Evaluation result for CM-course EDA/DAT240-ht05

	5	4	3	2	1	Avg.
Overall rating of the course	6	11	2	0	0	4,21
Lectures in general	4	13	1	0	0	4,17
Student presentations	1	3	9	5	1	2,89
Workshop (metaphor) lectures	1	10	8	0	0	3,63
Workshop (metaphor) exercises	1	8	9	1	0	3,47
Other exercises	0	9	10	0	0	3,47
Lab. exercises	4	10	3	2	0	3,84
Working in groups	8	8	3	0	0	4,26
Course literature	3	10	4	4	0	3,57
Theme 2 – the construction site	2	13	4	0	0	3,89
Theme 3 – the study	0	10	8	1	0	3,47
Theme 4 – the library	2	12	4	1	0	3,79
Theme 5 – formal CM	1	14	4	0	0	3,84
Theme 6 – CM++	1	12	6	0	0	3,74
Industrial presentation	2	7	7	2	0	3,50
Mini project	3	4	9	3	0	3,37
Oral examination in group	10	6	2	1	0	4,32
The web pages for the course	6	5	5	3	0	3,74

The most outstanding paper(s) – and why:
Babich (10); Feiler (4); Daniels (3); Asklund&Bendix&Ekman (3); Asklund (1); Mahler (1); Kelly (1); Dart (1); Bendix&Vinter (1); Streamed lines (1); Asklund&Bendix (1)

The most "hated" paper(s) – and why:
Streamed lines (7); Impact analysis (3); Compton (3); Daniels (2); Feiler (2); Mahler (1)

When there are new things on the course website, do you prefer to be notified by:
- O email – 15
- O the news page – 1
- O both – 3

How do you rate the workload (reading papers, preparing for exercises, labs and mini project) on the course:
- O too high (please comment) – 5
- O adequate – 14
- O too low (please comment) – 0 ;-)

Summarised comments/suggestions (in random order – only critical comments and suggestions listed):

Would like more labs – either to see more tools or to go deeper into e.g. ClearCase. The lab description should be handed out earlier so that you have a chance to spend some time in the lab before the scheduled lab, that is the way most people are working with labs. I heard many questions about different tools – maybe a short list of current "leading" SCM tools with a short feature list could be part of the course material.

The student presentations (including mine) did not give anything – but the discussions afterwards were very interesting and gave a lot. Some lectures could be difficult to follow, because some groups did not seem well prepared or had language problems.

The workload is rather high from reading a lot of papers. Especially when you are not sure how careful you should read them and what is important. The course really needs a textbook – write it Lars. The high number of papers was an obstacle to creating an overview – and they were not always well connected. Good contents of the papers, but they were too American (i.e too many words for the contents). There is a need for an index of all papers to be able to organise and use the compendium.

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