Report of evaluation: FS19 Programmierung 2 (2417)

Dear Mr./Mrs. 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 appropriate to the course type Vorlesung. In the report, you first see the mean values of the most important dimensions:

- Conveying the course content
- Course materials to assist Learning
- Commitment of the lecturer
- Complexity and Scope
- Assessment of Individual Lectures

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 on the left hand side equals the lowest grade given by the students, grade 5 or more on the right hand side the highest grade. 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.

The free comments at the end of the questionnaire are only read by the lecturer him/herself and won't be evaluated statistically. Please don't pay much attention to negative statements of single persons. You are to look closely in case of frequent occurrence of similar comments.

Please briefly discuss the results with your students before the end of the semester. You will find a presentation template on the last pages of the report. By giving serious consideration to the feedback of the students, you can contribute to higher future response rate.

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.

Yours sincerely

D. Wuillemin
Evaluation office
Vice-rectorate of teaching
1. Conveying the course content (α = 0.76)

1.1) The course follows a coherent structure.

1.2) The wider context of the subject matter is sufficiently elucidated.

1.3) The lecturer expresses him-/herself clearly and comprehensibly.

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

1.5) The design of the course contributes to an understanding of the subject matter.
2. Course materials to assist Learning

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

2.2) The course materials (slides, course manuals, hand-outs, etc.) are overall of sufficient quality.

3. Commitment of the lecturer

3.1) The lecturer takes students seriously.

3.2) The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students.

3.3) The lecturer addresses questions and suggestions from students adequately.

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

4. Complexity and Scope

4.1) The degree of difficulty of the course is:

4.2) The amount of content of the course is:

4.3) The pace of the course is:

4.4) The amount of knowledge presupposed by the course is:

5. Overall Assessment

5.1) How would you grade the course as a whole?
5.2) How would you grade the lecturer with regard to subject expertise?

![](chart1.png)

5=excellent

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

6.1) 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

6.2) Was the topic of interest to you?

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

6.3) How many lectures did you miss?

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

6.4) If you missed more than 2 lectures, please give one reason:

- lack of interest
- course overlap
- course manual / required reading suffices for exam preparation
- illness etc.
- other reasons

6.5) Allocation of the course in your study programme:

- mono subject/ Major/Hauptfach
- minor subject/ Nebenfach
- other
Your current number of semesters since starting your studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher than 10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer not to say</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Assessment of Individual Lectures

8.1) Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2) OO Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3) Design by Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4) A Testing Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5) Debugging and Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6) Iterative Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.7) Inheritance and Refactoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.8) Advanced Design Lab

8.9) GUI Construction

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 Nierstrasz
Name of the course: Programmierung 2

Values used in the profile line: Mean

1. Conveying the course content

1.1) The course follows a coherent structure.
   not true true
   n=54 av.=4.37 md=4.00 dev.=0.68

1.2) The wider context of the subject matter is sufficiently elucidated.
   not true true
   n=55 av.=4.40 md=5.00 dev.=0.76

1.3) The lecturer expresses him-/herself clearly and comprehensibly.
   not true true
   n=54 av.=4.70 md=5.00 dev.=0.54

1.4) The course provides an adequate overview of the subject matter treated.
   not true true
   n=56 av.=4.55 md=5.00 dev.=0.60

1.5) The design of the course contributes to an understanding of the subject matter.
   not true true
   n=55 av.=4.27 md=4.00 dev.=0.85

2. Course materials to assist Learning

2.1) There is overall enough material provided to assist the learning process (slides, course material, hand-outs, etc.).
   not true true
   n=53 av.=4.30 md=4.00 dev.=0.85

2.2) The course materials (slides, course manuals, hand-outs, etc.) are overall of sufficient quality.
   not true true
   n=55 av.=4.20 md=4.00 dev.=0.89

3. Commitment of the lecturer

3.1) The lecturer takes students seriously.
   not true true
   n=50 av.=4.86 md=5.00 dev.=0.35

3.2) The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students.
   not true true
   n=52 av.=4.87 md=5.00 dev.=0.40

3.3) The lecturer addresses questions and suggestions from students adequately.
   not true true
   n=51 av.=4.84 md=5.00 dev.=0.37

3.4) The lecturer seems to care about his/her students' learning progress.
   not true true
   n=53 av.=4.64 md=5.00 dev.=0.59

4. Complexity and Scope

4.1) The degree of difficulty of the course is: too low/narrow too high / wide
   n=55 av.=3.62 md=4.00 dev.=0.78

4.2) The amount of content of the course is: too low/narrow too high / wide
   n=55 av.=3.85 md=4.00 dev.=0.83

4.3) The pace of the course is: too low/narrow too high / wide
   n=56 av.=3.48 md=3.00 dev.=0.66

4.4) The amount of knowledge presupposed by the course is: too low/narrow too high / wide
   n=55 av.=3.47 md=3.00 dev.=0.81
5. Overall Assessment

5.1) How would you grade the course as a whole?  

1=poor  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  |  6=excellent  

n=57    av.=4.72  md=5.00  dev.=0.90

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

1=poor  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  |  6=excellent  

n=58    av.=5.79  md=6.00  dev.=0.45

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

1=poor  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  |  6=excellent  

n=57    av.=5.26  md=5.00  dev.=0.77

5.4) The course has taught me:  

very little  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  |  an awful lot  

n=56    av.=4.25  md=4.00  dev.=0.81

8. Assessment of Individual Lectures

8.1) Introduction  

n=50    av.=3.48  md=3.00  dev.=1.11

8.2) OO Design Principles  

n=50    av.=4.24  md=4.00  dev.=0.87

8.3) Design by Contract  

n=49    av.=4.33  md=5.00  dev.=0.88

8.4) A Testing Framework  

n=48    av.=4.23  md=4.00  dev.=0.88

8.5) Debugging and Tools  

n=44    av.=3.95  md=4.00  dev.=0.96

8.6) Iterative Development  

n=46    av.=3.89  md=4.00  dev.=0.82

8.7) Inheritance and Refactoring  

n=48    av.=4.10  md=4.00  dev.=0.88

8.8) Advanced Design Lab  

n=44    av.=3.23  md=3.00  dev.=1.08

8.9) GUI Construction  

n=46    av.=3.43  md=3.00  dev.=1.07

8.10) Guidelines, Idioms and Patterns  

n=48    av.=4.04  md=4.00  dev.=0.77

8.11) A bit of C++  

n=43    av.=3.00  md=3.00  dev.=1.02

8.12) A bit of Smalltalk  

n=42    av.=3.43  md=3.00  dev.=1.11

8.13) Einblicke in die Praxis  

n=37    av.=3.43  md=3.00  dev.=1.21
Profile Line for Indicators

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conveying the course content</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course materials to assist Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment of the lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Complexity and Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessment of Individual Lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Comments

7.1) What did you like about the course?

The lecturer was very motivated and friendly. We learned a bit of Programming in Po and how we learned to design properly.

Exercise feedback, good overview,

Prof. expressed himself very clearly and gave lots of examples.

The presentations about different topics were quite useful. Podcast is great, good explanation of topics. Good lecture lab the peer session (much needed) with competent support. Git and Interface are ok.

Style of presentation, podcasts

The lecture was quite interesting and well organized.

That there were podcasts available

The exercises allow for the students to train and use their knowledge acquired in the course.

Good structure and very practical.

Would be good to have more fresh air in the room. I feel sleepy...

I got an adequate overview on oo programming.
Podcasts are available, slides too.

Gute Ergänzung von Theorie und Übungen. Podcast waren quasi Hille!

Podcasts, Topics.

- Student阻力 do speck lab practicals
- Andrej and Pavel!
- Prof. BON is a cool lecturer.
- JW-Büchlein in der Praxis

Very interesting, a lot of practical e.g. code/demos etc.), the prof is quite funny. The assistant team is very nice & helpful.

practical experience and the must step learning curve.

The courses are interesting and a good inspiration for self-learning.

It's interesting and it teaches some things that are really good to know for being efficient at work later.

good slides, very good & nice lecturer and assistants
educational exercises

practical view e.g. (look at topics from practical side) lol of examples

The very last lesson was very interesting and the way the professor interacted with students was great.
Learned a lot, lab was really good.

The instructor expressed himself clearly and there was a lot of practical application.

It's very intense, but you come out feeling like you've made a lot of progress.

everything above

The exercises were really bridging the skill in programming and the correction, revisions etc. were done very well.

That we had podcasts was very convenient.

- Learned so much.
- The GM tutorial was fun and gave time to breathe for the tutorials.

- Programming

Covered a wide range of topics.

Practical part, running examples:

+ Great presentations
+ Hidden slides are helpful
+ Feedback of exercises (very helpful)
+ Podcasts, lots of example codes, cool exercises
I really feel like I’m a better programmer now, I learnt a lot although it was tough.

The lecturer knew a lot about the subject and presented extremely well.

Programming

Many exercises to practice coding.

The professor and lab instructors were very helpful and knew the materials that they presented.

The Programming

Theme

The course was very educational and Prof. Nierstrasz has a very good and understandable teaching style. The tutors were helpful. I also liked that the extension of the deadline was granted when needed. I also really appreciate the podcasts (I wasn’t able to attend the course in person).

What did you not like about the course?

C++ and Smalltalk very briefly at the end... not worth it.

I would rather spend more time on implementing a GUI.
The lecture slides were not always clear.

Too big exercises for the last week, generally workload super high on exercises.

Exercises were added too late. Too little time for too much work. While the corrections came in weeks after submitting them, hardly any progress as we did not know what we got before.

The exercises took way too much time. Especially towards the exam it would have been nice to lighten the workload a bit.

**Übungsbetrieb**

The exercises came too very late. There is no notification if we must correct exercises, thus this is a change to miss corrections.

The exam preparation was not well-designed.

Exercises were quite messy in the beginning. Had to change partners a lot because a lot of students who quit. Also the pace was quicker with tests that wasn't the case at all.

I found the lecture was not following a clear structure. Sometimes it felt like "here a bit of that & there a bit of this."

In comparison to other courses it too many hours spent on exercises. No advantages as seen big exercises. No real feedback on them. (Just: ok, not good)

Exercises back not in time.

**Testabstimmung und Diskussionen der Prüfungsinhalte kam viel zu spät (3 Tage vor Prüfung...)**

Inconsequent Tutors.
Unclear Tutors. Past and past conditions always changed.
The feedback on the exercises were not always helpful.

-Exercises take too much time! You do learn a lot, but it still takes too much effort for tests.

The exercises are really a lot of work and very difficult.

At the end it would be better to have a shorter exercise. The one with the Pattys needed much time that was needed for other exam preparations. It was generally good but included much work that did not help understanding Pattys the exercises where quite tedious at times, and debugging could be explained better (the practical application in the IDE).

Group exams since difference in level is too high and that exercises don’t contribute to understanding.

The exercises were a bit too much sometimes.

The topics in the first few lectures could be more well structured...

That C++ and Smalltalk felt like they were just thrown in there.

So much workbook especially at the end since feedback took too long.

The handling of the exercises, correction were returned very late and the feedback wasn’t always helpful.
You could maybe be a bit more explicit about the team work with partners, that both really contribute.

Patterns could be explained earlier without so much pressure in the end (one at a time)

GUI lecture (2nd half) somewhat overly complicated. Too difficult exercises.

This course should be a practice, the exercises are big enough and also everything you need. The things I studied for the exam had only in context to do with what I did throughout the year. And the exam was really pointless in its content. Thanks for understanding!

Often it was difficult to understand the part, because he talked to fast.
The exercises were very low difficulty, you often didn't have a chance to complete them without external help.

- Crazy workload
- Too much (exam, exam, exam!!!)
- GUI code stuff was too much (and not used in tutorial)

The exam, no exam and only exercises!

Too much work, too much details to learn,

0) too much work for exercises
   exercise could be more focused

It was a waste of time.

- Management of the exercises/lab hours, I would have liked real feedback on the exercises, too much effort needed for exercises

Sometimes we repeated certain points too often (e.g. "Long methods are bad", c.s.o.). Also, sometimes the lecture provides almost too much information (additionally to slides + comments)

Some exercises were tedious and simply took too much time.
Suggestions for improvements?

- Smaller exercises
- Slide could be better, had to google a lot

Ask someone else to hold the lab/lecture on design patterns. I did not understand any of it.

Skip gui exercise and let them do the database exercises earlier or postpone gui lecture to later.
Give a mock exam so the students knew exactly what to expect from the exam and can better prepare themselves.

The exercise 5 (i.e. project) should have taken 2 weeks at most. The GUT design seemed unnecessary.

Very teaching methods in exercise classes were just oral presentation is exhausting and hard to follow. The outline maybe also in a Roman as well a bit more structure.

If you teach us about test driven development you should be able to write and test a small program for the test without bugs. The game.IsValid() was clearly not tested properly.

In mind 1.5 weeks in December doesn't correspond in November two days influence learning.

Have a straight line. Be clear and consequent.

Better organisation between assistants

More ECTS or smaller exercises. It is not about the difficulty, it is about the amount.

Define in the beginning of the course the desired performances. I like 8/10 ECTS must be passed.
The communication for the exam was poor. Tell us earlier and more precisely what is needed. If we have to learn details we need more time.

Exercises should influence the work (for example ½) since exams really theoretical and a lot of students weren't good in exercises or didn't do anything of high quality and still they will probably pass the exam. This is not a good representation of knowledge.

Maybe allow a short cheat with fragments of code at an exam. Some things aren't used very often and using a development environment doesn't help memory.

Potter looks into Design Pattern Further

? maybe more exercises with design patterns since they are useful but we barely use them.

Feedback need to come faster (sometimes we waited weeks)

Don't distract the students during the exam by making corrections (or do it quietly without confusing and taking exam time).

You already answered this above. Make programming courses a practice on exam is pointless?

4 please take shower.

No exam only exercises
Distinguish clearly what comes at the exam.

Do not put it to the mandatory courses for people with 5 years of experience in professional software engineering.

- try to do more and correct feedback, also maybe a bit faster than 4 weeks, leave exercise so since no one has him, allow us to implement our GUI in ex3 instead of the reverseDB, restructure the course, I know it's hard as some topics are overlapping, change the ECTS, system in general. In PI, I worked at least 12h/week (additionally to lectures), in DB maybe 2 - I got better distribution of exercises

Avoid above.

This.

Maybe not quite as many exercises. It was a lot of work, especially considering that we (the students) often have five more lectures with assignments to hand in.
### EvaSys Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conveying the course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale width: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course materials to assist Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale width: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment of the lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale width: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Complexity and Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity and Scope: left pole=too low, right pole=too high; grade 3=exactly right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale width: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessment of Individual Lectures</td>
<td></td>
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