Report of evaluation: FS18 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) ($\alpha = 0.77$)

- Planning and Presentation: Mean: 3.54, Standard Deviation: 0.61
- Manners with Students: Mean: 3.91, Standard Deviation: 0.32
- Interest and Relevance: Mean: 3.56, Standard Deviation: 0.62
- Complexity and Scope: Mean: 3.56, Standard Deviation: 0.69

**Overall Assessment** (Skalenbreite: 6) ($\alpha = 0.84$)

- Overall Assessment: Mean: 5.37, Standard Deviation: 0.78

**Survey Results**

**Legend**

**Question text**

Absolute Frequencies of answers
Relative Frequencies of answers

**Histogram**

- Scale: 1 = Not true, 5 = True
- Mean: Average
- Median: Middle value
- Quantile: 25%, 50%, 75%

**Planning and Presentation**

1 The course follows a coherent structure.

- Not true: Mean: 3.53, Standard Deviation: 0.65
- True: Mean: 3.93, Standard Deviation: 0.33

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

- Not true: Mean: 3.62, Standard Deviation: 0.54
- True: Mean: 4.05, Standard Deviation: 0.43

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

- Not true: Mean: 3.80, Standard Deviation: 0.40
- True: Mean: 4.28, Standard Deviation: 0.29

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

- Not true: Mean: 3.57, Standard Deviation: 0.62
- True: Mean: 4.06, Standard Deviation: 0.41

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

- Not true: Mean: 3.38, Standard Deviation: 0.64
- True: Mean: 4.33, Standard Deviation: 0.23

6 There is overall enough material provided to assist the learning process (slides, course material, hand-outs, etc.).

- Not true: Mean: 3.36, Standard Deviation: 0.82
- True: Mean: 4.36, Standard Deviation: 0.20
7 The course materials (slides, course manuals, hand-outs, etc.) are overall of sufficient quality.

Manners with Students

8 The lecturer takes students seriously.

9 The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students.

10 The lecturer addresses questions and suggestions from students adequately.

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

Interest and Relevance

12 The lecturer succeeds in making the course interesting.

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

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

15 The lecturer fosters my interest in the subject.

Complexity and Scope

16 The degree of complexity of the course is:

17 The scope of the course is:

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

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

n=44
av.=3.61
md=4
dev.=0.72

20 How would you grade the course as a whole?

n=44
av.=5.05
md=5
dev.=0.78

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

n=47
av.=5.68
md=6
dev.=0.75

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

n=45
av.=5.36
md=5.8
dev.=0.8

23 The course has taught me

- very little
- little
- this or that
- a lot
- an awful lot

n=47
av.=4.19
dev.=0.61

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

- 0h
- less than 2h
- 2 to 4h
- 4 to 6h
- more than 6h

n=47

25 Was the topic of interest to you?

- not at all
- slightly
- fairly
- quite a lot

n=41

26 How many lectures did you miss?

- none
- 1 - 2
- 3 - 4
- more than 4

n=46
27 If you missed more than 2 lectures, please give one reason:

- lack of interest: 1
- course overlap: 3
- illness etc.: 4
- course manual/required reading suffices for exam preparation: 8
- other reasons: 11

n=27

28 Allocation of the course in your study programme:

- mono subject/Major/Hauptfach: 29
- Minor/Nebenfach: 14
- complementary or specialization course: 3

n=46

29 Your current number of semesters?

- 1: 0
- 2: 21
- 3: 0
- 4: 14
- 5: 1
- 6: 6
- 7: 0
- 8: 2
- 9: 0
- 10: 2
- higher than 10: 1

n=47

30 Sex

- female: 6
- male: 31
- n/a: 2

n=39

Assessment of Individual Lectures

8.1 Introduction

- strongly agree: 44
- strongly disagree: 3

n=44

av.=2.77
md=3
dev.=0.83

8.2 OO Design Principles

- strongly agree: 44
- strongly disagree: 3

n=44

av.=3.34
md=3
dev.=0.64

8.3 Design by Contract

- strongly agree: 44
- strongly disagree: 3

n=44

av.=3.45
md=4
dev.=0.66

8.4 A Testing Framework

- strongly agree: 42
- strongly disagree: 2

n=42

av.=3.48
md=4
dev.=0.74
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>n=47</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The course follows a coherent structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The wider context of the subject matter is sufficiently elucidated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The lecturer expresses him-/herself clearly and comprehensibly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The course provides an adequate overview of the subject matter treated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The design of the course contributes to an understanding of the subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 There is overall enough material provided to assist the learning process (slides, course material, hand-outs, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The course materials (slides, course manuals, hand-outs, etc.) are overall of sufficient quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manners with Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>n=47</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 The lecturer takes students seriously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 The lecturer addresses questions and suggestions from students adequately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 The lecturer seems to care about his/her students’ progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interest and Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>n=46</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 The lecturer succeeds in making the course interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The course is probably very useful for my future professional life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The applicability and relevance of the subject matter is sufficiently clarified by the lecturer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 The lecturer fosters my interest in the subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Complexity and Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Far Too Low/ Narrow</th>
<th>Far Too High/ Wide</th>
<th>n=46</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 The degree of complexity of the course is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 The scope of the course is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18 The pace of the course is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>far too low/narrow</th>
<th>far too high/wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=44 av.=3.39 md=3.00 dev=0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 The amount of knowledge presupposed by the course is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>far too low/narrow</th>
<th>far too high/wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=44 av.=3.61 md=4.00 dev=0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Assessment

20 How would you grade the course as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=44 av.=5.05 md=5.00 dev=0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=47 av.=5.68 md=6.00 dev=0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=45 av.=5.36 md=5.00 dev=0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment of Individual Lectures

8.1 Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=44 av.=2.77 md=3.00 dev=0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 OO Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=44 av.=3.34 md=3.00 dev=0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Design by Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=44 av.=3.45 md=4.00 dev=0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4 A Testing Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=42 av.=3.48 md=4.00 dev=0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5 Debugging and Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=42 av.=2.88 md=3.00 dev=0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6 Iterative Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=42 av.=3.19 md=3.00 dev=0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.7 Inheritance and Refactoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=43 av.=3.12 md=3.00 dev=0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.8 GUI Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=42 av.=2.81 md=3.00 dev=0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.9 Advanced Design Lab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=39 av.=2.74 md=3.00 dev=0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.10 Guidelines, Idioms and Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=42 av.=3.26 md=3.00 dev=0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.11 A bit of C++

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=44 av.=2.41 md=2.00 dev=0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.12 A bit of Smalltalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=42 av.=2.69 md=3.00 dev=0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.13 Einblicke in die Praxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=36 av.=2.78 md=3.00 dev=0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Skalenbreite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Presentation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manners with Students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Relevance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity and Scope</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Open Questions

**What did you like about the course?**

- It was a lot of information & very good teaching.
- It showed a lot about practices in real personal work.

- Thank you. Great lecture.

- Lots of Examples

- *Podcasts and Exercises*  

- Podcasts were reliable (on time).  
  - Present good, better than 2016.  
- Exercises were challenging but fulfilling.
Very clear and concise presentation by the instructor (much better than in "Einführung in die Informatik"). Maybe this is because of the language. The lecturer really seems to enjoy/love OOP.

The question at the end of the slide is interesting.

Pleasant voice.

"Gute Didaktik!"

Worth the efforts.

Exercises contain very very much work.

Very strict correction.
It was interesting

Coding
IDE insights, tips, tricks

Mr. Nierstrasz is an excellent prof. for computer science. Seriously!

I learned so much and it was cool to feel like I was a good programmer and the program worked.

Professor seems to enjoy teaching.

I liked that there were a lot of running examples. The exercises were fun. The guest lecture was also a great insight in the process.

Podcast

Small talk, at first I was extremely confused but after a bit I was surprised how easy and funny small talk is. The assistants were very supportive which helped a lot.
Very interesting and useful.

The exercises taught me a lot and the assistant gave useful feedback with care.

The thematic
What did you not like about the course?

Things were mentioned more than once (e.g., Cock Smith, DBC)
8) In lecture: Yes  Exercise and feed back: No

Friday afternoon is a rather tiring time for such a lecture (but can't be helped)

A lot of homework, especially for someone only doing CS as a minor.

A lot of time for the exercises
- The exam is kinda "Bureaucratic"
It was way too much. If you regard that this is only 5 points!

- Quiet long exercises not always related to the lecture
- Exercise instruction contained quiet a lot of missing or unclear instructions

Advanced Design Lab
- Huge exercise workload → relevance of exercises for exam

Exercises did take too much time
Some exercises were a bit too big, not only a little.

Exercises too much

that 2 new programming languages come one after another

Not clear what to learn. What is important?

The exercises were too intense for getting only SECTS.
Time: It was only my afternoon and in on the way back to the office.

The exercises for the test run were too broad and most of the time not specified clearly.

smalltalk, too fast and not entirely explained. impossible to learn sufficiently

Not well worked together with the P1 course. Neither assistant nor the lecturer seemed to know what we did there. Assistants and lecturer also didn’t coordinate well.

Some topics are covered multiple times (invariants, code smells, refactoring)

Exercise should be more streamlined or hours better distributed. Lab. podcasts not always on time.
Suggestions for improvements?

I would have liked to learn more about 1/0 means or maybe multiplication. Not of course the lecture is only a prep for later lectures.

DBC mentioned in the first lecture, I didn’t understand it - after third lecture was no problem to stay in the program instead of talking always of all a bit - but overall really good notes.

- Presentations of the exercise hours on podcast would be nice!

The exercises take a lot of time so it would be nice if they count as a part of the grade.

Since the exercises are such an essential part they should count towards the final grade (~20-30%)}
exercises too hard.

Please upload old exams

Suggest more specific exercises
I would like for the exam not to be so early on. I wished I had at least a week to study. And getting the test is super stressful.

Less Exercises. Pool session could be more organized. Sometimes one student took up 20 minutes of someone's time so I had to wait for 7 minutes for a 2 minute
Better structure, overview of all lessons.
Mock test or some sample questions, or old tests.

Less exercises for the tests.
Better coordination, a bit more help for people who haven't programmed all their life, nicer comments and better explaining where to get information.

clarify more why patterns are useful and give practical examples.

Maybe more of a focus on UML for patterns, more small examples in slides, evaluation not after exams but in a lecture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale width</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Presentation (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manners with Students (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Relevance (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity and Scope (S)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment (S)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dev. = Std. Dev.