

Uni Osnabrück – Servicestelle Lehrevaluation – Seminarstraße 20 – 49069 Osnabrück

Ms Imke von Maur
private/ confidential
Lehrereinheit Kognitionswissenschaften
im Hause

Evaluation report on course "Introduction to the Philosophy of Emotions" in WS 2017/18

Osnabrück, 12.02.2018

Dear Ms von Maur,

this report contains the results of the evaluation of the course entitled "Introduction to the Philosophy of Emotions", which you held at the University of Osnabrueck in WS 2017/18. The purpose of the report is to give you detailed and individual feedback regarding the quality of your course from the students' point of view. On the following pages, prior to the report, you will find explanations regarding how the statistics given in the various different sections were yielded and how they are to be understood. The results report itself is divided into three sections: (1) overall indicators, (2) survey results and, finally, if available, (3) comments. Regarding the comments, we want to point out that you have to preserve the students' anonymity under all circumstances. This holds true even if the students' identities could be determined via their handwritten comments.

Please retain your results report as we are going to delete any personalized evaluation data after three years.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or suggestions regarding the report.

The course was held by the lecturers mentioned below. If it was held by more than one lecturer, for technical reasons this covering letter can address a single lecturer only; in addition, the order of the entries is fixed. Therefore, these facts do not allow any conclusions regarding the contribution of the particular lecturer.

Imke von Maur

Kind regards,

Your Teaching Evaluation Service Point
University of Osnabrueck
Institute of Psychology
<http://www.lehreval.uos.de>

Contact Partner	Telephone	E-Mail
Dr. Judith Rickers	969-4041	lehreval@uos.de
Dipl.-Psych. Jennifer Molitor	969-4043	lehreval@uos.de
Prof. Dr. Thomas Staufenbiel	969-4512	thomas.staufenbiel@uos.de

Information on the teaching evaluation report

1 Overall indicators

The section "Overall indicators", the first section of the feedback report, gives an overview of the evaluation results in certain subject areas that have been addressed. These are compared with the average results that are gained in seminars evaluated at the University of Osnabrueck.

Before giving a detailed explanation of the portrayal of the results, the composition of the questionnaire that was employed for the evaluation shall first be presented.

1.1 Composition of the questionnaire

The evaluation was carried out by means of a standardised questionnaire (Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Seminars, FESEM). The front page of this questionnaire contains 18 "questions" that relate to specific aspects of the course. The "questions" are always formulated as statements, e.g.: "The seminar is clearly structured". The students indicate the extent of their approval or rejection of these statements on a 5-point scale. The scale ranges from "strongly disagree", "somewhat disagree", "partly agree, partly disagree" to "somewhat agree" and "strongly agree". There is also the possibility to select the answer "not applicable".

With regard to content, 17 out of the 18 questions can be classified to the following four subject areas. (Question number 18 does not belong to any particular subject area.)

Subject Area	The questions relate to the extent to which ...
Planning and Presentation	... the seminar is clearly structured, gives a good overview, the lecturer gives enough explanatory or secondary information, the organisation of the seminar contributes towards the understanding of the subject matter, and helpful aids of a good quality are available to support the learning process.
Interaction with Students	... there is a good working climate in the seminar, the lecturer behaves towards the students in a friendly and respectful manner, shows an interest in their learning success, and goes into their questions and suggestions in sufficient detail.
Interestingness and Relevance	... the seminar is made interesting, there is a good combination of knowledge transfer and discussion, interest in the subject area is promoted, and the usability and usefulness of the subject matter – also with regard to other subjects/areas – is highlighted.
Quality of the Seminar Papers	... contributors present the information in a comprehensible manner, emphasise the really relevant information, and are well prepared for questions.

In addition to these questions, the following four global questions are asked:

Global Question	Wording of the Question
School grade for one's own seminar paper	„If you gave a presentation which "school grade" would you give yourself for the presentation?" on a school grade scale of 1 to 5?
School Grade for Lecturer	„Which "school grade" would you give the lecturer as the course instructor?" on a school grade scale of 1 to 5?

School Grade for Course	„Which overall “school grade” would you give the course?” on a school grade scale of 1 to 5?
Subjective Learning Success	„How much have you learnt in this course?” on a scale of 1=„very little” to 5=„a great amount”

Besides the subject areas and global questions a series of specific questions are asked in the questionnaire related to the level of difficulty of the course, the conditions, the amount of work, as well as characteristics regarding the students (e.g. sex, previous interest in the course, reasons for attending the course). The questionnaire closes with an open question where students can express further remarks and suggestions in free form.


For more information on the instrument used please refer to our homepage at [FAQ](#).

1.2 Portrayal of the results

The name of the lecturer, the title of the course and the number of students who took part in the evaluation (No. of responses) are given at the head of the page.

The section of the results report entitled **“Overall indicators”** comprises the results related to the four aforementioned subject areas as well as the four global questions. Each respective aspect is visible in the column with the heading **“Dimension”**. The column with the heading **“Value”** provides the responses averaged for all of the students (who have answered the respective questions). The values range ...

- between 5.0 (=best possible score) and 1.0 (=worst possible score) for the four subject areas “Planning and Presentation”, “Interaction with Students”, “Interestingness and Relevance” and “Quality of the Seminar Papers” and the question regarding subjective learning success. An average is given for all students and all respective questions.
- between 1.0 (=best possible score) and 5.0 (=worst possible score) for the three school grades.



The purpose of the information to the right of the values is to help you classify these results. Can a value of 4.34 in the subject area “Planning and Presentation”, for instance, be evaluated as good? It goes without saying that various different evaluation standards are possible here. The result could be deemed successful, for instance, if a lower value of, e.g. 4.05, was achieved in the last evaluation of the same course. A comparison could also be made with parallel courses, if applicable. The evaluation assistance given in this report originates from a comparison with a large number of seminars that have already been evaluated using this questionnaire¹.






¹ At the moment, this comprises data from 3.059 seminars that were evaluated by 53.883 students in previous semesters at the University of Osnabrück.

The column with the heading **"Percentile rank"** indicates how many lecturers of the norm sample (in percent) achieved the same result or worse. The higher the Percentile Rank, the better the students assess the course. The Norm values were calculated from the means of courses evaluated with FESEM (not from the means of questionnaires).

On the far right, the **Profile portrayal** gives a graphic illustration of the Norm values. Looking at the example given, the Percentile Rank of 71 indicates that of all the lectures that were evaluated with the same questionnaire at the University of Osnabrueck, 71 were rated as being equally good or worse (and vice versa 29% as being even better).

Between the details of the Percentile Rank and the profile line is a column containing coloured symbols that facilitate a **rough evaluation** of the Percentile Ranks.²

The symbols have the following meanings:

-  The green symbol „+++" indicates a result that is very much above average (Percentile Rank 96 to 100).
-  The green symbol „+" indicates a result that is above average (Percentile Rank 66 to 95).
-  The grey symbol „0" indicates an average result (Percentile Rank 36 to 65).
-  The yellow symbol „-" indicates a slightly below average result (Percentile Rank 6 to 35).
-  The red symbol „--" indicates a result that is very much below average (Percentile Rank 0 to 5).

2 Survey Results – Evaluation section of the closed questions


The second section gives a detailed depiction of the responses given to the individual questions. The number of students who have responded to the question (n), the mean (av.), the standard deviation (dev.) and the number of abstentions (ab.) are reported for each question. Questions that belong to a subject area are compiled under the respective heading. The number given in front of the respective question shows the position of the question in the evaluation sheet.

As an example, let us explain the depiction of the (fictitious) results for the question "What was your level of interest in the course subject before the course began?" with the possible responses 1="very low", 2="low", 3="average", 4="high", and 5="very high".

From the statistics on the right it can be seen that n=62 students responded to this question³. The number of abstentions ab. is only reported if a respective category was explicitly intended for the question and was ticked at least once. In this questionnaire this is only the case with questions 1 to 18; with these questions students can tick the category "not applicable". The mean of these students' responses is av.=2.31. The standard deviation, which in this case is dev.=0.95, is a measurement of the dispersion of the responses about the mean. The higher dev. is, the greater the students' responses differ. If dev. is at its minimum of 0, they have all given the same answer.

² Further information on the calculation of raw and Norm values and on the underlying Norm values can be found on our homepage at [Downloads](#).

³ The number of students who have not answered the question is yielded from the difference between this number and the total number of students who have completed a questionnaire, which is given at the head of the report page.



The height of the blue bars in the graphic illustration on the left shows the relative frequency of responses for each possible answer (here 1 = "very low" to 5 = "very high"). Each percentage is also given in figures above the respective bar. The thick, red vertical line in the centre represents the mean of the responses to the question. The horizontal line illustrates the standard deviation of the responses.

For technical reasons, it is not possible to automatically calculate a mean value for the questions regarding the amount of work, the semester for which students are enrolled and the number of missed sessions.

3 Comments Report – Evaluation section of the open questions

This is where all of the students' remarks in response to the closing question regarding remarks and suggestions on the course (open question) are portrayed as display windows. If no responses were given to this question, the respective page is missing in the feedback report.

Course Evaluation at the Osnabrück University
in WS 2017/18

Introduction to the Philosophy of Emotions (8.3159)
27 Forms

Lecturers
Imke von Maur


Overall indicators

Dimension	Value	Percentile rank		0	50	100
Planning and Presentation	4.84	98	⊕			
Interaction with Students	4.93	98	⊕			
Interestingness and Relevance	4.89	99	⊕			
School Grade for Lecturer	1.07	99	⊕			
School Grade for Course	1.12	99	⊕			
Subjective Learning Success	4.56	99	⊕			

Survey Results


Legend

Question text




Planning and Presentation


1. The seminar is clearly structured.




6. The seminar provides a good overview of the subject area.




8. The lecturer gives explanatory or secondary information on the subjects covered.



13. The lecturer makes use of helpful aids (e.g. literature list, script, transparencies) to support the learning process.




14. The way in which the seminar is held furthers understanding of the subject.




Interaction with Students


2. The lecturer seems to care about the students' learning success.




4. The lecturer behaves in a friendly and respectful manner towards the students.



7. The lecturer goes into the students' questions and suggestions in sufficient detail.




11. There is a good working climate in the seminar.




Interestingness and Relevance


3. The lecturer makes the seminar interesting.




5. The lecturer conveys the fact that the students can also make use of the knowledge gained in the seminar in other subjects/areas.




9. The lecturer clarifies the usability and usefulness of the subject covered.



10. The seminar is a good combination of conveyance of knowledge and discussion.




12. The lecturer encourages my interest in the subject area.




Quality of the Seminar Papers


15. The contributors are usually well prepared for questions and discussions.



16. The really relevant information is usually emphasised in most presentations.




17. The contributors usually present the information in a comprehensible manner.




Supervision of one's own Seminar Paper

18. I am very pleased with the advice given to me on my presentation by my seminar instructor (e.g. preliminary discussion, debriefing, feedback).




Difficulty and Extent


19. The level of difficulty of the seminar is:



20. The scope of the seminar is:




21. The pace of the seminar is:




General Conditions

22. I am satisfied with the general conditions pertaining to this course (the room, the equipment, the timing, temperature, noise and lighting conditions, etc.).




School Grade for one's own Seminar Paper

23. If you gave a presentation which "school grade" (1-5) would you give yourself for the presentation?




School Grade for Lecturer

24. Which "school grade" (1-5) would you give the lecturer as the course instructor?




School Grade for Course

25. Which overall "school grade" (1-5) would you give the course?




Subjective Learning Success

26. How much have you learnt in this course?



Interest before Course

27. What was your level of interest in the course subject before the course began?




n=27
av.=3.96
dev.=0.9

Reasons for Attendance

28. What were your reasons for attending the course? (several answers possible)


n=27



Expenditure of Time

29. How much time do you spend on average per week (outside class) working on the substance matter? (please state in hours, rounding off)


n=24



Absences

30. How many sessions of the course did you miss?


n=27



Subject-related Semester

31. Which semester are you currently enrolled for (in your major)?


n=26



Sex

32. Sex:

n=27



Comments Report

Comments

33. What did you particularly like or not like about this course? Use this space for further remarks and suggestions!

Ok, so I'm more of an analytical philosophy guy. So personally I enjoyed the first half more. I loved the course overall. ^{that we would talk about politics} I'd like to dig deeper into the analytical aspects of emotions but of course I understand that you are personally very concerned with politics, and I don't mind that, despite my preference for analytical philo (and you made it clear since the beginning)

Imke did more than a great job. She learned all our names, conducted a great atmosphere for discussion, summed up everything that was said the week before. Tried to reach all of us. The topics & papers chosen were very interesting & made me think again about me in philosophy. It was a lot of work. Sometimes it was hard to carefully read along text each week. ~~Maybe~~ For me Monday morning contribution ~~was a bit hard.~~ I never had a great course like that one... Thank you for putting that much effort into that. Imke you give a big contribution to make everything a bit better. Props!!

It was quite difficult to participate in vivid discussions because of a lot of people involved. ~~the level of participant's~~ level of participant's statement was very different and it was sometimes tough. But in general the course was very good.

could spend even more time, ~~on~~ on the matter great seminar, should be more like that instructor is very engaged, interested in the topic, shares her interest

The group was a bit too large for everyone to participate because it went quite fast

I loved everything. The topics were new for me although I have background in studying emotions. It helped me to widen my horizon with respect to many current social problems.

~~we~~ I like that we could talk ^{freely} about whatever topics we want as long as it is related with the week's paper.

And the instructor ~~was~~ managed well ~~to~~ to direct the discussion in better ways.

More time would have been nice / less people.

↳ sometimes discussion led to end although they weren't finished (sadly) ;)

ALL IN ALL: very good course, best course during the week :)

Good climate,

please treat politics more out of a meta-level

Imke is really well-prepared for every single class and really clear in mind what she is thinking and how the class is better to go. Participants are also really engaged in the subjects and well prepared. First time ever, no critique.

Great working environment. Discussions really made the topics more appealing and I think helped every one learn more, above and beyond the course. Great the lectures had superb ability to wrap up all the ideas to make them into a coherent whole. Overall, a very worthwhile and inspiring seminar!

For a person who is not that probed in discuss in english it was sometimes very fast and difficult to participate in the seminar, but that is was a personal problem. Beside that I really like the course and have learned a lot.

The structure of the class was perfect. Even though one might have ~~not~~ not seen why the paper of the week was helpful at the beginning of the class, Imke ~~helped~~ and the discussion helped to see the total picture of the topic. Additionally the way the seminar is held (open discussion round) is perfect too. It really 'forces' people to think about what the topic is and stay in touch with the topic.

I liked the methodology, the way that discussion and arguments were used to allow further understanding of a topic. The fact that we needed to do a question every week is a great advantage because it assures that people will be prepared and the class will be productive.

I really like an atmosphere. The lecturer cares about our progress. The presentations usually take time. So, I'm glad that we focused more on the papers and our comments. This made the seminar more productive.

I am very happy that I could participate in this course. I am looking forward to the next course on emotions held by Imke v. M.

One of the best seminars I have ever attended, due to the organisation and mix of learning through reading, writing and then discussing the papers. The lecturer was very appreciating towards all comments, ~~took~~ took care of holding the structure by summing up important points in between the discussion and relating always to daily examples.

I liked the way the course was structured: Discussions were free and open, but guided to important points and relevant issues. The importance of the subject for other subjects and for questions we raise in our daily lives, could not have been made more clear.

super discussions
maybe even more overview slides with keywords in between
would be helpful