

Evaluation results for CM-course EDA/DAT240-ht04

	5	4	3	2	1	Avg
Overall rating of the course	10	21	1	0	0	4,28
Lectures in general	3	20	7	1	0	3,81
Student presentations	1	9	12	7	3	2,94
Workshop (metaphor) lectures	4	12	13	3	0	3,53
Workshop (metaphor) exercises	4	8	10	11	0	3,15
Other exercises	1	12	10	9	0	3,16
Lab. exercises	8	15	8	1	0	3,94
Working in groups	14	13	4	0	1	4,22
Course literature	6	10	14	2	0	3,63
Theme 2 – the construction site	5	13	13	0	1	3,66
Theme 3 – the study	5	15	11	1	0	3,75
Theme 4 – the library	5	12	12	3	0	3,59
Theme 5 – formal CM	6	20	5	0	0	4,03
Theme 6 – CM++	3	20	6	1	0	3,83
Mini project	5	12	9	5	0	3,55
Oral examination in group	17	12	1	1	1	4,34
The web pages for the course	12	8	8	4	0	3,88

When there are new things on the course website, do you prefer to be notified by:

26 mail
10 the news page

How do you rate the workload (reading papers, preparing for exercises, labs and mini project) on the course:

2 too high (please comment)
30 adequate
0 too low (please comment)

Summarised comments/suggestions (in falling order of frequency – only critical comments and suggestions listed):

An extra lecture for those who have not followed the XP-course. The course referred too often to XP for people who have not followed the XP-course/project.

Difficult to find things from the main homepage of the course.

Cut down on the student presentations in favour of longer discussions. Very un-even quality of student presentations. Student presentations should not be in English. Less monologue from the lecturer.

Low quality on some of the papers in the compendium. Some of the papers in the compendium are rather old. Prefer a real book.

Difficult to get started with the discussions at the exercises. Write a little more for the questions, so they are easier to understand. Sometimes it was not quite clear what the proper solutions were as a lot was up to interpretation.

Better and more explicit information about the mini project. More clear requirements for the mini project.

Un-even workload – sometimes very (too?) high. A lot to read.

CVS-lab too easy – maybe a lab on arc. Maybe less labs on CVS and more on ClearCase. Have a lab-intro at the lecture.

More emphasis on CM-plan creation, maybe by encouraging work on it from the start. (More) examples of CCB agenda/protocol and various forms and plan(s).

Grading: 5 – excellent; 4 – good; 3 – average; 2 – poor; 1 – unacceptable.