Prof. Dr. Gunther Friedl

Controlling (WI001083) (WS 20/21)
Erfasste Fragebögen = 35

Survey Results

Legend

Question text



n=No. of responses
av.=Mean
md=Median
dev.=Std. Dev.
ab.=Abstention

1. General Information

1.1. On which campus are you primarily studying?

n=35

Munich (including Garching, Freising and Weihenstephan)	97.1%
Heilbronn	0%
Straubing	2.9%

1.2. Which degree program are you in?

n=34

Bachelor Management & Technology	52.9%
Master Management & Technology	2.9%
Master in Management	0%
Master Consumer Science	0%
Exchange student	2.9%
other	41.2%

1.3. How often (in %) have you attended this lecture?

n=32

0 %	0%
20 %	0%
40 %	3.1%
60 %	9.4%
80 %	9.4%
100 %	78.1%

1.4. How much time, on average, did you spend on preparing for the lecture and reviewing your notes per week?

n=35

0 hours	5.7%
1 hour	28.6%
2 hours	34.3%
3 hours	11.4%
4 hours	14.3%
5 hours	5.7%
6 hours	0%
> 6 hours	0%

2. Concept, Structure and Communication of Content

2.1. The goal of the lecture is clear



n=35
av.=1,6
md=1
dev.=0,7

2.2. The lecture is well-structured



n=35
av.=1,5
md=1
dev.=0,7

2.3. The subject matter of individual sessions was logically sequenced



n=35
av.=1,6
md=1
dev.=0,7

2.4. The lecture content was communicated clearly and understandably



n=35
av.=1,7
md=2
dev.=0,8

2.5. The content of the lecture overlaps with that of other courses/ modules



n=30

3. Ethics, Sustainability and Responsibility

3.1. Did the module point out how the content is related to ethics, sustainability and responsibility?



n=34

3.2. Did the lecture make me think in a socially and ecologically responsible way?

n=33

4. Quality of Supervision - The Lecturer ...

4.1. ... highlights connections to other subjects



n=35
av.=1,9
md=2
dev.=0,8

4.2. ... can spark my interest in the topic and motivated me to engage with its content



n=35
av.=1,6
md=2
dev.=0,5

4.3. ... used a variety of instructional methods to reach the course objectives (e.g. group discussions, student presentations, etc.)



n=34
av.=2,4
md=2
dev.=1,1

4.4. ... was readily available for questions/ guidance



n=34
av.=1,7
md=1
dev.=0,8

4.5. ... showed interest in students' success



n=35
av.=1,5
md=1
dev.=0,6

4.6. ... was well prepared



n=35
av.=1,3
md=1
dev.=0,6

4.7. ... was responsive to student comments and questions



n=35
av.=1,4
md=1
dev.=0,6

4.8. ... provided clear and understandable explanations of solutions



n=34
av.=1,4
md=1
dev.=0,7

5. Media and Lecture Materials

5.1. In which format is this course delivered?



n=35

5.2. Which platform?

n=35

5.3. The lecture materials are timely available



n=35
av.=1,1
md=1
dev.=0,2

5.4. Outlines of the lecture, presentations, overheads, etc. used in the course were understandable



n=35
av.=1,4
md=1
dev.=0,6

5.5. The lecture used the newest technical tools and methods



n=35
av.=1,6
md=1
dev.=0,8

5.6. The course used innovative teaching elements (e.g. online-voting, online-quiz, flipped classroom)

n=32

6. Scope and Difficulty Level

6.1. Grading criteria (multiple choice, written and/or oral exam, paper, presentation, homework etc.) are fair and transparent.



n=34
av.=2
md=2
dev.=0,8

6.2. The scope of the lecture considering the number of ECTS credits is



n=34
av.=2,8
md=3
dev.=0,5

6.3. The difficulty level of the lecture is



n=35
av.=2,7
md=3
dev.=0,6

7. Tutorial - if there was no tutorial, please skip this section

7.1. How often (in %) have you attended the tutorial?



n=31

7.2. How helpful was the tutorial with respect to comprehending the content of the lecture?



n=32
av.=1,6
md=1
dev.=0,7

8. Overall

8.1. I have benefited from the lecture (I have obtained knowledge and I know how to use the newly acquired knowledge in practice)



n=35
av.=1,6
md=2
dev.=0,6

8.2. The lecture highlights topics at the interface between management and technology



n=35
av.=1,9
md=2
dev.=0,8

8.3. Overall grade for Prof. Dr. Gunther Friedl



n=35
av.=1,4
md=1
dev.=0,5

8.4. Overall grade for



n=33
av.=1,3
md=1
dev.=0,5

8.5. Overall grade for the lecture



n=35
av.=1,5
md=1
dev.=0,6

Profile

Subunit: TUM School of Management
Name of the instructor: Prof. Dr. Gunther Friedl
Name of the course: (Name of the survey) Controlling (WI001083) (Ctrl_WS21)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

2. Concept, Structure and Communication of Content



2.1. The goal of the lecture is clear	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,6	md=1,0	dev.=0,7
2.2. The lecture is well-structured	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,5	md=1,0	dev.=0,7
2.3. The subject matter of individual sessions was logically sequenced	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,6	md=1,0	dev.=0,7
2.4. The lecture content was communicated clearly and understandably	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,7	md=2,0	dev.=0,8

4. Quality of Supervision - The Lecturer ...



4.1. ... highlights connections to other subjects	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,9	md=2,0	dev.=0,8
4.2. ... can spark my interest in the topic and motivated me to engage with its content	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,6	md=2,0	dev.=0,5
4.3. ... used a variety of instructional methods to reach the course objectives (e.g. group discussions, student presentations, etc.)	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=34	av.=2,4	md=2,0	dev.=1,1
4.4. ... was readily available for questions/ guidance	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=34	av.=1,7	md=1,0	dev.=0,8
4.5. ... showed interest in students' success	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,5	md=1,0	dev.=0,6
4.6. ... was well prepared	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,3	md=1,0	dev.=0,6
4.7. ... was responsive to student comments and questions	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,4	md=1,0	dev.=0,6
4.8. ... provided clear and understandable explanations of solutions	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=34	av.=1,4	md=1,0	dev.=0,7

5. Media and Lecture Materials



5.3. The lecture materials are timely available	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,1	md=1,0	dev.=0,2
5.4. Outlines of the lecture, presentations, overheads, etc. used in the course were understandable	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,4	md=1,0	dev.=0,6
5.5. The lecture used the newest technical tools and methods	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,6	md=1,0	dev.=0,8

6. Scope and Difficulty Level



6.1. Grading criteria (multiple choice, written and/or oral exam, paper, presentation, homework etc.) are fair and transparent.	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=34	av.=2,0	md=2,0	dev.=0,8
6.2. The scope of the lecture considering the number of ECTS credits is	too large	too small	n=34	av.=2,8	md=3,0	dev.=0,5
6.3. The difficulty level of the lecture is	too high	too low	n=35	av.=2,7	md=3,0	dev.=0,6

7. Tutorial - if there was no tutorial, please skip this section

7.2. How helpful was the tutorial with respect to comprehending the content of the lecture?	very helpful	not helpful	n=32	av.=1,6	md=1,0	dev.=0,7

8. Overall

8.1. I have benefited from the lecture (I have obtained knowledge and I know how to use the newly acquired knowledge in practice)	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,6	md=2,0	dev.=0,6
8.2. The lecture highlights topics at the interface between management and technology	strongly agree	strongly disagree	n=35	av.=1,9	md=2,0	dev.=0,8
8.3. Overall grade for Prof. Dr. Gunther Friedl	1 (excellent)	5 (poor)	n=35	av.=1,4	md=1,0	dev.=0,5
8.4. Overall grade for	1 (excellent)	5 (poor)	n=33	av.=1,3	md=1,0	dev.=0,5
8.5. Overall grade for the lecture	1 (excellent)	5 (poor)	n=35	av.=1,5	md=1,0	dev.=0,6