Sehr geehrter Herr
Dr. Tudor Girba (PERSÖNLICH)

Institut für Informatik und angewandte Mathematik
Neubrückstrasse 10

Auswertungsbericht Lehrveranstaltungsevaluation an die Lehrenden

Sehr geehrter Herr Dr. Girba,

Please find attached the results of the automatic analysis belonging to the evaluation of the course 08 W7084 Software Evolution. Type of questionnaire VORLe. Please observe: The results first show under the heading "Globalwerte" the mean value for the following dimensions:

- Planning and Presentation
- Manners with Students
- Interest and Relevance
- Complexity and Scope
- Overall Assessment of Course
- Overall Assessment of Lecturer
- Overall Assessment of Teaching Methods

The second part shows the results for all the questions individually.

1 equals the lowest grade (unless the question is inverted), 4 or more the highest grade. In the group 'Complexity and Scope' the grade 3 corresponds to "exactly right".

We hope that this report is useful for the further planning of your teaching.

Please briefly discuss the results of this evaluation with your students.

The collaborators of the Group "Hochschuldidaktik" (contact: helmut.ertel@kwb.unibe.ch) are happy to discuss the results with you. Please bring a copy of the reports with you since they are not accessible to anybody else but you.

The evaluation process and details for your faculty may be found under: http://www.rektorat.unibe.ch/unibe/rektorat/unistab/content/e362/e1957/e980/LeitfadenLVEvalDezember2008.pdf

In case you need further information, please do not hesitate to contact us.
### Globalwerte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bereich</th>
<th>Skala</th>
<th>mittelwert</th>
<th>q1</th>
<th>q2</th>
<th>q3</th>
<th>q4</th>
<th>q5</th>
<th>q6</th>
<th>q7</th>
<th>q8</th>
<th>q9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manners with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity and Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment of Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment of Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment of Teaching Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legende

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragetext</th>
<th>Linker Pol</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Rechter Pol</th>
<th>mittelwert</th>
<th>q1</th>
<th>q2</th>
<th>q3</th>
<th>q4</th>
<th>q5</th>
<th>q6</th>
<th>q7</th>
<th>q8</th>
<th>q9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, A</td>
<td>true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not true</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The course follows a coherent structure.

| 1, B                     | true       |   |   |   |   |   | not true    | 0%         | 0% | 6% | 22%| 72%|    |
| The wider context of the subject matter is not sufficiently elucidated.

| 1, C                     | true       |   |   |   |   |   | not true    | 0%         | 0% | 28%| 72%|    |    |    |    |    |
| The lecturer expresses him-/herself clearly and comprehensively.

| 1, D                     | true       |   |   |   |   |   | not true    | 0%         | 0% | 39%| 61%|    |    |    |    |    |
| The course provides an adequate overview of the subject matter treated.

| 1, E                     | true       |   |   |   |   |   | not true    | 0%         | 0% | 41%| 59%|    |    |    |    |    |
| The design of the course contributes to an understanding of the subject matter.
There is overall enough material provided to assist the learning process (slides, course material, hand-outs, etc.).

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

Manners with Students

The lecturer takes students seriously.

The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students.

The lecturer adresses questions and suggestions from students adequately.

The lecturer doesn't seem 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 not sufficiently clarified by the lecturer.

The lecturer fosters my interest in the subject.
Complexity and Scope

4. A) 16 The degree of complexity of the course is:

- far too low/narrow: 0%
- too low/narrow: 11%
- just right: 83%
- too high/wide: 6%
- far too high/wide: 0%

n=18
mw=2.9
md=3
s=0.4

4. B) 17 The scope of the course is:

- far too low/narrow: 0%
- too low/narrow: 6%
- just right: 83%
- too high/wide: 11%
- far too high/wide: 0%

n=18
mw=3.1
md=3
s=0.4

4. C) 18 The pace of the course is:

- far too low/narrow: 0%
- too low/narrow: 0%
- just right: 78%
- too high/wide: 6%
- far too high/wide: 0%

n=18
mw=2.9
md=3
s=0.6

4. D) 19 The amount of knowledge presupposed by the course is:

- far too low/narrow: 0%
- too low/narrow: 6%
- just right: 78%
- too high/wide: 11%
- far too high/wide: 0%

n=18
mw=3.2
md=3
s=0.6

Overall Assessment of Course

5. A) 20 How would you grade the course as a whole?

- 1 (poor): 0%
- 2 (poor): 0%
- 3 (poor): 11%
- 4 (poor): 72%
- 5 (good): 17%
- 6 (excellent): 0%

n=18
mw=5.1
md=5
s=0.5

Overall Assessment of Lecturer

6. A) 21 How would you grade the lecturer with regard to subject expertise?

- 1 (poor): 0%
- 2 (poor): 0%
- 3 (poor): 6%
- 4 (poor): 56%
- 5 (good): 28%
- 6 (excellent): 72%

n=18
mw=5.7
md=6
s=0.6

Overall Assessment of Teaching Methods

7. A) 22 How would you grade the lecturer with regard to teaching methods?

- 1 (poor): 0%
- 2 (poor): 0%
- 3 (poor): 6%
- 4 (poor): 56%
- 5 (good): 39%
- 6 (excellent): 0%

n=18
mw=5.3
md=5
s=0.6

7. B) 23 The course has taught me

- very little: 0%
- little: 0%
- this or that: 13.3%
- a lot: 86.7%
- an awful lot: 0%

n=15
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24 How many hours per week did you invest in preparation and revision for the course (on average)?

- 0h: 5.6%
- less than 2h: 5.6%
- 2 to 4h: 77.8%
- 4 to 6h: 11.1%
- more than 6h: 0%

25 Was the topic of interest to you?

- not at all: 0%
- slightly: 0%
- fairly: 38.9%
- quite: 61.1%

26 How many lectures did you miss?

- none: 38.9%
- 1 - 2: 50%
- 3 - 4: 11.1%
- more than 4: 0%

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

- lack of interest: 0%
- course overlap: 25%
- illness etc.: 50%
- course manual/required reading suffices for exam preparation: 0%
- other reasons: 25%

28 Allocation of the course in your study programme:

- mono subject/Major/Hauptfach: 70.6%
- Minor/Nebenfach: 11.8%
- complementary or specialisation course: 17.6%
29 Your current number of semesters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher than 10</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Questions

31 What did you like about the course?

The lecturer's presentation technique, and presenting our topics.

The course website and to use it as a team.

Enthusiastic teacher, important subject.

The stories!
A story per week
Interaction with students

Focus on practical use and practical makers

That it is very practical and offers a more creative approach to an otherwise rather dry course

Interesting

Motivated and well skilled - also soft-skills - lecturer.

Last lecture, food topic: fairly concrete topic with others as examples (e.g. seaweed or pineapple). Good presentation.

Best example: most useful tool ( Kosovo) was never mentioned.

That the lecturer based subjects on real life examples (sometimes using metaphors) that we actually learned something that we’ll use after our studies.

Experience of the lecturer in practice/field.

It offered a new set of tools and perspectives to reason about software.

Emphasis on Presenting.
What did you not like about the course?

Sometimes too abstract – e.g. what are those questions a reverse engineer can ask a system – examples may seem be outdated, but they are helpful.

LOT OF WORK

Assignments were sometimes like a large part of ice-cold water one had to jump into!
Small talk

Exercise before Theory

Too much about useless unuseful exercises (waste of time to do something that was discussed later in the lecture e.g., etc.)

As I did my bachelor studies abroad, my Java knowledge isn’t as up-to-date as students here. That made it sometimes difficult for me to keep up at lectures.

At the beginning there were not many annotations on the handouts.

Think in the beginning the

Pressure of Assignments.

For me personally the preconditions on the technical side (Eclipse, etc.) were too high, I spent too much time fighting with that stuff instead of the actual subject.

9.3) Suggestions for improvements?
Five more tips for the Analytical assignment:
- Use and for the same talk - or define the talk as a pre-requirement.

More text in slides:
Slides available before lecture for printing.

Stories are ok, but focus on translating Reformation.

More text in handouts.

Useful exercises:
Other tools than courses (e.g., for C, C++, Java)
Which are used in daily business.

If we could print the handouts before the course,
it would be better for us as (to make our notes).

Be a little bit more open for answers of students, don't just wait until someone says something you wanted to hear. Allow lecture to be a bit more like a conversation.
## Teilbereich:
Phil.-nat. Fakultät

### Name der/des Lehrenden:
Dr. Tudor Girba

### Titel der Lehrveranstaltung:
08 W7084 Software Evolution

### Profillinie

| 1. A) | The course follows a coherent structure. | not true | true | mw=3.7 |
| 1. B) | The wider context of the subject matter is not sufficiently elucidated. | true | not true | mw=3.7 |
| 1. C) | The lecturer expresses him-/herself clearly and comprehensibly. | not true | true | mw=3.7 |
| 1. D) | The course provides an adequate overview of the subject matter treated. | not true | true | mw=3.6 |
| 1. E) | The design of the course contributes to an understanding of the subject matter. | not true | true | mw=3.6 |
| 1. F) | There is overall enough material provided to assist the learning process (slides, course material, hand-outs, etc.). | not true | true | mw=3.1 |
| 1. G) | The course materials (slides, course manuals, hand-outs, etc.) are overall of sufficient quality. | not true | true | mw=3.3 |
| 2. A) | The lecturer takes students seriously. | not true | true | mw=3.8 |
| 2. B) | The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students. | not true | true | mw=3.8 |
| 2. C) | The lecturer adresses questions and suggestions from students adequately. | not true | true | mw=3.8 |
| 2. D) | The lecturer doesn't seem to care about his/her students' progress. | true | not true | mw=3.8 |
| 3. A) | The lecturer succeeds in making the course interesting. | not true | true | mw=3.8 |
| 3. B) | The course is probably very useful for my future professional life. | not true | true | mw=3.4 |
| 3. C) | The applicability and relevance of the subject matter is not sufficiently clarified by the lecturer. | true | not true | mw=3.8 |
| 3. D) | The lecturer fosters my interest in the subject. | not true | true | mw=3.5 |
| 4. A) | The degree of complexity of the course is: | far too low/narrow | far too high/wide | mw=2.9 |
| 4. B) | The scope of the course is: | far too low/narrow | far too high/wide | mw=3.1 |
| 4. C) | The pace of the course is: | far too low/narrow | far too high/wide | mw=2.9 |
| 4. D) | The amount of knowledge presupposed by the course is: | far too low/narrow | far too high/wide | mw=3.2 |
| 5. A) | How would you grade the course as a whole? | 1 (poor) | 6 (excellent) | mw=5.1 |
| 6. A) | How would you grade the lecturer with regard to subject expertise? | 1 (poor) | 6 (excellent) | mw=5.7 |
| 7. A) | How would you grade the lecturer with regard to teaching methods? | 1 (poor) | 6 (excellent) | mw=5.3 |
Präsentationsvorlage

Vorlesung 08 W7084 Software Evolution
Dr. Tudor Girba
Erfasste Fragebögen = 18

Planning and Presentation
mw = 3.5

Manners with Students
mw = 3.8

Interest and Relevance
mw = 3.6

The mark "3" means "exactly right".

Complexity and Scope
mw = 3

Overall Assessment of Course
mw = 5.1
Overall Assessment of Lecturer

mw = 5.7

Overall Assessment of Teaching Methods

mw = 5.3