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General information

Information on the project Qualis

- Funded by Saarland University, Qualis is an evaluation project lead by the chair of Differential Psychology and Psychodiagnistics
- Courses in the following degree programmes/facilities are being evaluated: Business Studies, Education, Chemistry, Computational Linguistics, Teaching Methodology, German Studies, Computer Science, Materials Science & Engineering Technology, Medicine, Pharmacology, Psychology, Romance Studies, Key Competences for Lawyers, Language Centre, Centre for Key Competences

Details on the Qualis survey

- The basic form consists of 28 items, one free-response item as well as basic demographic variables
- For purposes of analysis, individual items of the basic form are aggregated into five scales (Lecturer, Structure, Topic, Requirements, Overall Assessment) and reported in terms of these scales.
- The basic form is amended by additional scale items (e.g. presentations, work assignments) based on each course’s specific assessments.

The Qualis-Team would like to thank all students and lecturers for their numerous and extensive participation!
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Comparison of means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1,61</td>
<td>0,43</td>
<td>1,77</td>
<td>0,62</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1,81</td>
<td>0,72</td>
<td>2,01</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>2,21</td>
<td>0,87</td>
<td>1,91</td>
<td>0,83</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>1,81</td>
<td>0,65</td>
<td>2,33</td>
<td>0,86</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1,45</td>
<td>0,47</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,73</td>
<td>2,11</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison group: Computer Science, lectures, WS 15/16 (35 courses)

M: Mean, SD: Standard deviation, N: Number of returned questionnaires
The lecturer was enthusiastic and motivated.

I was able to follow the pace of the lecturer.

The lecturer provided a good learning and working atmosphere.

The lecturer has always been well prepared.
The lecturer was very competent.

The lecturer was able to put complicated ideas across.

It was important to the lecturer that the participants benefitted from the course.

The lecturer motivated the participants.
Structure

The learning objective was clear to me.

The educational objectives were well defined from the beginning.

The course was well structured and comprehensible.

The structure of the content was logical/easy to follow.
I was already interested in the subject of the course before I signed up for it.

I believe that I have learned important facts in this course.

The topic of the course is relevant.
Requirements

The difficulty of the content was adequate.

The amount of the content was adequate.

The requirements of the course were adequate.

The amount of time required for the course as a whole (including preparation and follow-up) was appropriate.
The course was too difficult for me.

- 2 completely
- 6 not at all
- 5 not at all
- 12 not at all
- 12 not at all

N= 37
M= 3.7
SD= 1.24
k.A.= 0
Concerning the organizational aspects of the course (i.e. place, time, performance requirements) I was informed well.

I was satisfied with the accessibility of necessary learning material.

Organizational issues were dealt with in time and in detail.

The course was running smoothly during the semester.

Concerning the organizational aspects of the course (i.e. place, time, performance requirements) I was informed well.

I was satisfied with the accessibility of necessary learning material.

Organizational issues were dealt with in time and in detail.

The course was running smoothly during the semester.
Altogether, the course was well organized.

- 23 completely
- 14 not at all

N= 37
M= 1.38
SD= 0.49
k.A.= 0
Overall Assessment

Overall, this was a good course.

I learned a lot in this course.

The course fulfilled my expectations.

I would recommend the course.
Overall Assessment

In terms of its quality, this course was as good as the best course I have ever attended.
Further remarks: I especially appreciated

"Good examples, develop proofs at the blackboard."

"Very good intuition given for complex abstract systems. Very good material. Very vigorous, but yet intuitive projects"

"The grade of formality of the proofs and definitions."

"Professor’s interaction with students (very friendly)."

"Examples on the blackboard."

"The lecturer explains well and step by step, which is nice."

"Examples on the board for a concept we just got introduced to."

"Examples & explanations during lecture"

"The lecture PDFs"

"Lecturer is a very good didact."
Further remarks: I especially appreciated

"The explanations given on the blackboard."

"The course content."

"The script, examples on the blackboard."

"Example during the lecture, available at exams."

"The examples given in the lecture."

"The diversity of the contents of the course."

"The detailed explanations after questions."

"Combination of slides and blackboard --> good pace."

"The explanation of ideas and the structuring of lectures,"

"Free course materials"
Further remarks: I did not like

"I would say, I did not prefer the lecture time on Mondays."

"For some topics it takes long until I get an intuition of what’s happening. It helps that I had AI before, which gave an intuition for some of the topics treated here as well. The fact that we treat the topics more formal here is good, but even more examples or initial motivation would be even better."

"Lack of solutions to H/W to refer to online."

"No exam should be on a Saturday."

"There are sometimes too less examples given in the lecture notes."

"The material is not good for the preparation to the exam."

"That the blackboard examples don´t occur in the script."

"Some exam questions that were marked binary (0 or full points)."

"He did not present the lecture in an interesting way."
Further remarks: I did not like

"Proofs being binary in evaluation."

"The air in the lecture hall."

"Lecture timings --> 4-6 is odd."

"Having the midterm in a Saturday. It could have occurred during the lecture time."
Further remarks: Suggestions for improvements

"Single script, not parts of it separately."

"Supply script as single pdf"

"Interactive session (lectures) with students working on the proofs instead of the professor doing it himself."

"I think adding reference at the end of each section would be great."

"More examples in script and for exercises similar to the sheets."

"Add more detailed calendar info ahead of time on the website e.g. exam review was scheduled a bit late and as far as I know only mentioned in class (not listed on the website)."

"More examples in script, mark sheets and exam in the same way, provide example solution for exam."

"A forum would have been nice"

"More example of exercise in the courses material."
Further remarks: Suggestions for improvements

"A forum, where one can ask questions to exercises/lectures."

"Examples made in the lecture should be included in the script."

"Sometimes more detailed explanations in the script would be nice."

"Turn on side lights in lecture."

"Help students learn properties required for proofs in the course more!"

"Sometimes the lecture could be a bit faster."

"Nil."