# Section 1

Number of questionnaires returned: *17* (28.33%)

General questions

1. What percent of the lectures did you attend?


0%:	0 (0.00 %)
25%:	1 (6.25 %)
50%:	4 (25.00 %)
75%:	6 (37.50 %)
100%:	5 (31.25 %)

2. How many hours per week (excluding contact hours) did you, on average, spend on self-study (e.g. study of literature, working out the exercises, doing assigments, etc.) for this course?

< 4:	1 (6.25 %)
4-5:	5 (31.25 %)
6-7:	5 (31.25 %)
8-9:	5 (31.25 %)
> 10:	0 (0.00 %)

3. The lecturer(s) informed us about the workload (i.e. number of self-study hours p/week)

Yes: 9 (64.29 %)

No: 5 (35.71 %)

Unsure: 0 (0.00 %)

4. The indicated workload of the course matches the actual workload I experienced (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 2 (14.29 %)

Neutral: 4 (28.57 %)

Agree: 6 (42.86 %)

Strongly agree: 2 (14.29 %)

Mean:	3.6	Std:	0.9	N:	14	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	2	Max:	5

5. Considering the number of credits (ECTS) assigned to the course, the workload was appropriate (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 7 (50.00 %)

Agree: 3 (21.43 %)

Strongly agree: 4 (28.57 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	0.9	N:	14	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3.5	Mode.:	3	Min:	3	Max:	5

Connection to the programme

6. I believe I had enough prior knowledge to succesfully participate in the course (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 7 (41.18 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.7	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

7. The connection of this course to the rest of the programme is clear to me (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 3 (17.65 %)

Disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 8 (47.06 %)

Strongly agree: 2 (11.76 %)

| Mean:	3.2	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

Course structure

8. The learning outcomes (i.e. learning goals or objectives) of the course were clearly articulated (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	3 (17.65 %)
Disagree:	3 (17.65 %)
Neutral:	2 (11.76 %)
Agree:	6 (35.29 %)
Strongly agree:	3 (17.65 %)

| Mean:	3.2	Std:	1.4	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

9. Expectations for student learning were made clear (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	2 (11.76 %)
Disagree:	3 (17.65 %)
Neutral:	5 (29.41 %)
Agree:	5 (29.41 %)
Strongly agree:	2 (11.76 %)

Mean:	3.1	Std:	1.2	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

10. The grading practices were clearly defined (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	2 (11.76 %)
Disagree:	4 (23.53 %)
Neutral:	3 (17.65 %)
Agree:	3 (17.65 %)
Strongly agree:	5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.3	Std:	1.4	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

Lecturer: M. Dumontier

11. The lecturer effectively explained course concepts (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	1 (5.88 %)
Disagree:	1 (5.88 %)
Neutral:	2 (11.76 %)
Agree:	9 (52.94 %)
Strongly agree:	4 (23.53 %)

| Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.1	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

12. The lecturer has a good pace during the lectures (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 7 (41.18 %)

Strongly agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Mean:	3.9	Std:	1.1	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

13. The lecturer encouraged student questions and participation (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 7 (41.18 %)

Strongly agree: 7 (41.18 %)

Mean:	4.1	Std:	1.1	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

14. The lecturer was helpful when I had difficulties or questions (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Strongly agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.2	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

15. Please rate the overall performance of the lecturer (1-5)


Very bad: 1 (5.88 %)

Bad: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 5 (29.41 %)

Good: 5 (29.41 %)

Very good: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.7	Std:	1.2	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

Lecturer: K. Moodley

16. The lecturer effectively explained course concepts (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 3 (17.65 %)

Agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Strongly agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

17. The lecturer has a good pace during the lectures (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 8 (47.06 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.2	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

18. The lecturer encouraged student questions and participation (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (12.50 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 1 (6.25 %)

Agree: 8 (50.00 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (31.25 %)

Mean:	3.9	Std:	1.3	N:	16	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

19. The lecturer was helpful when I had difficulties or questions (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 3 (17.65 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Strongly agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Mean:	3.7	Std:	1.4	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

20. Please rate the overall performance of the lecturer (1-5)

Very bad: 2 (11.76 %)

Bad: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 4 (23.53 %)

Good: 6 (35.29 %)

Very good: 4 (23.53 %)

Mean:	3.5	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

Labs (or exercise sessions / tutorials / practicals) (if applicable)

21. The labs helped me to better understand the course content (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 7 (41.18 %)

Neutral: 1 (5.88 %)

Agree: 3 (17.65 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.2	Std:	1.4	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3	Mode.:	2	Min:	1	Max:	5

22. Please rate the overall quality of the labs (1-5)

Very bad: 2 (12.50 %)

Bad: 5 (31.25 %)

Neutral: 2 (12.50 %)

Good: 7 (43.75 %)

Very good: 0 (0.00 %)

Mean:	2.9	Std:	1.1	N:	16	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	4

Teaching assistant(s) (if applicable)

23. Overall, the TA('s) was/were effective in fulfilling their role (e.g. teaching, answering questions, providing help and feedback) (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 5 (29.41 %)

Agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Strongly agree: 4 (23.53 %)

Mean:	3.5	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

24. Please rate the overall performance of the TA('s) (1-5)

Very bad: 2 (11.76 %)

Bad: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 5 (29.41 %)

Good: 5 (29.41 %)

Very good: 4 (23.53 %)

Mean:	3.5	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

Assignment(s) (if applicable)

25. The assignments were helpful for my learning (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	1 (5.88 %)						
Disagree:	1 (5.88 %)						
Neutral:	3 (17.65 %)						
Agree:	7 (41.18 %)						
Strongly agree:	5 (29.41 %)						

| Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.1	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

26. The feedback on the assignment(s) made it clear to me what the strong and weak points of my work were (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	1 (5.88 %)
Disagree:	3 (17.65 %)
Neutral:	4 (23.53 %)
Agree:	8 (47.06 %)
Strongly agree:	1 (5.88 %)

Mean:	3.3	Std:	1.0	N:	17	Mean 2018:	4.0
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

27. The assignment(s) were feasible within the given time frame (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 5 (29.41 %)

Agree: 10 (58.82 %)

Strongly agree: 2 (11.76 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	0.6	N:	17	Mean 2018:	4.4
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	3	Max:	5

Final exam --> only fill this in if your exam was NOT postponed

28. The exam covers the subject matter of this course (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 1 (11.11 %)

Agree: 5 (55.56 %)

Strongly agree: 3 (33.33 %)

Mean:	**4.2**	Std:	0.7	N:	9	Mean 2018:	4.7
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	3	Max:	5

29. The exam was/were feasible within the given time frame (1-5)


Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (22.22 %)

Agree: 4 (44.44 %)

Strongly agree: 3 (33.33 %)

Mean:	4.1	Std:	0.8	N:	9	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	3	Max:	5

30. In general, the level of difficulty in this exam was appropriate (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 3 (33.33 %)

Agree: 5 (55.56 %)

Strongly agree: 1 (11.11 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	0.7	N:	9	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	3	Max:	5

Rate your course

31. In this course, I learned content or skills that I consider valuable (1-5)


Strongly disagree: 1 (6.25 %)

Disagree: 4 (25.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (12.50 %)

Agree: 4 (25.00 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (31.25 %)

Mean:	3.5	Std:	1.4	N:	16	Mean 2018:	4.0
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

32.Please rate the overall quality of this course (1-5)

Very bad:	2 (11.76 %)
Bad:	3 (17.65 %)
Neutral:	3 (17.65 %)
Good:	7 (41.18 %)
Very good:	2 (11.76 %)

Mean:	3.2	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	4.1
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

Section 1

Number of questionnaires returned: *17* (28.33%)

General questions

1. What percent of the lectures did you attend?

| 0%:	0 (0.00 %)
25%:	1 (6.25 %)
50%:	4 (25.00 %)
75%:	6 (37.50 %)
100%:	5 (31.25 %)

2. How many hours per week (excluding contact hours) did you, on average, spend on self-study (e.g. study of literature, working out the exercises, doing assigments, etc.) for this course?

< 4:	1 (6.25 %)
4-5:	5 (31.25 %)
6-7:	5 (31.25 %)
8-9:	5 (31.25 %)
> 10:	0 (0.00 %)

3. The lecturer(s) informed us about the workload (i.e. number of self-study hours p/week)

Yes: 9 (64.29 %)

No: 5 (35.71 %)

Unsure: 0 (0.00 %)

4. The indicated workload of the course matches the actual workload I experienced (1-5)


Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 2 (14.29 %)

Neutral: 4 (28.57 %)

Agree: 6 (42.86 %)

Strongly agree: 2 (14.29 %)

Mean:	3.6	Std:	0.9	N:	14	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	2	Max:	5

5. Considering the number of credits (ECTS) assigned to the course, the workload was appropriate (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 7 (50.00 %)

Agree: 3 (21.43 %)

Strongly agree: 4 (28.57 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	0.9	N:	14	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3.5	Mode.:	3	Min:	3	Max:	5

Connection to the programme

6. I believe I had enough prior knowledge to succesfully participate in the course (1-5)


Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 7 (41.18 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.7	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

7. The connection of this course to the rest of the programme is clear to me (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 3 (17.65 %)

Disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 8 (47.06 %)

Strongly agree: 2 (11.76 %)

Mean:	3.2	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

Course structure

8. The learning outcomes (i.e. learning goals or objectives) of the course were clearly articulated (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	3 (17.65 %)
Disagree:	3 (17.65 %)
Neutral:	2 (11.76 %)
Agree:	6 (35.29 %)
Strongly agree:	3 (17.65 %)

Mean:	3.2	Std:	1.4	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

9. Expectations for student learning were made clear (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	2 (11.76 %)
Disagree:	3 (17.65 %)
Neutral:	5 (29.41 %)
Agree:	5 (29.41 %)
Strongly agree:	2 (11.76 %)

Mean:	3.1	Std:	1.2	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

10. The grading practices were clearly defined (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 4 (23.53 %)

Neutral: 3 (17.65 %)

Agree: 3 (17.65 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.3	Std:	1.4	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

Lecturer: M. Dumontier

11. The lecturer effectively explained course concepts (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 9 (52.94 %)

Strongly agree: 4 (23.53 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.1	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

12. The lecturer has a good pace during the lectures (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 7 (41.18 %)

Strongly agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Mean:	3.9	Std:	1.1	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

13. The lecturer encouraged student questions and participation (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 7 (41.18 %)

Strongly agree: 7 (41.18 %)

| Mean:	4.1	Std:	1.1	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

14. The lecturer was helpful when I had difficulties or questions (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Strongly agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.2	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

15. Please rate the overall performance of the lecturer (1-5)


Very bad: 1 (5.88 %)

Bad: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 5 (29.41 %)

Good: 5 (29.41 %)

Very good: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.7	Std:	1.2	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

**Lecturer: K. Moodley**

16. The lecturer effectively explained course concepts (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 3 (17.65 %)

Agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Strongly agree: 6 (35.29 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

17.The lecturer has a good pace during the lectures (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (11.76 %)

Agree: 8 (47.06 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.2	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

18.The lecturer encouraged student questions and participation (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (12.50 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 1 (6.25 %)

Agree: 8 (50.00 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (31.25 %)

Mean:	3.9	Std:	1.3	N:	16	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

19.The lecturer was helpful when I had difficulties or questions (1-5)

Strongly disagree:	3 (17.65 %)
Disagree:	0 (0.00 %)
Neutral:	2 (11.76 %)
Agree:	6 (35.29 %)
Strongly agree:	6 (35.29 %)

Mean:	3.7	Std:	1.4	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

20. Please rate the overall performance of the lecturer (1-5)

Very bad:	2 (11.76 %)
Bad:	1 (5.88 %)
Neutral:	4 (23.53 %)
Good:	6 (35.29 %)
Very good:	4 (23.53 %)

Mean:	3.5	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

Labs (or exercise sessions / tutorials / practicals) (if applicable)

21. The labs helped me to better understand the course content (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 7 (41.18 %)

Neutral: 1 (5.88 %)

Agree: 3 (17.65 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Mean:	3.2	Std:	1.4	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3	Mode.:	2	Min:	1	Max:	5

22. Please rate the overall quality of the labs (1-5)

Very bad: 2 (12.50 %)

Bad: 5 (31.25 %)

Neutral: 2 (12.50 %)

Good: 7 (43.75 %)

Very good: 0 (0.00 %)

Mean:	2.9	Std:	1.1	N:	16	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	3	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	4

Teaching assistant(s) (if applicable)

23. Overall, the TA('s) was/were effective in fulfilling their role (e.g. teaching, answering questions, providing help and feedback) (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 2 (11.76 %)

Disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 5 (29.41 %)

Agree: 5 (29.41 %)

Strongly agree: 4 (23.53 %)

Mean:	3.5	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

24. Please rate the overall performance of the TA('s) (1-5)

Very bad: 2 (11.76 %)

Bad: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 5 (29.41 %)

Good: 5 (29.41 %)

Very good: 4 (23.53 %)

Mean:	3.5	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

Assignment(s) (if applicable)

25. The assignments were helpful for my learning (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Neutral: 3 (17.65 %)

Agree: 7 (41.18 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (29.41 %)

| Mean:	3.8	Std:	1.1	N:	17	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

26. The feedback on the assignment(s) made it clear to me what the strong and weak points of my work were (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (5.88 %)

Disagree: 3 (17.65 %)

Neutral: 4 (23.53 %)

Agree: 8 (47.06 %)

Strongly agree: 1 (5.88 %)

Mean:	3.3	Std:	1.0	N:	17	Mean 2018:	4.0
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5

27. The assignment(s) were feasible within the given time frame (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 5 (29.41 %)

Agree: 10 (58.82 %)

Strongly agree: 2 (11.76 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	0.6	N:	17	Mean 2018:	4.4
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	3	Max:	5

Final exam --> only fill this in if your exam was NOT postponed

28. The exam covers the subject matter of this course (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 1 (11.11 %)

Agree: 5 (55.56 %)

Strongly agree: 3 (33.33 %)

Mean:	**4.2**	Std:	0.7	N:	9	Mean 2018:	4.7
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	3	Max:	5

29. The exam was/were feasible within the given time frame (1-5)


Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (22.22 %)

Agree: 4 (44.44 %)

Strongly agree: 3 (33.33 %)

Mean:	4.1	Std:	0.8	N:	9	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	3	Max:	5

30. In general, the level of difficulty in this exam was appropriate (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Disagree: 0 (0.00 %)

Neutral: 3 (33.33 %)

Agree: 5 (55.56 %)

Strongly agree: 1 (11.11 %)

Mean:	3.8	Std:	0.7	N:	9	Mean 2018:	-
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	3	Max:	5

Rate your course

31. In this course, I learned content or skills that I consider valuable (1-5)

Strongly disagree: 1 (6.25 %)

Disagree: 4 (25.00 %)

Neutral: 2 (12.50 %)

Agree: 4 (25.00 %)

Strongly agree: 5 (31.25 %)

Mean:	3.5	Std:	1.4	N:	16	Mean 2018:	4.0
Median:	4	Mode.:	5	Min:	1	Max:	5

32. Please rate the overall quality of this course (1-5)

Very bad: 2 (11.76 %)

Bad: 3 (17.65 %)

Neutral: 3 (17.65 %)

Good: 7 (41.18 %)

Very good: 2 (11.76 %)

Mean:	3.2	Std:	1.3	N:	17	Mean 2018:	4.1
Median:	4	Mode.:	4	Min:	1	Max:	5