**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 DIKU’s 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>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | 2017/02/17 |
| Your name | Jon Sporring |
| Course name and number | 5100-B1-2E16; Programmering og problemløsning |
| Number of students registered for the exam | 209 |
| Summary, including your comments, of the students’ written evaluations. (The student evaluations are at KUnet under SYSTEMADGANGE > Kursusevaluering SCIENCE (eng. Course evaluation SCIENCE). Prevalent student comments, both negative and positive, should be considered. | 230 students are registered in Absalon, but only 209 registered for the exam. 27 of these failed. That gives a passing rate of 87% at the exam and 79% of Absalon registered. At time of writing, it is not clear how many of the original students that failed are first year computer science students.  Summary of A1 kursusevaluering (81/213 answers): In general, the students assessed that the level, content, and load of the course was good/appropriate/a good match with their expectations.  Summary of E1 eksamensevaluering (28/213 answers): The students found that the exam form was well matched with the course content  Summary of B Underviserevaluering (Jon Sporring – Underviser, 27/213 answers): The teacher was good at presenting the contents of the course.  Christian Lioma and Torben Mogensen were not evaluated explicitely, but some detailed comments touch upon their teaching, and particularly Christina Lioma receives praise.  I summarize the detailed comments to the above 3 questionnaires as follows (in no particular order):   1. The students found it difficult at times to hear the lecturer without a microphone 2. The students are happy with the structure of 3 hours lectures and 6 hours exercise classes 3. Many students expressed great satisfaction with the exercise class teaching 4. Many students found the topical relation between the lectures, exercise classes and exercises 5. Many students would like less online coding and more regular lectures 6. Some students express particular satisfaction with the order and relation between the 3 programming paradigms taught 7. Some students would like even further integration with DMA 8. Some students found the organization, the “uge(r)sedler”, and some of the assignments disorganized 9. A few students are dissatisfied with the notes 10. A few students are dissatisfied with F# as a language, but others are happy. 11. A few students are unhappy about using Scratch as introduction to programming.   Particularly, I would like to emphasize:   1. This year we interchanged the order of functional and imperative programing, such that the taught paradigm order was: imperative, functional and structural. This was a response to last year’s evaluation and to better support the parallel course Diskret matematik og algoritmer (DMA). Comments from students indicate that the order and the balance between them was good. 2. This year we also initiated a shift away from the book Functional programming using F# to notes written by Jon Sporring and Torben Mogens for imperative and functional programming, and variaous notes and book excerpts for structural programming. We intend to write a complete set of notes for the full course, and the feedback in the evaluation indicates that the students were happy with what’s been written so far. 3. Some comments on Jon Sporring’s teaching style indicate that there is discrepancy between his lecturing and the student’s learning readiness. We do not have data on relations between, e.g., student’s comments, whether they have read in advance, their background, nor any other factors, it is difficult to investigate deeply any possible cause-and-effects. But Christina Lioma’s style is praised, which could indicate that hers should be emphasized on the rest of the course. |
| Has the oral student evaluation expanded in some fashion upon the written student evaluation. If so, how? | Not performed. |
| Which adjustments/changes/initiatives, if any, do you propose to address positive and negative student feedback? | We have identified the following points, to be improved next year:   1. The notes will be expanded to cover the rest of the course 2. We will introduce modular programming early 3. We will spend more time on imperative programming 4. We will reduce the amount of online programming and introduce elements of Christina Lioma’s teaching style to the rest of the course 5. We will use the microphone 6. We will improve the organization of the course. |
| Which changes, if any, to the course description will be needed? | Late in the course, it became apparent, that some students do not have Math A level from high school. We will thus need to decide whether to change the requirements of the course or amend the course. |