Summary of the course evaluation made for NUMA01 autumn 2020

During the autumn term 2020 the course NUMA01 had a total of 140 registered students, 30 of these were reregistered students. The number of students that passed the examination was 78.

Since the course took place during the Corona-pandemic, all lectures, all training sessions, and all oral parts of the examination, were conducted through video conferences.

After the examination all students were given the opportunity to make a course evaluation, only 29 students did it. A summary of their answers is given below.

NUMA01- autumn 2020

```
Answer Count: 29
```

Your role in the course?



Your participation in the lectures.

| Your participation in the lectures. | Number of Responses | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|---|
| 0 - 10 | 3 (10.3%) | - | |
| 11 - 21 | 2 (6.9%) | | |
| 22 - 32 | 3 (10.3%) | | |
| 33 - 43 | 1 (3.4%) | | |
| 44 - 54 | 1 (3.4%) | 0 - 10 - | |
| 55 - 65 | 1 (3.4%) | | |
| 66 - 76 | 2 (6.9%) | 11-21- | |
| 77 - 87 | 1 (3.4%) | 00.00 | |
| 88 - 98 | 6 (20.7%) | 22 - 32 - | |
| 99 - 109 | 9 (31.0%) | 33 - 43 - | |
| Total | 29 (100.0%) | | |
| | | 44 - 54 - | |
| | | 55.05 | |
| | | 55 - 65 - | |
| | | 66 - 76 - | |
| | | | |
| | | 77 - 87 - | |
| | | | |
| | | 88 - 98 - | |
| | | 99 - 109 - | |
| | | | |
| | | + + + | |
| | | 0.0 % 5.0 % | 10.0 % 15.0 % 20.0 % 25.0 % 30.0 % 35.0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Your participation in the lectures. | | 67.2 | 35.3 |

Your participation in the training exercises.

| Your participation in the training exercises. | Number of Responses | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------|--|
| 0 - 10 | 10 (34.5%) | | |
| 11 - 21 | 2 (6.9%) | | |
| 22 - 32 | 1 (3.4%) | | |
| 33 - 43 | 3 (10.3%) | | |
| 44 - 54 | 3 (10.3%) | 0 - 10 - | |
| 55 - 65 | 0 (0.0%) | | |
| 66 - 76 | 1 (3.4%) | 11-21- | |
| 77 - 87 | 2 (6.9%) | 22.22 | |
| 88 - 98 | 5 (17.2%) | 22 - 32 - | |
| 99 - 109 | 2 (6.9%) | 33 - 43 - | |
| Total | 29 (100.0%) | | |
| | | 44 - 54 - | |
| | | 55 65 | |
| | | 55-05- | |
| | | 66 - 76 - | |
| | | | |
| | | 77 - 87 - | |
| | | 88 - 98 - | |
| | | | |
| | | 99 - 109 - | |
| | | | |
| | | 0.0% 5.0% 1 | 0.0% 15.0% 20.0% 25.0% 30.0% 2 |
| | | 0.0 % 3.0 % 1 | 0.0 /0 10.0 /0 20.0 /0 20.0 /0 30.0 /0 3 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Your participation in the training exercises. | | 44.0 | 37.4 |

Have you ever have written a computer program before the course start? (Please give the most relevant answer)

| Have you ever have written a computer program before the course start? (Please give the most relevant | Number of |
|--|----------------|
| answer) | Responses |
| No. | 14 (48.3%) |
| Yes, in Java. | 2 (6.9%) |
| Yes, in C. | 2 (6.9%) |
| Yes, in C++ | 1 (3.4%) |
| Yes, in Matlab. | 3 (10.3%) |
| Yes, in a visual programming language, like Snap! . | 0 (0.0%) |
| Yes, in Python. | 5 (17.2%) |
| Yes, in a language not listet. | 2 (6.9%) |
| Total | 29 (100.0%) |



 Mean
 Mean
 Standard Deviation

 Have you ever have written a computer program before the course start? (Please give the most relevant answer)
 3.2
 2.7

Why did you sign up for the course? (several answers possible)



Now that the lectures are done, my impression is.....



The lectures

| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) were hard to follow. 6 (21.4%) were rather theoretical. 49 (175.0%) Total 49 (175.0%) Mean Standard Deviation | | Mean | | | Standard D | eviation | |
|--|--|-------------|-------------------------|-------|------------|----------|------|
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were hard to follow. 6 (21.4%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) were rather theoretical. were rather theoretical. were rather theoretical. 0.0% 20.0% 40.0% 6 | | | | | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were hard to follow. 6 (21.4%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were rather theoretica | | | |).0 % | 20.0 % | 40.0 % | 60.0 |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were hard to follow. 6 (21.4%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) | | | | | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were hard to follow. 6 (21.4%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) were rather theoretica were rather theoretica were hard to follow. were insight to alt gave me insight to alt were hard to follow. | | | were totally useless f. | | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were hard to follow. 6 (21.4%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) were rather theoretica were rather theoretica | | | were hard to follow | v | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were hard to follow. 6 (21.4%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) showed me the relevanc showed me the relevanc | | | were rather theoretica. | | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were hard to follow. 6 (21.4%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) Total 49 (175.0%) | | | showed me the relevanc. | | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) were totally useless for me. 3 (10.7%) | Total | 49 (175.0%) | gave me insight to alt. | | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) were rather theoretical. 7 (25.0%) helped me to understan helped me to understan | were totally useless for me. | 3 (10.7%) | | | | | - |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. 8 (28.6%) | were rather theoretical. | 7 (25.0%) | helped me to understan. | | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details. 15 (53.6%) gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. 10 (35.7%) | showed me the relevance of programming in mathematics/physics. | 8 (28.6%) | | | | | |
| The lectures Responses helped me to understand concepts and details 15 (53 6%) | gave me insight to alternative solution approaches. | 10 (35.7%) | | | | | |
| The lectures Responses | helped me to understand concepts and details | 15 (53 6%) | | | | | |
| Number of | The lectures | Number of | | | | | |

The material used during lectures was ordered in a way ...

| way Responses | |
|---|------------|
| which was a good mix of new concepts and deepening of concepts from previous lectures 22 (78.6%) | |
| which made that I often felt lost 6 (21.4%) | |
| Total 28 (100.0%) | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| which was a good | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| which made that | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 0.0 % 20.0 % 40.0 % 6 | 0.0% 80.0% |
| | |
| | |
| Mean Standard L | |

Trainings Exercises

| | | Number of | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------|
| - | I liked to have the trainings exercises directly after the lectures and that they made me work with "the topic of the day". | 13 (44.8%) | 1 | | | |
| | I would have liked to have a distance of at least one day between new material and the training. | 7 (24.1%) | | | | |
| | Don't know | 9 (31.0%) | | | | |
| | Total | 29 (100.0%) | I liked to have the tra | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | Luccold bases file days | | | |
| | | | I would have liked to h | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | Don't know - | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | + | | + | |
| | | | 0.0 | % 10.0 % 20.0 % 30 |).0 % 40.0 % | 6 50.0 % |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---------------------|------|--------------------|
| Trainings Exercises | 1.4 | 0.5 |

Support

| | Number of |
|--|-------------|
| Support | Responses |
| I had to wait less than 5 minutes for support during | |
| the training exercises | 15 (68.2%) |
| I had to wait between 5 and 15 minutes | 4 (18.2%) |
| I had to wait more than 15 minutes until a teaching | |
| assistant helped me. | 3 (13.6%) |
| Total | 22 (100.0%) |
| | |



Support

| | Number of |
|--|-------------|
| Competence | Responses |
| The teaching assistants were competent. | 20 (69.0%) |
| The teaching assistant sometimes could not answer | |
| but found another one to help. | 3 (10.3%) |
| The teaching assistents tried there best but gave me | |
| often wrong answers. | 0 (0.0%) |
| The teaching assistants did not care. | 0 (0.0%) |
| Don't know | 6 (20.7%) |
| Total | 29 (100.0%) |



1.1

| Competence |
|------------|
|------------|

Taining exercises. I worked in a group.



Homework



The homework presentations.

The homework presentations.

| | Number of |
|---|-------------|
| The homework presentations. | Responses |
| The way the homeworks were presented gave me a chance to get extra feedback. | 16 (55.2%) |
| The way the homeworks were presented gave me a chance to show and test my knowledge. | 17 (58.6%) |
| The way the homework was presented did not match to my effort I put into this work. | 4 (13.8%) |
| I felt treated unfair. | 0 (0.0%) |
| I do not like orals with teaching assistants. | 2 (6.9%) |
| Don't know | 3 (10.3%) |
| Total | 42 (144.8%) |



I found it helpfull to work in groups for the homework





Course material. The slides and Jupyter Notebook files were ...

The course book.

The course book.

| | Number of |
|---|-------------|
| The course book. | Responses |
| I never used the course book. | 14 (48.3%) |
| I consulted the book rarely. | 6 (20.7%) |
| I consulted the book occasionally. | 5 (17.2%) |
| I reread the actual sections of the lecture in the course book. | 1 (3.4%) |
| I used it for further reading and deepening. | 3 (10.3%) |
| Total | 29 (100.0%) |



Course style. Language

