**Course evaluation by course organiser**

To ensure that course evaluations have an effect on teaching quality and the development of the course and to make sure that DIKUs teaching committee has a good basis for processing the student course evaluations please fill out this form. This is the course organiser´s own evaluation of the course. Please involve other lecturers and teaching assistants when relevant. Please send the evaluation to [vilu@di.ku.dk](mailto:vilu@di.ku.dk). Deadline: one week after reporting the grades in your course.

Find more information about the evaluation procedures here: <https://intranet.ku.dk/diku/teaching/evaluation/Pages/default.aspx>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course block and year | Blok 1 and 2 in 2017-2018 |
| Course name and number | NDAB15009U Programmering og problemløsning (PoP) |
| Your name | Jon Sporring |
| Which are the most common student’s comments? What are your own reflections about the student’s comments? (The student evaluations are at KUnet: SYSTEMADGANGE > Kursusevaluering SCIENCE (eng. Course evaluation SCIENCE). | There are mostly positive comments in the students’ responses. The students seem to like the ratio of lecture and exercise, and particularly like what they did in the exercise classes.  Many remarks indicate that the students found the course challenging. However, since 92% of the active students (having passed assignment 2) passed, the level is definitely not too high.  Many students state that the work load is too large. This is also supported by the hours reported under “Min gennemsnitlige ugentlige arbejdsindsats…”. This question is however possibly misleading, since it asks of a per-course workload, but the possible answers hints at the total workload for all courses. Further, the courses last assignments are the most challenging that the first, so the answers may be biased toward the students’ workload late in the course.  There are several positive comments about the course material. Some of the negative comments hints at that some students were reading last year’s material, which unfortunately circulated alongside this year’s updated material.  Unfortunately, no teacher but Jon Sporring was evaluated, so comments to teachers are a bit scattered and at times difficult to decipher. |
| Did you go through the student evaluations in class? If yes, did that bring about further insights into the written student evaluations? | Yes. This gave no further insight into the student’s evaluations. However, it did allow me to add a separate evaluation of the book as last year. |
| Which adjustments/changes/initiatives, if any, do you propose to address positive and negative student feedback? | In order to avoid too many students skipping the last 2-week assignment, this year we made assignment 10 the 2-week assignment instead of assignment 11. This thus became the first hand-in in object-oriented programming, which probably was too overwhelming for the students. In general, it seems that the time set of to allow the students to absorb the object-oriented programming paradigm is too short, and for 2019-2020, we will look at options for reshuffling topics to allow for starting teaching object-oriented programming one week earlier. |
| What worked well in your course? Did something make a noticeable difference? E.g. a new teaching strategy, format for feedback or type of assignments.  Which initiatives, if any, could be inspirational for other course organisers? | Compared to last year, the book has improved.  Increasing the size of assignment 10 and decreasing the size of assignment 11, meant that more students completed the big one. |
| Which adjustments, if any, to the course description, is urgent? | No urgent changes are needed but we will look at reallocating time to increase the focus on object-oriented programming. |