.=0.40

22 How would you grade the lecturer with regard to teaching methods?

1  6

n=45  av.=5.56  md=6.00  dev.=0.66

Assessment of Individual Lectures

8.1 Introduction

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=33  av.=2.76  md=3.00  dev.=0.83

8.2 OO Design Principles

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=36  av.=3.28  md=3.00  dev.=0.74

8.3 Design by Contract

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=34  av.=3.38  md=3.50  dev.=0.70

8.4 A Testing Framework

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=35  av.=3.63  md=4.00  dev.=0.60

8.5 Debugging and Tools

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=32  av.=3.31  md=3.00  dev.=0.59

8.6 Iterative Development

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=33  av.=3.06  md=3.00  dev.=0.70

8.7 Inheritance and Refactoring

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=34  av.=2.88  md=3.00  dev.=0.64

8.8 GUI Construction

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=34  av.=2.65  md=3.00  dev.=0.98

8.9 Advanced Design Lab

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=32  av.=2.41  md=3.00  dev.=1.01

8.10 Guidelines, Idioms and Patterns

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=34  av.=3.32  md=3.00  dev.=0.68

8.11 A bit of C++

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=36  av.=2.56  md=3.00  dev.=0.91

8.12 A bit of Smalltalk

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=36  av.=2.86  md=3.00  dev.=0.90

8.13 Einblicke in die Praxis

- strongly disagree
- strongly agree

n=30  av.=3.00  md=3.00  dev.=0.83
### Profile Line for Indicators

**Subunit:** Phil.-nat. Fakultät  
**Name of the instructor:** Prof. Dr. Oscar Marius Nierstrasz  
**Name of the course:** Programmierung 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Skalenbreite</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Mean (av.)</th>
<th>Deviation (dev.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Presentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manners with Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Relevance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity and Scope</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments Report

Open Questions

What did you like about the course?

A great professor that really loves his subject.

Introduction to design patterns.

A lot of real life stuff to learn that will actually use.

Loved the lectures. Lecturer showed a lot of passion while talking about the different themes.

Good structure, cool exercises.

- The lecturer has excellent speaking abilities, the course was always so interesting to listen to.
- Assistant did take time to answer questions.
- I have learned lots of things that (as far as I may think) have practical relevance.
- Great lecture.

Many examples.
The lecture showed programming on a level I had no experience in before. I like the idea of trying to find out how to work on a program and in terms of structural procedure and less on syntax and semantics.

Powerpoint was very good and the extra slides were repeating the lecture easier.

Programming

Relevance

Partial application & exercises

Interesting and important for the future I guess.
- Slides with explanations

You could really see that the lecturer knows a lot about it and also is really passionate about the topics.

The professor was a pleasure to listen to, even though I had P2 before. The lecturer and his lectures made it charming for me to listen to.

Taught me about test-driven design, how to write properly.
The correction of the exercises is really really well done! I learned a lot from the feedback I got and I saw that the assistant (Mathieu) really went through our code and tried to give good and constructive comments.

The lecturer was very nice and he explained the things very good.

Very interesting

presentation and style of teaching
What did you not like about the course?

The exercises were really hard, yet I learned a lot but the time was not there.

Java

Programming is way too much. Quizzes took me about 20 hours in one week. And then for the exam learn all these material for this and that is too much.

Maybe do some exam and exercise, passed a course passed and no exam.

All the dudes lecturing for one or two or three times were not as good as

The exercises were in my opinion to complex and I had to put a lot of work to succeed. It's really difficult if you only have knowledge from the course.
although the exercises were good, they were also kind of difficult sometimes.

- the exercises and the course content should better fit each other, at the beginning of the semester, this was the case of the CED and
- it would have been great is there was an practical (not just theoretical) exercise about CED
- the amount of work for the exercises was far out the SPECTS!

The advanced design lab's lecture didn't help me at all! It was very slow and nobody really participated so it was boring.

The lectures that were not with Prof. Dr. Nonstrace were harder to understand and seemed less informative.

It would have been interesting to also discuss other design principles and languages other than CED.

The exercises used a lot of time. I work 40% and an exercise difficulty -> test + ex.

way too much exercises relative to other courses (40-90 a week! mil)
- exercises too complex and too many
- long waiting times for corrections

The exercises are far too hard and used very much time. This course should be here to teach students how to code, but I often felt like I should already have been programming for a long time or teach it myself. Also the lectures with the assistant were not good at all.
The design lab was not interesting and the example wasn’t good. In addition, some input tasks didn't make sense.

The exercises are very time consuming even if you have programming experience. The last task was not used at all. The outline on other programming languages was not necessary I guess.

The homework were a little bit to hard.

Some task in the exercise were a bit unclear.
the exercises were too hard and sometimes doesn’t have much to do with the lecture

Suggestions for improvements?

the last two exercises should be canceled or just every two weeks one
I would start earlier with C++ and Smalltalk to show us that these principles can be applied more generally than just in Java. Maybe even including C++ something to see what works there and what doesn't. Would be cool, maybe set it up in the Dr. No struct configuration.

Less exercises?
Balanced time requirements of the exercises they varied widely. More than attending exercise hours, in one I had to wait 7/5 of the time I didn't have time for me.

Create this course by the exercises not by a written exam where we just have to memorize things I don't really understand them.

The exercises take a lot of time. Maybe the exercises could partly count for the exam.

Less exercises but more time to do them properly
Less exercises.

Exercise to implement simple GUI

Exercise should guide to lecture

I think the C++ part was not as well as the rest of the course. I lacked some explanations and could not really follow.
Adjust some of the lab sides to be more descriptive.
Friday lecture from 14:00 - 16:00 is torture.

- Lecture and exercise close together from the theme.
- At least two weeks before the exam a student should
  rather focus on studying than the exercises.
### EvaSys Evaluation

**Programmierung 2**

Responses = 47 questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale Width</th>
<th>Mean (Ø)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (dev.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Presentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manners with Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Relevance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity and Scope</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dev.=Std. Dev.