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1 Lecture Evaluation

1.1 Please rate the lecture’s concept.

1.1.1 How often did you attend the lecture?

Always – Never
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.2
Standardabweichung: 0.4

1.1.2 Did the lecture appear to be clearly structured to you?

Yes – No
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.2
Standardabweichung: 0.6

1.1.3 Have topics been illustrated by sensible examples?

Always – Never
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.4
Standardabweichung: 0.8

1.1.4 Were the slides/lecture notes helpful?

Very helpful – Not helpful
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.7
Standardabweichung: 0.9

1.1.5 Have there been topics that should have been explained more extensively?

Many – None
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 3.5
Standardabweichung: 1.1

2 Lecturer Evaluation

2.1 Please rate Dr. Tamas Horvath.

2.1.1 How much of the content do you understand during the lecture?

Everything – Nothing
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.9
Standardabweichung: 0.9
2.1.2 The speed of proceeding was...
Too fast – Too slow
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 2.9
Standardabweichung: 0.6

2.1.3 Did the lecturer answer your questions profoundly?
Always – Never
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.3
Standardabweichung: 0.6

2.1.4 Was the lecturer available for questions outside of the lecture?
Always – Never
Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 1.5
Standardabweichung: 0.8

2.1.5 Could you understand the lecturer acoustically?
Very well – Not at all
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.6
Standardabweichung: 0.9

2.2 Please rate PD Dr. Michael Mock.

2.2.1 How much of the content do you understand during the lecture?
Everything – Nothing
Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 1.8
Standardabweichung: 0.6

2.2.2 The speed of proceeding was...
Too fast – Too slow
Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 2.7
Standardabweichung: 0.4
2.2.3 Did the lecturer answer your questions profoundly?

Always – Never

Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 1.6
Standardabweichung: 1.0

2.2.4 Was the lecturer available for questions outside of the lecture?

Always – Never

Antworten: 10
Durchschnitt: 1.6
Standardabweichung: 0.8

2.2.5 Could you understand the lecturer acoustically?

Very well – Not at all

Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 1.6
Standardabweichung: 1.0

2.3 Please rate Prof. Dr. Stefan Wrobel.

2.3.1 How much of the content do you understand during the lecture?

Everything – Nothing

Antworten: 3
Durchschnitt: 1.7
Standardabweichung: 0.5

2.3.2 The speed of proceeding was...

Too fast – Too slow

Antworten: 3
Durchschnitt: 2.7
Standardabweichung: 0.5

2.3.3 Did the lecturer answer your questions profoundly?

Always – Never

Antworten: 3
Durchschnitt: 1.7
Standardabweichung: 0.9
2.3.4 Was the lecturer available for questions outside of the lecture?
Always – Never
Antworten: 2
Durchschnitt: 1.0
Standardabweichung: 0.0

2.3.5 Could you understand the lecturer acoustically?
Very well – Not at all
Antworten: 3
Durchschnitt: 1.0
Standardabweichung: 0.0

3 Exercise Evaluation

3.1 Please rate the quality of the exercises that accompanied the lecture.

3.1.1 How often did you attend the exercise class?
Always – Never
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.3
Standardabweichung: 0.5

3.1.2 Did the contents of the exercises match the current contents of the lecture?
Lecture far ahead – Lecture far behind
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 2.3
Standardabweichung: 0.8

3.1.3 Have the exercise sheets been available on time?
Always – Never
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.1
Standardabweichung: 0.3

3.1.4 Judge the size of your exercise group!
Too big – Too small
Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 2.9
Standardabweichung: 0.3
3.1.5 Usually I thought the exercises were...

Too difficult – Very easy

Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 2.5
Standardabweichung: 0.8

17% 17% 67% 0% 0%

3.1.6 The difficulty of the exercises varied...

Greatly – Not at all

Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 3.1
Standardabweichung: 1.0

8% 17% 33% 42% 0%

4 Module Evaluation

4.1 Please rate the module as a whole.

4.1.1 Did the course teach you helpful knowledge and abilities that will be useful in later work life?

Much – Nothing

Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.5
Standardabweichung: 0.8

67% 17% 17% 0% 0%

4.1.2 In relation to the number of credit points awarded, is the amount of work to be done justified?

Too high – Too low

Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 2.5
Standardabweichung: 0.8

9% 36% 46% 9% 0%

4.1.3 Do the obligatory course achievements support successful completion of the module?

Yes – No

Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 1.4
Standardabweichung: 0.5

64% 36% 0% 0% 0%

4.1.4 Do you think the obligatory course achievements are adequate?

Yes – No

Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 1.5
Standardabweichung: 0.7

64% 27% 9% 0% 0%
4.1.5 Did your interest in this module’s field of study change?

Strongly inc. – Strongly dec.

Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 2.3
Standardabweichung: 1.2

4.1.6 Would you recommend taking this module to your best friend?

Yes – No

Antworten: 11
Durchschnitt: 1.5
Standardabweichung: 0.9

4.2 How much time did you spend on this module every week, including lecture, exercises, exercise tasks...?

[0,3) hours 0%  
[3,6) hours 42%  
[6,8) hours 25%  
[8,10) hours 25%  
[10,12) hours 8%  
[12,∞) hours 0%  

5 Exercise Class Evaluation

5.1 Please rate the exercise class you visited.

5.1.1 Has the tutor been available for questions outside of the tutorial?

Always – Never

Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.2
Standardabweichung: 0.6

5.1.2 Could you understand your tutor’s corrections and gradings?

Always – Never

Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.8
Standardabweichung: 0.8

5.1.3 Did the tutor manage to handle all the relevant content in the exercise class?

Always – Never

Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.8
Standardabweichung: 1.0
5.1.4 Would you recommend visiting this exercise class?

Yes – No

Antworten: 12
Durchschnitt: 1.5
Standardabweichung: 0.8

6 Comprehensive Rating

6.1 Please give an overall rating of the course on a scale from excellent (1) to very poor (6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent (1)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good (2)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory (3)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequate (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor (5)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very poor (6)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Free Text Comments

7.1 Which aspects of the course did you like?

Content.
Professor
- state of the art topics
- Explanations were clear most of the time.

- Well aligned theory
- Ready workspace for practical projects

The topics were taken from papers with interesting results.
The examples were illustrative.
There were practical aspects in the course.

The programming part was explained very good and midterm is necessary in my opinion. The course is not too complicated and structured very good.

The topics are very relevant.

7.2 What could be improved?

Put the slide online before the lectures
Most complex topics would require more time in the lectures.

- Architecture part could be more demonstration based
- newer technologies could be covered
- more adequate examples and exercises would rise the interest to the architectural part

- Structure of the course:
- Sections were not clear for first part.
- Too many proofs for second part.

The exercises should include a thorough overview of the lectures rather than just briefly solve the exercises.

Probably, a theoretical part should be a bit faster, nevertheless slides were good.

The lecture notes for the first part (Dr. Mock) are not well suited for studying. Need more explanations.

7.3 You can leave remarks and further feedback here.

Time series related architecture would be interesting to include in materials.
Mandatory course achievements

- joining an exercise solution group
- active contribution to the solution of all homework assignments in the exercise solution group
- regular submission of the exercise group solutions (in written form for the theoretic and algorithmic tasks and electronically for the programming exercises)
- up to the date where the admission decision is made: achievement of at least 50% of all possible points that can be received for the solutions submitted and for the oral presentation of the programming exercises
- passing of the mid-term exercise checkup

Lecturers’ Questionnaire

This part contains data provided by the lecturers.

1 Lecture metadata

| Number of students in the lecture at the beginning of the semester | ≈ 40 |
| Number of students in the lecture at the end of the semester | ≈ 25 |
| Number of students participating in the exercise classes at the beginning of the semester | ≈ 40 |
| Number of students participating in the exercise classes at the end of the semester | ≈ 20 |
| Number of students that have registered for the exam | 21* |

* (in BASIS)

2 Exercise classes

| Number of exercise classes | 2 |
| Average number of students per exercise class at the end of the semester | 10 |

The students have been assigned to an exercise class in the following way:
Assignment by the lecturer

3 Helpful stuff

There has been a text exam.
Sample solutions for exercise tasks have been distributed.

4 Free text comments

4.1 In your opinion, what aspects of the module worked well this semester?

-
4.2 What would you change if you were to offer this module again and why?

-

4.3 In case there have been obligatory course achievements: Please judge on their effectivity regarding the learning success of the students.

-

4.4 Further remarks