Report of evaluation: HS19 Einführung in Software Engineering (2420)

Dear Mr./Mrs. Prof. Dr. Nierstrasz

Please find here the results of the evaluation of your course "Einführung in Software Engineering". 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
Overall indicators

1. Conveying the course content ($\alpha = 0.81$) 

\[ \text{av.}=4.23 \quad \text{dev.}=0.87 \]

2. Course materials to assist Learning ($\alpha = 0.57$) 

\[ \text{av.}=4.34 \quad \text{dev.}=0.97 \]

3. Commitment of the lecturer ($\alpha = 0.69$) 

\[ \text{av.}=4.87 \quad \text{dev.}=0.41 \]

4. Complexity and Scope ($\alpha = 0.57$) 

\[ \text{av.}=3.5 \quad \text{dev.}=0.67 \]

8. Assessment of Individual Lectures ($\alpha = 0.71$) 

\[ \text{av.}=3.67 \quad \text{dev.}=0.98 \]

Survey Results

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left pole</th>
<th>Right pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>absolute frequencies of answers</td>
<td>relative frequencies of answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=No. of responses</td>
<td>av=Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Conveying the course content

1.1) The course follows a coherent structure.

\[ \text{av.}=3.96 \quad \text{md}=4 \quad \text{dev.}=1.03 \]

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

\[ \text{av.}=4.22 \quad \text{md}=4 \quad \text{dev.}=0.9 \]

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

\[ \text{av.}=4.76 \quad \text{md}=5 \quad \text{dev.}=0.61 \]

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

\[ \text{av.}=4.36 \quad \text{md}=5 \quad \text{dev.}=0.82 \]

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

\[ \text{av.}=3.87 \quad \text{md}=4 \quad \text{dev.}=0.98 \]
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.).

Table 1: Course materials to assist Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>true</th>
<th>4.4%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.2%</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6.7%</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>28.9%</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>57.8%</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>11.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=45</td>
<td>av.=4.33</td>
<td>md=4</td>
<td>dev.=1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 2: Course materials quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>true</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.2%</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>17.4%</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>17.4%</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>60.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=46</td>
<td>av.=4.35</td>
<td>md=5</td>
<td>dev.=0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Commitment of the lecturer

3.1) The lecturer takes students seriously.

Table 3: Commitment of the lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>true</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4.3%</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>12.4%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4.7%</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>17.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=43</td>
<td>av.=4.91</td>
<td>md=5</td>
<td>dev.=0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2) The lecturer is friendly and respectful towards students.

Table 4: Friendliness of lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>true</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4.4%</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>95.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=45</td>
<td>av.=4.96</td>
<td>md=5</td>
<td>dev.=0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 5: Addressing questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>true</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4.9%</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>80.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>av.=4.9</td>
<td>md=5</td>
<td>dev.=0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 6: Care about learning progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>true</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>12.2%</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>12.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=41</td>
<td>av.=5.68</td>
<td>md=5</td>
<td>dev.=0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Complexity and Scope

4.1) The degree of difficulty of the course is:

Table 7: Degree of difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>too low/narrow</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4.5%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4.5%</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=44</td>
<td>av.=3.45</td>
<td>md=3</td>
<td>dev.=0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2) The amount of content of the course is:

Table 8: Amount of content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>too low/narrow</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>21.1%</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=47</td>
<td>av.=3.98</td>
<td>md=3</td>
<td>dev.=0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3) The pace of the course is:

Table 9: Pace of course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>too low/narrow</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>27.3%</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>57.4%</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=47</td>
<td>av.=3.93</td>
<td>md=3</td>
<td>dev.=0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 10: Knowledge presupposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>too low/narrow</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>52.1%</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>11.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=47</td>
<td>av.=3.3</td>
<td>md=3</td>
<td>dev.=0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Overall Assessment

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

Table 11: Overall course grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1=poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8.9%</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>57.8%</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>11.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=45</td>
<td>av.=4.67</td>
<td>md=4</td>
<td>dev.=0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions continued on the next side
5.2) How would you grade the lecturer with regard to subject expertise?

![Graph showing the grading distribution of the lecturer's subject expertise.]

- 1=poor
- 6=excellent
- n=45
- av.=5.71
- md=6
- dev.=0.59

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

![Graph showing the grading distribution of the lecturer's teaching methods.]

- 1=poor
- 6=excellent
- n=44
- av.=5.34
- md=5
- dev.=0.71

5.4) The course has taught me:

![Graph showing the extent to which the course taught participants.]

- 0% very little
- 13.6% 2
- 47.8% 3
- 21.7% 4
- 3.8% 5
- 7.7% an awful lot

6. Socio-demographic Data and Background Variables

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
- n=44
- av.=5.71
- md=6
- dev.=0.59

6.2) Was the topic of interest to you?

- not at all
- slightly
- fairly
- quite a lot
- n=46
- av.=3.89
- md=4
- dev.=0.77

6.3) How many lectures did you miss?

- none
- 1 - 2
- 3 - 4
- more than 4
- n=46
- av.=5.34
- md=5
- dev.=0.71

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
- n=27
- av.=5.34
- md=5
- dev.=0.71

6.5) Allocation of the course in your study programme:

- mono subject/ Major/Hauptfach
- minor subject/ Nebenfach
- other
- n=46
- av.=5.34
- md=5
- dev.=0.71
6.6) Your current number of semesters since starting your studies:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher than 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=46

6.7) Sex:

- female: [ ] 8
- male: [ ] 25
- prefer not to say: [ ] 3

n=36

7. Comments

Please take advantage of the opportunity to comment your answers above.

Questions continued on the next side

8. Assessment of Individual Lectures

I learned a lot from this lecture:

(Please leave blank if you did not attend)

8.1) Introduction: The Software Lifecycle

8.2) Requirements Collection

8.3) Agile Practices in Industry

8.4) Modeling Objects and Classes

8.5) Modeling Behaviour

8.6) Software Testing
Many thanks for your cooperation
1. Conveying the course content

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?  
1=poor | 6=excellent  
n=45  
\( \text{av.}=4.67 \)  
\( \text{md}=5.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.88 \)

### 5.2) How would you grade the lecturer with regard to subject expertise?  
1=poor | 6=excellent  
n=45  
\( \text{av.}=5.71 \)  
\( \text{md}=6.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.59 \)

### 5.3) How would you grade the lecturer with regard to teaching methods?  
1=poor | 6=excellent  
n=44  
\( \text{av.}=5.34 \)  
\( \text{md}=5.50 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.90 \)

### 5.4) The course has taught me:  
very little | an awful lot  
n=46  
\( \text{av.}=3.89 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.77 \)

---

## 8. Assessment of Individual Lectures

### 8.1) Introduction: The Software Lifecycle  
n=37  
\( \text{av.}=3.62 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.95 \)

### 8.2) Requirements Collection  
n=37  
\( \text{av.}=4.14 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.86 \)

### 8.3) Agile Practices in Industry  
n=38  
\( \text{av.}=4.03 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=1.20 \)

### 8.4) Modeling Objects and Classes  
n=35  
\( \text{av.}=3.63 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.97 \)

### 8.5) Modeling Behaviour  
n=35  
\( \text{av.}=3.62 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=1.16 \)

### 8.6) Software Testing  
n=34  
\( \text{av.}=3.82 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.90 \)

### 8.7) User Interface Design  
n=36  
\( \text{av.}=3.36 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=1.15 \)

### 8.8) Software Quality  
n=34  
\( \text{av.}=3.68 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.84 \)

### 8.9) Software Security  
n=34  
\( \text{av.}=3.67 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=1.08 \)

### 8.10) Software Metrics  
n=34  
\( \text{av.}=3.38 \)  
\( \text{md}=3.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=1.04 \)

### 8.11) Project Management  
n=36  
\( \text{av.}=3.89 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.85 \)

### 8.12) Software Architecture  
n=36  
\( \text{av.}=3.75 \)  
\( \text{md}=4.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=0.94 \)

### 8.13) SE in practice  
n=34  
\( \text{av.}=3.38 \)  
\( \text{md}=3.00 \)  
\( \text{dev.}=1.26 \)
Profile Line for Indicators

Subunit: Phil.-nat. Fakultät
Name of the instructor: Prof. Dr. Oscar Nierstrasz
Name of the course: Einführung in Software Engineering
Comparative line: HS18 - Einführung in Software Engineering

1. Conveying the course content
   - av.=4.23 dev.=0.87
   + av.=4.08 dev.=1.08

2. Course materials to assist Learning
   - av.=4.34 dev.=0.97
   + av.=4.07 dev.=1.24

3. Commitment of the lecturer
   - av.=4.87 dev.=0.41
   + av.=4.74 dev.=0.56

4. Complexity and Scope
   - av.=3.50 dev.=0.67
   + av.=3.49 dev.=0.76

8. Assessment of Individual Lectures
   - av.=3.67 dev.=0.98
   + av.=3.80 dev.=1.10
7. Comments

7.1) What did you like about the course?

I really liked the project we did. I learned a lot while communicating/interacting with my team.

- Good project
- Informative slides

The practical part was very interesting. We could be very creative and very independent. Also we could apply the theory learned in the course.

The project

PRACTICAL & EXERCISES
GOOD lectures, mostly GOOD guest lectures

I really liked the structure of the course. With a different specific subject each week.

The overview of the subject, the lectures and the guests.

I had project during semester and I learnt lots of new information. Thank you for everything...

Assistsants really make to help with exercises
Guest lectures
Podcast incl. Google pictures

Lecturer speaks clearly and precisely...
Slides provided are great to revise especially due to the what you should know / can you answer these questions

Great project during ex. hour, great course overall
The project was really cool although it was quite hard. I like the questions at the end of all lecture slides. Most guest lectures were very interesting.

ON INKS the assistant is great. Also nice guest lectures.

The guest lectures were very interesting. The project taught me very much.

As I didn't attend lectures I cannot say anything about them. But the project was fun and I learned a lot.

The inclusion of speakers from the industry

The exercise is engaging and competitive.

The amount of practical exercises, like drawing UML. The testing lecture was very interesting.

The possibility to make a project

many guest lectures

- The professors
- Guest lectures

The podcast

The guest lectures (some were a shot in the dark but interesting nonetheless).

Lectures about design were very interesting.

The practical project was very tempting and allowing.
What did you not like about the course?

Preparation for the exam / the exam itself, it was a lot and really theoretical and hard to know what to learn.

Guest lectures (especially No 14) were not so interesting / were inefficient.
That the project does only count 40% - the effort was very much higher.

Lectures seemed to always come too late to be useful in the project, not a lot of overlap occurred. Most

I wouldn't change anything about the course, I surely did the exam but it's due to doing to little to late.

The way the final project is managed.

I am an erasmus student out my department is Business Informatic. This course was so difficult for me.

Project is to much work compared to amount of ECTS

It would be nice to be able to use a programming language we learned last year instead.

- lecture slides feel old
- exercises and lectures are not really connected

exams took ages and were really complicated

Too short of an introduction into language and environment that we had to use for project.

I would have liked an example exam to study to understand where the focus lies

I felt quite insecure about the exam, I wished for more information. Also, I think, 5 ECTS is not enough as I invested at least 60h per week for the project (without lectures/exam preparation etc.)

See as in P2, but more: Project takes way too much time. Basically around 60h per week, for 5 ECTS. We have other courses and they need time as well. Plus relatively big exam topic exam after the exhausting project, and no cheat sheet allowed.
The projects cost 40+ hours a week, yet we still have to write an exam that counts even more. I find that really
unnecessary. We still have to do the projects, so we must do them, but the requirements for project unclear. A lot of work. A little bit more monitoring if everyone in team did stick for the project or whether some are just hanging in it but
The lack of guidance for the project can also be seen as positive.

The exercise does not necessarily match the scope of the course. Learning about UML’s and building a full mobile and desktop app with React back-end feels quite mismatched.

The project that gives 40% of 5 ECTS so 2 ECTS took 1000 hours for some teams? That’s pretty unreasonable.

The learning curve of the project was very steep in the beginning.

An interesting project but task could have been clearer.
- The exercise project was a bit too hard, we didn’t really learn anything in the course about our project. We had to self-udy everything.

The project effort was high.

The quality of the guest lectures was not always good and it was not always clear what the learning goals of the guest lectures were.
No little connection lectures Project - almost like two different courses
direct no information on the exam only Duke was published

Exercises were really chaotic and misunderstood, as goals were not clear sometimes

Guest lecturers do not provide much (excl. testing) (esp. agile methods)

It was a lot of work, especially with the project. I would’ve preferred if the project evaluation had more weight in the final mark, since it was the main focus effort-wise of this course.

- The language
- The slides were a bit overloaded and the layout is outdated which makes it hard to see
- Time effort for the project was like 80% and for the actual exam 10%
Suggestions for improvements?

It would be better if the software project counted at least 60% or if it took a lot more time than the exam. It would be cool if it was more practical (help to implement principles in the project).

Make a clear structure and don’t have different definitions by you and a guest lecturer.

Provide UML exercises.

Integrate lectures and project better (E & I: Project Management - deliver earlier)
Either limit or be more exact on the project requirements or let it be free for student to decide. Select specific tools. Videulate the project with engineering, not programming. More hours were spent programming than engineering the project.

Use the same language in PC and ESE.

Upload an example exam to iRing.

Weight the order of the lectures could be improved. Some very important lectures (for the project) came just in the end.

Smaller project or no exam or less exam topics or allow a cheat sheet on the exam (like many other IT studies courses?)

Project should give at least 50% or it should be less time consuming.

Mehr Vorfühstellung bei den Projekten.

Better group supervision.

Clearer requirements for project + presentation.
In the 73rd week, I believe there was a lecture on project management. I believe it would have been handy to have this at the start, as we effectively lost in managing our project.

The course content should match the exercise better. 40% of a grade is awfully low for the hours put into it, and did not necessarily prepare us for the exam.

Have actual Milestones:

Smaller project scales, Project feedback before the exam

Maybe skip the kind of "assumptions are your clients" thing and ease the students into the project instead of student comically watching bruises and waiting time till it clicks in their head

Deduce on Project Management Expiry because modeling to class requirements for project
The professor's own lecture on agile development.

Organise the project in a more structured/defined way, maybe limit its scope.

Chaining the points above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale Width</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conveying the course content</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course materials to assist Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment of the lecturer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Complexity and Scope</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity and Scope: left pole=too low, right pole=too high; grade 3=exactly right</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessment of Individual Lectures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dev.=Std. Dev.