



Questionnaire for the Evaluation of the Education

Base + Tutorials

28-10-2016 63x

Formnr StanCursusEval2014-wE

CETAR VU

vrije Universiteit amsterdam



COURSE: Introduction IMM

PROGRAMME: B Informatie, Multimedia en Manag

TEACHER(S): Victor de Boer

FACULTY: FEW

How to answer

- Please put a clear marking with black or blue pen, in this way: ○ ● ○
- Unless you have been instructed otherwise, - = disagree strongly/very bad; - = disagree/fairly bad; +/ - = neither agree nor disagree; + = agree/rather good; ++ = agree strongly/very good; na = not applicable.

Course content

- | | -- | - | +/- | + | ++ | n/a |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----|------------|----|-------|
| 1. It was an interesting course. | 01 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 2. The learning objectives were clear to me. | 02 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 3. The relevance of this course to the programme was clear to me. | 03 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 4. I learned a lot from this course. | 04 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 5. The study materials (books, readers, etc.) were clear and informative. | 05 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 6. For me, the level of this course was | | | | | | |
| | ○ too low | ○ just right | | ○ too high | | ○ n/a |
| 7. The total study load of this course was in proportion to the number of credits (EC) | | | | | | |
| | ○ too low | ○ just right | | ○ too high | | ○ n/a |
| 8. Overall rating of the quality of the content of this course | 08 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Course organisation

- | | -- | - | +/- | + | ++ | n/a |
|---|--------|---|-----|---|----|-----|
| 9. The course information was clear and up to date. | 09 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 10. This course was well-organised. (If you disagree, please explain at the open questions on the back of this form.) | 10 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Student commitment

- | | -- | - | +/- | + | ++ | n/a |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------------|---------|------------|-------|
| 11. I was able to keep up with the material well during the course. | 11 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 12. Percentage of classes attended | | | | | | |
| | ○ 0 - 32% | ○ 33- 66% | ○ 67 - 100% | | | ○ n/a |
| 13. Estimated time spent in hours on out-of-class study per week (i.e. excluding face-to-face instruction) | | | | | | |
| | ○ 0-4 | ○ 4-8 | ○ 8-12 | ○ 12-16 | ○ > 16 hrs | ○ n/a |

Lecture teacher

- | | -- | - | +/- | + | ++ | n/a |
|---|--------|---|-----|---|----|-----|
| 14. The teacher explained the material clearly during the lectures. | 14 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 15. The teacher encouraged students to think about the material. | 15 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 16. The teacher made a clear distinction between main points and side issues. | 16 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 17. The teacher's command of English was adequate. | 17 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 18. Overall rating of the teaching qualities of the teacher | 18 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Exam

- | | -- | - | +/- | + | ++ | n/a |
|---|-----------|--------------|-----|------------|----|-------|
| 19. I knew clearly in advance what to expect in the exam (via exercises, practice tests, study instructions, etc.) | 19 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 20. The exam was a good indicator of what I had learned in this course. (If you disagree, please explain at the open questions on the back of this form.) | 20 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 21. The exam questions were clear. | 21 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 22. The time allowed to take the exam was sufficient. | 22 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 23. In my opinion, the level of the exam was | | | | | | |
| | ○ too low | ○ just right | | ○ too high | | ○ n/a |
| 24. Overall rating of the exam | 24 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Tutorials

- | | -- | - | +/- | + | ++ | n/a |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----|------------|----|-------|
| 25. The tutorials were useful and worthwhile. | 25 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 26. I learned a lot from the tutorials. | 26 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 27. For me, the level of the tutorials was generally | | | | | | |
| | ○ too low | ○ just right | | ○ too high | | ○ n/a |
| 28. Overall rating of the tutorials | 28 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

My tutorial teacher was:

○ Hajo Reijers ○ Davide Ceolin ○ Anton Eliens

○ Olvano Malavolta / Patric Tobias Kuhn ○

- | | -- | - | +/- | + | ++ | n/a |
|--|--------|---|-----|---|----|-----|
| 29. The teacher involved everyone actively in the discussions. | 29 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 30. The teacher answered any questions satisfactorily. | 30 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 31. Overall rating of the teaching qualities of the teacher | 31 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Additional questions

- | | -- | - | +/- | + | ++ | n/a |
|--|--------|---|-----|---|----|-----|
| 32. I learned a lot from the paper writing assignment | 32 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 33. The papers we had to read and present were relevant and interesting | 33 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 34. The guest lectures were interesting and informative (please specify below) | 34 - ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Thank you very much for filling out this questionnaire!
Please also answer the questions on the back of this form.

Please answer the open questions below. You may also use the space to explain your answers or give further comments. Your answers will be reported to the course coordinator literally.

What do you think was good about this course?

What suggestions for improvement can you make?

Further comments