# Sammanställning av Course Evaluation

16 av 45 har svarat

## Fråga 1: How well did the course goal show at the beginning of the course? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 1 svar (6%)
- 3 - 1 svar (6%)
- 4 - 6 svar (38%)
- 5 - 6 svar (38%)
- 6 - 2 svar (13%)

Medelvärde 4,438

## Fråga 2: How useful did you find the course webpages? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 2 svar (13%)
- 4 - 3 svar (19%)
- 5 - 7 svar (44%)
- 6 - 4 svar (25%)

Medelvärde 4,812

## Fråga 3: What do you think about the lecture notes? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 1 svar (6%)
- 4 - 7 svar (44%)
- 5 - 5 svar (31%)
- 6 - 3 svar (19%)

Medelvärde 4,625

## Fråga 4: What do you think about the books? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 2 svar (13%)
- 2 - 2 svar (13%)
- 3 - 5 svar (31%)
- 4 - 2 svar (13%)
- 5 - 4 svar (25%)
- 6 - 1 svar (6%)

Medelvärde 3,438

## Fråga 5: Which percentage of lectures did you attend? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 100 - 7 svar (44%)
- 80 - 7 svar (44%)
- 60 - 0 svar (0%)
- 40 - 1 svar (6%)
- 20 - 1 svar (6%)
- 0 - 0 svar (0%)

Medelvärde 82,5

## Fråga 6: How was the lecturer pedagogically? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 1 svar (6%)
- 4 - 4 svar (25%)
- 5 - 6 svar (38%)
- 6 - 5 svar (31%)

Medelvärde 4,938

## Fråga 7: What use did you have of the lectures? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 5 svar (31%)
- 4 - 6 svar (38%)
- 5 - 3 svar (19%)
- 6 - 2 svar (13%)

Medelvärde 4,125

## Fråga 8: Was the lecturer enthusiastic and motivated? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 0 svar (0%)
- 4 - 4 svar (25%)
- 5 - 3 svar (19%)
- 6 - 9 svar (56%)

Medelvärde 5,312

## Fråga 9: How well did the lecturer answer questions? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 2 svar (13%)
- 4 - 1 svar (6%)

- 5 - 4 svar (25%)
- 6 - 9 svar (56%)

Medelvärde 5,25

## Fråga 10: How friendly and helpful was the lecturer during breaks, in Emails, etc? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 1 svar (6%)
- 4 - 1 svar (6%)
- 5 - 3 svar (19%)
- 6 - 11 svar (69%)

Medelvärde 5,5

## Fråga 11: Did the lecturer use avalable tools appropriately (OH, video, etc)? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 1 svar (6%)
- 4 - 2 svar (13%)
- 5 - 5 svar (31%)
- 6 - 8 svar (50%)

Medelvärde 5,25

## Fråga 12: Which percentage of lab sessions did you attend? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 100 - 8 svar (50%)
- 80 - 6 svar (38%)
- 60 - 2 svar (13%)
- 40 - 0 svar (0%)
- 20 - 0 svar (0%)
- 0 - 0 svar (0%)

Medelvärde 87,5

## Fråga 13: What use did you have of the lab assignments? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 0 svar (0%)
- 3 - 2 svar (13%)
- 4 - 4 svar (25%)
- 5 - 4 svar (25%)
- 6 - 6 svar (38%)

Medelvärde 4,875

## Fråga 14: Were the lab assignments interesting and stimulating? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 1 svar (6%)
- 3 - 0 svar (0%)
- 4 - 5 svar (31%)
- 5 - 4 svar (25%)
- 6 - 6 svar (38%)

Medelvärde 4,875


## Fråga 15: How well did the lab assignments fit the course content? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 1 svar (6%)
- 3 - 2 svar (13%)
- 4 - 2 svar (13%)
- 5 - 7 svar (44%)
- 6 - 4 svar (25%)

Medelvärde 4,688


## Fråga 16: The lecture rooms concerning light, acoustics, and air? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 1 svar (6%)
- 3 - 5 svar (31%)
- 4 - 1 svar (6%)
- 5 - 4 svar (25%)
- 6 - 5 svar (31%)

Medelvärde 4,438


## Fråga 17: The rooms for tutorials and lab sessions? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 1 svar (6%)
- 3 - 4 svar (25%)
- 4 - 2 svar (13%)
- 5 - 4 svar (25%)
- 6 - 5 svar (31%)

Medelvärde 4,5


## Fråga 18: Did you have all prerequisite knowledge for the course? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 1 svar (6%)
- 2 - 1 svar (6%)

- 3 - 4 svar (25%)
- 4 - 2 svar (13%)
- 5 - 6 svar (38%)
- 6 - 2 svar (13%)

Medelvärde 4,062

# Fråga 19: How meaningful do you consider the course? (16 personer)

**Svarsalternativ**
- 1 - 0 svar (0%)
- 2 - 1 svar (6%)
- 3 - 3 svar (19%)
- 4 - 1 svar (6%)
- 5 - 8 svar (50%)
- 6 - 3 svar (19%)

Medelvärde 4,562

# Fråga 20: Comments? (11 personer)

**Kommentarer**
- there should be more lab sessions
- no comments :)
- The Exam did not cover the course contra lab assignments. Had difficulties in lab assignments, maybe because of bad teachers in earlier programming courses.
- Kind of difficult to understand exactly everything if the english language is not your primary language. Even though one should know english pretty good by now it is not always easy.
- i lacked some in my java, so the book was a good way to catch up in java and get to know c++ better at the same time.

    regarding the routy-lab and ppl not knowing what a router is, i think that shoulndt be a big problem, it is to be axpected that students at it know what that is.

    im surprised so few managed to pass the labcourse and the examination. not a good sign for the future, but maybe a good sign regarding competition in future careerpaths.

    all in all a good course, and a pretty bad class, in my opinion
- Make sure the next year has either appropriate amounth of time for lab 1-2 routy, and \ or has had network communication before this course. Wouldve helped :) Otherwise, a job well done!
- This was a great course and i think i have learned many valuable things,  however there is some things you might want to consider. Firstly i think the focus of this course could be a bit more streamlined with the previous programming courses (Algorthims and OOp). I think you should have a chat with Henrik Bergström (http://daisy.dsv.su.se/anstalld/anstalldinfo.jspa?personID=7) or Beatrice Åkerblom (http://daisy.dsv.su.se/anstalld/anstalldinfo.jspa?personID=221) so that you can conclude what stuff that is relay important.  Then it was this "Mini erlang" thing which i think you could have explained a bit more extensively, especially that stack based pseudo-like code which i think nobody had ever seen before. Another suggestion is that you add more small preparation assignments (like the c++ 0-0 lab) which is optional. For example, when i did the routy lab i had never ever created an erlang thread before, and the fact that i didnt know much about networking didnt make things better. The routy lab is cool, so dont remove it!! Just explain stuff more extensively in the lab-pm and make more preparation assignments. Actually its kind of sad that we have to learn two programming languages in so short time. To make things simpler we could have been taught c++ from the start (in OOp) and then this course could be entirely focused on functional programming, concurrent programming and paradigms without having to explain c++ also, but its in the best of worlds.. of course.
- Im not a fan of programming exams where you have to code with only pencil and paper. I dont see the why a manual or something similar is allowed since I find it very hard to write code from the memory. Especially with a (for me and probably many other fellow students) new language such as Erlang.
- Put up the correct answers on your homepage after the exam for eager students :) Cant relax before I know how well/poorly i did.

- Good course! Should have had an FX grade on the exam. I liked the labs and I'm very surprised that people had problems and didn't finish them! The introductory C++ part should have been left at the warm up lab (2.0). I think you should expect more from a student who has already done two courses in Java.
- I had a hard time to really undertands the lectures about Erlang, it was a little fast, and a little tough sense it was in english. When I whent through the lectures myself I understood much more. I belive you get easely confussed with all new english terms. The "pictures/slides" in the lectures had a relly wierd layout... with all points and random subpoints, made me confussed. The content was on the other hand good.