Evaluation result for CM-course EDA/DAT240-ht07

	5	4	3	2	1	Avg.
Overall rating of the course	14	22	9	1	0	4,07
Lectures in general	12	21	11	4	0	3,85
Student presentations	2	6	24	10	5	2,79
Workshop (metaphor) lectures	10	11	20	6	0	3,53
Workshop (metaphor) exercises	9	12	18	8	1	3,42
Other exercises	6	19	16	4	0	3,60
CVS labs	7	21	13	5	1	3,60
Perforce labs	7	19	14	6	1	3,53
Working in groups	18	17	9	3	0	4,06
Course literature	9	15	15	5	2	3,52
Theme 2 – the construction site	7	21	14	4	1	3,62
Theme 3 – the study	3	18	17	8	1	3,30
Theme 4 – the library	6	13	20	7	1	3,34
Theme 5 – formal CM	10	16	17	1	1	3,73
Theme 6 – CM++	11	17	14	1	1	3,82
Industrial presentation	14	22	7	2	1	4,00
Mini project	9	23	11	2	0	3,87
Oral examination in group	17	20	6	3	1	4,04
The web pages for the course	5	12	16	10	3	3,13

The most outstanding paper(s) – and why:
Babich (15); Daniels (4); Milligan (4); Feiler (3); Asklund&Bendix (3); Leblang (2); Mahler (2); Bendix&Ekman (2); Dart (1); Kelly (1); Streamed lines (1); Crnkovic&Asklund&Dahlquist (1); Bendix&Vinter (1).

The most "hated"/difficult/useless paper(s) – and why:
Feiler (9); Streamed lines (6); Mahler (6); Impact analysis (4); Daniels (4); Crnkovic&Asklund&Dahlquist (2); Leon (2); Whitgift(2); Asklund&Bendix (1); Leblang(1); White (1).

How do you rate the workload (reading papers, preparing for exercises, labs and mini project) on the course:
- O   too high (please comment) – 8
- O   adequate – 37
- O   too low (please comment) – 0 ;-)

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

Many papers were repeating each other too much and were too theoretic (I learn more from practical examples). Some papers seemed rather old – however, the contents were good. Lars, write a text-book for this course. Sometimes it is hard to relate the theoretic things to real problems without any work experience. Very much text for each paper caused me to not be able to get an overview. Towards the end I didn't have time to read all papers carefully so I just skimmed through them. The sheer amount of reading takes (too much) time and there isn't quite enough time for reflection.

It is a shame that we didn't get to lab in ClearCase – that would have been nice. It was too late to get the material for the Perforce lab the day before the actual lab. The labs, it was said, were not about learning a tool. I disagree; I think they were. That is not necessarily a bad thing, but I also think that 3 labs for CVS and 2 for Perforce is too much. We should have had more labs and less exercises.

Group presentations did not give very much as many were not carried out very well. More feedback on the presentations would have been good. I would have liked more discussion between students and lecturer at lectures.

Provide more information on the examination form and examples of what will give different grades.

Links for the SCM wiki and other only came in email and could not be found on the course web-pages. It could have been an idea to "force" groups to fill in certain parts of the wiki as part of their presentation, this way the wiki would not have been so "empty".

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