Computer Science I	Depar	tment	t -	
Indiana University	2.			
Evaluation of Disc.	Sect.	/Lab	& Ins	tructor

Course/Section	C251/1784
Instructor	Venkatesh Choppella
Sem./Year	Spring 1993

1. The laboratory and/or discussion section is

1 - very important for learning the material.	1 -	very	important	for	learning	the	material.
---	-----	------	-----------	-----	----------	-----	-----------

- 2 somewhat important for learning the material.
- 3 not sure
- 4 not very important for learning the material.
- 5 a waste of time

2. The discussion section and/or laboratory is

- 1 very well planned and organized.
- 2 well planned and organized.
- 3 sometimes organized.
- 4 not well planned or organized.
- 5 completely disorganized.

3. The availability and quality of the laboratory equipment is

- 1 exceptionally good.
- 2 above average.
- 3 average.
- 4 somewhat inadequate.
- 5 totally inadequate.

4. The time allotted in the laboratory is

- 1 much more than needed.
- 2 a little more than needed.
- 3 exactly as much as needed.
- 4 a little short of what is needed.
- 5 far short of what is needed.

5. The discussion section and/or laboratory is

- 1 intellectually stimulating.
- 2 fairly interesting.
- 3 occasionally interesting.
- 4 not very interesting.
- 5 very dull.

6. The associate instructor is well prepared

- 1 always.
- 2 usually.
- 3 sometimes.
- 4 rarely.
- 5 never.

MEAN =	2.50	MEDIAN	1 =	3
response	# of res	sponses /	# of	respondents

1	:	4 / 18	(22	%)
2	:	5 / 18	(27	%)
3		7 / 18	(38	%)
5	: 1	2 / 18	(11	%)

MEAN = 2.44 MEDIAN = 3 response # of responses / # of respondents

1	:	3 / 18	(16 %)
2	:	5 / 18	(27 %)
3	:	9 / 18	 (50 %)
4	:	1 / 18	(5 %)

MEAN = 1.72 MEDIAN = 3

response # of responses / # of respondents

1	;	2 / 18	(11 %)
2	:	1 / 18	(5 %)
3	:	9 / 18	(50 %)

MEAN = 2.17 MEDIAN = 3

response # of responses / # of respondents

2	: .	4 / 18	_	(22 %)
3	:	9: / 18		(50 %)
4	:	1 / 18		(5 %)

$MEAN = 2.50 \quad MEDIAN = 3$

response # of responses / # of respondents

ı	:	21	18	(11 %)
2	:	7 /	18	(38 %)
3	:	8 /	18	(44 %)
5	•	1 /	18	(5 %)

$MEAN = 2.22 \quad MEDIAN = 2$

response # of responses / # of respondents

1	;	4 / 18	(22	%)
2		6 / 18	(33	%)
3		8 / 18	(44	%)

The associate instructor's presentation of the material (use of blackboard, overhead projector,	MEAN = 2.22 MEDIAN = 3 response # of responses / # of respondents			
computer, voice, etc.) is) <u>1</u> :	4 / 18	(22 %	
	2 :	4 / 18	(22 %	
1 - especially effective.	3 :	8 / 18	(44 %	
2 - fairly effective.	4 :	1 18	(5 %)	
3 - average.				
4 - somewhat ineffective.				
5 - totally ineffective.				
The associate instructor's knowledge of the subject	MEAN = 1	.78 MEDIAN = 2		
matter is	response #	of responses / # of res	spondents	
	i :	9 / 18	(50 %	
1 - excellent.	2 :	4 / 18	(22 %	
2 - good.	3 :	5 / 18	(27 %	
3 - adequate.			(2,)	
4 - not very good.				
5 - totally inadequate				
			ļ	
The associate instructor's ability to use the English	MEAN = 2	.11 MEDIAN = 2		
language is		of responses / # of res	nondente	
	1 :	6 / 18	(33 9	
1 - excellent.	2 :	5 / 18	(27 9	
2 - good.	3 :	6 / 18	•	
3 - adequate.	4 :	1 / 18	(33 9	
4 - not very good.		1 / 10	(5 %)	
5 - inadequate for teaching.				
의 아이들 살이 있으면 살아나는 그래?				
The assistance offered by the associate instructor		.11 MEDIAN = 2		
		of responses / # of res		
1	1:	5 / 18	(27 %	
1 - extremely helpful.	2:	4 / 18	(22 %	
2 - helpful.	3 :	7 / 18	(38 %	
3 - sometimes helpful.	4 :	1 / 18	(5 %)	
4 - not very helpful.				
5 - totally inadequate.				
. The associate instructor's attitude toward the	MHAN = 2	.11 $MEDIAN = 2$		
students is	response # of responses / # of respondents			
	1:	6 / 18	(33 %	
1 - excellent.	2:	5 / 18	•	
2 - good.	3 :		(27 %	
3 - fair.		6 / 18	(33 %	
	4 :	1 / 18	(5 %)	
4 - unsatisfactory.				
5 - poor. and 3.22				
. The associate instructor maintains office hours	MEAN = 2	.28 MEDIAN = 3		
and appointments	response #	of responses / # of res	pondents	
	i :	5 / 18	(27 %	
1 - always.	2 :	2 / 18	(11 %	
	3 :	8 / 18	(44 %	
2 - usually.	<i>y</i> .			
2 - usually. 3 - sometimes.	4 :	2 / 18	(11 %	

13. The assignments are graded and returned	MEAN = 2.33 MEDIAN = 3	
	response # of responses / # of re	spondents
1 - very promptly.	1: 4/18	(22 %)
2 - fairly promptly.	2: 5/18	(27 %)
3 - in time to be useful.	3: 8/18	(44 %)
4 - sometimes too late.	4 : 1 / 18	(5 %)
5 - much too late to be useful.		
14. Overall, my associate instructor is	MEAN = 2.17 $MEDIAN = 3$	
	response # of responses / # of re	spondents
1 - an outstanding teacher.	1: 5/18	(27 %)
2 - a good teacher.	2: 2/18	(11 %)
3 - an average teacher.	3: 10/18	(55 %)
4 - a below average teacher.		
5 - a very poor teacher.		

15. What aspects of the lab/discussion do you find most valuable?

Since this was an optional lab, I did not often attend for two reasons. First, I did not really need to go over the homework, which is what he did in the lab. Second, the first and only time I went to the lab, I was the only female. I felt that he singled me out and tought to me. I don't think he realized it, but it was very upsetting to have him teach to me as if I couldn't understand the material.

Helps understand material a little better.

I find it is helpful to know why a particular answer is correct, and why a proof is complete or incomplete.

going over homework questions

I was never there.

Great portunity to cover new ground

going over the homework

Going over all of the homework problems.

getting answers to the problems

16. What aspects of the lab/discussion do you think need to be improved and what suggestions do you have for improvement?

Hold better discussions about the material

I wouldn't know... see previous response.

Perfect as is

Maybe having it closer to the due date for the next assignment, so we will havedone more on it and can ask questions about it

Pre-made solutions

N.A.

17. What aspects of the associate instructor's teaching style do you particularly like?

He is very spunky

He doesn't just spit out the answer to a problem, he tries to make us think about it, and waits for one of us to give him an answer (hopefull the correct answer)

knowledgeable and well-prepared

How the hell should I know.

Able to make one understand ANYTHING, well just about. I liked all the little tricks, short cuts, and explanations where the book cut corners in it's presentation. The AI's purist attitude.

He knows what he's talking about

Personally, I wish Venky would have been teaching the discussion, but I realizehe only has so much time. I think he was a part time A.I. if there is such a thing. I learned much more off of Venky and found he was always in 230 hangingout when he said. He is very thorough and I just worked better with him.

His enthusiam.

His enthusiasm.

18. What do you think the associate instructor could do to improve his/her teaching style?

Get his ideas across better or more clearly

Get the hell out of C251... this class sucks. (no reflection on Venky, he's a hell of a guy.)

when grading the homework an explaination about why i would lose points would have been nice.

Perfect as is.

not much - he speaks English quite well

By organizing the time better. Some labs ran out of time before he covered all of the material.

N.A.

Course/Section <u>C201/1768</u> Computer Science Department Instructor Venkatesh Choppella Indiana University Evaluation of Disc. Sect./Lab & Instructor # Students Enrolled_ Sem./Year_Fall 1990 8 # Student Responses ___ Evaluation of Discussion Section and/or Laboratory: 1. The laboratory and/or discussion section is important for learning the material.1 25 \(\frac{7}{2} \) 2 38 \(\frac{7}{3} \) 25 \(\frac{7}{4} \) 13 \(\frac{7}{5} \) 0 \(\frac{7}{6} \) a waste of time. 2. The discussion section and/or laboratory is well planned and organized. 1 38 % 2 50 % 3 13 % 4 0 % 5 0 % completely disorganized. 3. The availability and quality of the laboratory equipment is exceptionally good. 1 14 % 2 14 % 3 14 % 4 29 % 5 29 % totally inadequate. 4. The time allotted in the laboratory is much more than needed.1 0 % 2 0 % 3 100 % 4 0 % 5 0 % far short of what is needed. 5. The discussion section and/or laboratory is intellectually stimulating.1 25 \(\frac{7}{2} \) 2 25 \(\frac{7}{3} \) 38 \(\frac{7}{4} \) 13 \(\frac{7}{3} \) 5 \(\frac{0}{2} \) very dull. Evaluation of the Associate Instructor: 6. The associate instructor is well prepared always.1 63 7 2 38 7 3 0 7 4 0 7 5 0 7 never. 7. The associate instructor's presentation of the material (use of blackboard, overhead projector, computer, voice, etc.) is very effective. 1 13 \(\frac{7}{2} \) 2 75 \(\frac{7}{3} \) 3 13 \(\frac{7}{4} \) 0 \(\frac{7}{3} \) 5 0 \(\frac{7}{3} \) totally ineffective. 8. The associate instructor's knowledge of the subject matter is excellent. 1 75 % 2 13 % 3 13% 4 0 % 5 0 % totally inadequate. 9. The associate instructor's ability to use the English language is excellent. 1 38 7 2 25 7 3 25 7 4 13 7 5 0 7 inadequate for teaching. 10. The assistance offered by the associate instructor is extremely helpful.1 38 % 2 50 % 3 0 % 4 13 % 5 0 % totally inadequate. 11. The associate instructor's attitude toward the students is especially good.1 75 % 2 25 % 3 0 % 4 0 % 5 0 % very poor. 12. The associate instructor is available for consultation (office hours, etc.) whenever needed. 1 50 % 2 25 % 3 25 % 4 0 % 5 0 % never. 13. The assignments are graded and returned very promptly. 1 50 % 2 38 % 3 0 % 4 13 % 5 0 % much too late to be useful. 14. The feedback I get from the grading of the assignments is extremely helpful.1 0 % 2 38% 325 % 4 38% 5 0 % totally inadequate. 15. Overall, my associate instructor is an outstanding teacher.1 287 2 577 3 147 4 0 7 5 0 7 a very poor teacher.

Department of Computer Science

Evaluation of Course and Instructor

Course: C201 - Introduction to Computer Science

Section: 1769

AI: Venkatesh Choppella

Indiana University

Semester/Year: Fall, 1990

Number enrolled: Number responses: 7

OUESTION: What do you particularly like about the disucussion section and/or laboratory?

Helps in teaching the material.

- It enforces what has already been discussed in class. Its more opportunity to ask individual questions.
- The fact that is wasn't on Friday. The AI knew the material.

4. Clarifies subject.

They attempt to pull the threads together and tie everything up in nice bows. Generally this is good and works effectively.

6. Nothing.

What do you dislike about the discussion section and/or QUESTION: laboratory?

- It's so hard to get on a computer in the daytime because there are always classes in the computer rooms. We need larger facilities.
- We should go over homework in discussion. It would be much more effective in helping to understand the material.
- 3. The quiz was before the discussion section, so it was often difficult to work and ask questions relevant to the quiz. I liked the homework much better since it was turned in on Tuesday in class. Need a computer in discussion to show the actual scheme in action.

4. Nothing.

- Approx. 1/3 of the time I feel I understand the material, but by going over it 2,3,4 times I start to doubt myself. Possibly gleaming over "easy" concepts to focus on the more difficult ones would be helpful.
- 6. No computers are used.

What do you particularly like about the associate QUESTION: instructor?

1. He does a good job.

2. Very helpful in explaining and answering questions.

- He went over material I didn't understand in class. He was always available and very willing to offer assistance outside of class.
- He seems like a nice guy. Knew the material in Scheme and he tries to be helpful.

He explains everything better than a professor.

He is knowledgeable, friendly and outgoing. He brings an enthusiasm that is not annoying to the information.

7. Good teacher.

QUESTION: What do you dislike about the associate instructor?

1. Nothing.

- He needs to work on what is lectured in class and make confusing arguements clear. Often he only reviews what was said in lecture instead of clarifying.
- 3. Nothing.
- 4. He appears unprepared sometimes and runs out of time to discuss major points.
- 5. Nothing.

Computer Science Department	Course/Section <u>6201/1774</u>
Indiana University	Instructor Venkatesh Choppella
Evaluation of Disc. Sect./Lab & Instructor	# Students Enrolled
Sem./Year_Fall 1990	# Student Responses
Evaluation of Discussion Section and/or Laboration	oratory:
1. The laboratory and/or discussion section is important for learning the material.1 8 2	54 % 3 8 % 4 23 % 5 8 % a waste of time.
2. The discussion section and/or laboratory is well planned and organized.1 8 2	54 % 3 38 % 4 0 % 5 0 % completely disorganized.
3. The availability and quality of the laboratory exceptionally good. 1 1 2 2	quipment is 33 % 3 11 % 5 11 % totally inadequate.
4. The time allotted in the laboratory is much more than needed.10 \frac{7}{2} 2	33 % 3 56 % 4 11 % 5 0 % far short of what is needed
5. The discussion section and/or laboratory is intellectually stimulating.1 8 Z 2	17% 3 33 % 4 17 % 5 25% very dull.
Evaluation of the Associate Instructor:	
6. The associate instructor is well prepared	
	52 % 3 15 % 4 0 % 5 0 % never.
7. The associate instructor's presentation of the mavoice, etc.) is	sterial (use of blackboard, overhead projector, computer,
	54% 3 31% 4 0 % 5 0 % totally ineffective.
8. The associate instructor's knowledge of the sub- excellent. 1 54 % 2	ject matter is 38
9. The associate instructor's ability to use the Eng excellent. 1 _38 \%\ 2_	glish language is 38 % 3 4 15 % 5 0 % inadequate for teaching.
10. The assistance offered by the associate instructor	or is
extremely helpful.1 31 Z 2	31 % 3 23 % 4 15 % 5 0 % totally inadequate.
11. The associate instructor's attitude toward the s especially good.1 46 % 2	tudents is 46 \(\frac{7}{2} \) 3 \(\frac{8}{2} \) 4 \(\frac{0}{2} \) 5 \(\frac{0}{2} \) very poor.
12. The associate instructor is available for consulta	ation (office hours, etc.)
whenever needed. 1 31 % 2	46 % 3 15 % 4 8 % 5 0 % never.
13. The assignments are graded and returned very promptly. 1 15 % 2	54 % 3 31 % 4 0 % 5 0 % much too late to be useful.
14. The feedback I get from the grading of the assig	
	46% 3 31% 4 15% 5 0 % totally inadequate.
15. Overall, my associate instructor is	
an autotanding tanahar 1 467 2	3172 157 4 8 7 5 0 7

Department of Computer Science Indiana University

Evaluation of Course and Instructor Semester/Year: Fall, 1990

Course: S201 - Intro. to Computer Science, Honors

Section: 1774 Number enrolled:
AI: Venkatesh Choppella Number responses: 13

QUESTION: What do you particularly like about the disucussion section and/or laboratory?

- 1. Good teacher.
- 2. Didn't go enough.
- 3. Everything.
- 4. Discusses material different than that in class. It is confusing.
- 5. Goes over quizzes.
- It is layed back, but vey good for getting a solid understanding of the material.
- 7. We are sometimes explained concepts in detail that cannot be as thoroughly covered in class.
- 8. Venk is very good at reviewing the material at a level students can understand.
- 9. I might have some questions regarding the course and I will know that there is someone to help and answer my questions.
- 10. Expounded upon in-class material and helped to clarify things that you may not have understood the first time.

QUESTION: What do you dislike about the discussion section and/or laboratory?

- 1. It only rehashed what we did in the week.
- Didn't go enough.
- Not enough people show up. Sometime it paralleled class a little too closely.
- 4. Goes into too much detail.
- 5. It was on Friday afternoon.
- 6. It is too short and sometime there is not much to learn from it.
- 7. Would have been better if there was a lab as well as discussion.
 Actual practice on the computer during discussion would have been much better than explanation or question/answer alone.

QUESTION: What do you particularly like about the associate instructor?

- 1. Great guy. Easy to talk to. Clear explanations.
- 2. Very available for help.
- 3. Helpful and friendly.
- 4. His accent.
- 5. Enthusiastic.
- 6. He's very friendly and is better at explaining the material than the professor.
- He knows the material very well and is usually able to get the information across.
- Venk is exceptionally well prepared and presents the material well.
- 9. He has a good knowledge about the course and well prepared.
- 10. Very clear explanation, knew the subject very well. Always available for extra help

QUESTION: What do you dislike about the associate instructor?

1. Hard to get a hold of.

- 2. Not much.
- 3. Gets too wordy and doesn't always answer a question directly.
- 4. Nothing.
- 5. He is always in a hurry and answer the questions very quick and seems like he'd rather do his own things instead of standing and answering the questions clearly.

Instructor Evaluation Report		
Category : AY2006-2007/SEM2		
Course : Principles of Programming(ITM121)		
Teacher: Venkatesh Choppella		
Expertise		
The instructor had a solid grasp of the subject.	4.86	
The instructor was familiar with the software that students were required to use in the course.	4.79	
The instructor was familiar with the lab equipment that students were required to use in the course.	4.75	
Interaction		
The instructor encouraged and provided ample opportunity for active participation of students in classroom discussions.	4.75	
The instructor was generally available to students after class (during office hours, etc.)	4.71	
The instructor encouraged me to express my own views in class.	4.71	
The instructor adjusted his/her level of teaching to meet students' needs.	4.71	
The instructor was actively helpful.	4.68	
Presentation		
Overall, the instructor's presentations were audible, clear, and understandable.	4.75	
The instructor's pronunciation was intelligible.	4.71	
My questions were answered clearly and thoroughly.	4.75	
	4.71	
The instructor's presentation style was lively.	4.71	
The instructor was well-prepared.	4.75	
The instructor generally started the classes on time.	4.82	
Enthusiasm		
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject.	4.86	
The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.	4.71	
I felt involved in this course.	4.57	
Use Teaching aids		
The instructor's use of Web-based teaching tools was effective.	4.79	
Overall		
Overall, the instructor is good as a teacher.	4.75	
Overall, the instructor was helpful.	4.75	
I would like to have this instructor in another course.	4.71	

Instructor Evaluation Comments		
Category: AY2006-2007/SEM2 Course: Principles of Programming(ITM121) Teacher: Venkatesh Choppella		
-	-	
Instructor was willing to explain the portions as many number of times as required	Nothing	
The way he is teaching is very good. Also it is very interesting to be in his class. Also he is very organised.	No comments	
The lectures are exceptionally good and have helped us get a very good understanding of the Programming Principles. Also Sir ensures that each and every student in the class understands the concepts thoroughly. The tutorial sessions each week also provide a kind of weekly revision along with clearing doubts and sharing of ideas.	Nil	
Explains concepts very clearly.	No comments	
way of teaching,good and deep knowledge about subject,explained every concept with relevant and realworld examples	no comments	
His effort to make students understand each and every concept.	He is good in all aspects of teaching.	
No Comments	No comments	
He was successful in explaining the basic concepts clearly in the class also he was approachable any time.	nothing!!	
No comments	No comments	
No comments	No comments	
He is very clear in telling what actually we have to do. He presented the subject properly and in fully organized way.	Many times it happened that he paced fast only because of the computer science background students who responded him fast as a result of that those who are not from such background they suffered or it became boring.	
-	-	
more lively and good involvement	no comments	
Excellent Undestanding of Scheme . Highly professional approach. Punctual to the core	Sometimes he tries to explain our doubts so elabourately , but in the end I tends to be more confused	
Excellent class. It was really useful.	I found it difficult to do Javascript labs. Please provide necessary help.	
no comments	no comments	
course content is good the way of teaching is quite good exams and tests were good labs were ok	sometimes the way of teaching was abstract so students should be very attentive in calss	
-	-	
	No comments	
No comments	1 to comments	
No comments Course was taught well. Simple way of teaching.Instructor was very particular about ensuring that the subject was clear to each and every student.Overall very good teaching.	No shortcomings	
Course was taught well. Simple way of teaching.Instructor was very particular about ensuring that the subject was clear to each and		

The involvement of instructor both at delivering lectures and receiving feedbacks.	At times the vocabulary used in the course was a bit hindrance in grabbing the concept well.
Innovative and effective usage of computing resource for the course.	Too much stress on a particular concept, sometimes during the course, led to boredom.
Illustrating concepts in an abstract manner initially and then going for applying the same.	
Providing a healthy and competitive environment conducive to effective learning.	
Emphasizing on the concepts rather than bullwork of writing of programs which was well applied in quizzes, exams.	
The emphasis laid upon the punctuality and verbal communication throughout the course helped a lot.	
No comments	No comments
-	-
good	sir teach slowly and take care about poor student.