

TEACHING EVALUATIONS

CHARLOTTE LAMBERT

This section summarizes my teaching evaluations for simplicity. Attached are the original evaluations.

QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION SUMMARY

Here I present a summary of my teaching evaluations, particularly the quantitative results relevant to my skills as an instructor.

Question	Course	Mean (out of 5)	Dept. Rank (percentile)
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.	CS 105 (SP 2023)	4.31	87
	CS 105 (FA 2023)	4.33	75
	CS 105 (SP 2024)	4.21	75
	CS 105 (FA 2024)*	3.97	52
	CS 498 (SP 2025)	4.25	74
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?	CS 105 (SP 2023)	4.39	86
	CS 105 (FA 2023)	4.44	86
	CS 105 (SP 2024)	4.33	82
	CS 105 (FA 2024)*	4.15	49
	CS 498 (SP 2025)	4.38	81
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.	CS 105 (SP 2023)	4.71	88
	CS 105 (FA 2023)	4.58	85
	CS 105 (SP 2024)	4.49	88
	CS 105 (FA 2024)*	4.45	58
	CS 498 (SP 2025)	4.38	63
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.	CS 105 (SP 2023)	4.63	84
	CS 105 (FA 2023)	4.45	77
	CS 105 (SP 2024)	4.35	87
	CS 105 (FA 2024)*	4.27	63
	CS 498 (SP 2025)	4.50	82

Table 1: Summary of course evaluation metrics. CS 105 corresponds to an introductory computing course for non-technical majors and CS 498 is a computational social science course. Rows with an asterisk * indicate a co-instructing role.

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION SUMMARY

This section includes excerpts from my teaching evaluations categorized into three main categories. The excerpts are selected from 232 student evaluations across the five semesters after which I received evaluations. I note how many comments (out of 232) correspond to each category.

Ability to Clearly Lecture and Explain. ($n = 94$)

“She was very helpful and when asked a question she made sure you understood what was going on before you finished that problem. Her presentations during lab helped me understand this class better than anything in lecture.”

“Always willing to help. Very good at explaining and leading rather than just telling the answer.”

“She was always willing to explain any questions even if they took a long time to answer. And she was one of the only people who actually helped me understand the content.”

“Charlotte was extremely helpful in explaining the material. I always attended her Wednesday office hours and it was extremely helpful and enjoyable. She explains the material well and you can see that she actually enjoys what she does.”

“She is very knowledgeable about computer science and is a very good public speaker. She explains how to do everything very well and very clearly.”

Positive Attitude and Passion for Teaching. ($n = 34$)

“I appreciated Charlotte’s lecture during the beginning of class and her attitude. She is always ready to help and makes you feel lifted. I really like how she has the time to get to know our names too.”

“Very supportive and great at explaining the topics. She appears to really care about student’s learning.”

“The instructor’s passion for the course matter translated in her lectures and then to the students.”

“Charlotte was a great TA. She always explained everything very well and was always understanding when I wouldn’t pick up the code right away. I also appreciated how she remembered my name, even with a big discussion group.”

“Charlotte was always enthusiastic and excited to teach us new concepts. You could tell that she knew what she was teaching and did a great job of staying on task. It was a pleasure to learn from her, especially when many students took Friday lectures for granted. I appreciate the time and commitment to teaching this class.”

Creating a Safe Learning Environment. ($n = 7$)

“The instructor was very open to questions and she created an environment where it felt okay to not understand or make mistakes .”

“Charlotte was very calm and collected. She contributed to creating a positive learning environment every week. Her one-on-one helped give me confidence, and she was very motivating. Great instructor!”

“Charlotte was very accommodating to students learning styles and how we were learning the code. She didn’t make me feel dumb.”



Course Evaluation Results

CS 498 / CS 498 SCG / CS 498 SCU - Computational Social Science

Spring, 2025

Section SC3, Lecture-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)

T R, 3:30pm, 1302 Siebel Center for Comp Sci

Evaluations were completed by **8** out of **29** students (27.6%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Elective", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
-	-	-	75% (6)	25% (2)	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
88% (7)	13% (1)	-	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
75% (6)	25% (2)	-	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	75% (6)	25% (2)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	50% (4)	50% (4)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
100% (8)	-	-	-	-	-

Global Items

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	25% (2)	25% (2)	50% (4)	-	4.25	0.89	74	39

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	13% (1)	50% (4)	38% (3)	-	4.25	0.71	82	41

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	-	75% (6)	25% (2)	-	4.25	0.46	76	46

Departmental Core Items

CS - TA

Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	25% (2)	25% (2)	50% (4)	-	4.25	0.89	76

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)	-	4.38	0.74	81

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)	-	4.38	0.74	63

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	50% (4)	50% (4)	-	4.50	0.53	82

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	25% (2)	38% (3)	38% (3)	-	4.13	0.83	68

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	25% (2)	38% (3)	38% (3)	-	4.13	0.83	67

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)	-	4.38	0.74	68

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	13% (1)	25% (2)	38% (3)	25% (2)	-	3.75	1.04	16

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	13% (1)	75% (6)	13% (1)	-	-	4.50	0.93	98

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (1)	13% (1)	75% (6)	-	4.63	0.74	99

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	13% (1)	25% (2)	50% (4)	13% (1)	-	3.63	0.92	35

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	25% (2)	25% (2)	50% (4)	-	4.25	0.89	95

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.25
Rate the overall quality of this course.					4.25
How much have you learned in this course?					4.25
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					4.25
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.38
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.38
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.50
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					4.13
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.13
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					4.38
The grading procedures for the course were:					3.75
The course was:					4.50
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					4.63
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					3.63
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					4.25

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- Charlotte was amazing at explaining labs and always made sure to answer everyone's questions. Her dedication to this class was consistent and she always graded things on time.
- It was a great way to shove students into the deep end regarding CS research.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- None
- Genuinely just the grading procedures.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- Overall fair
- I have never seen a class that provides the rubric AFTER submission. Some students don't have research experience-- we shouldn't be penalized for arbitrary grading practices.



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Fall, 2024

Section AL1, Lecture (Charlotte Lambert)

F, 12pm, AUD Foellinger Auditorium

Evaluations were completed by **178** out of **372** students (47.8%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Large", a course type of "Mixed", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
51% (91)	40% (72)	6% (11)	2% (4)	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
16% (28)	40% (71)	44% (78)	1% (1)

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
67% (119)	6% (10)	27% (48)	1% (1)

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
2% (4)	73% (130)	25% (44)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
25% (45)	46% (81)	29% (52)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
68% (121)	28% (49)	4% (7)	1% (1)	-	-

Global Items

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	6% (10)	25% (44)	37% (66)	33% (58)	-	3.97	0.90	52	25

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
1% (1)	4% (8)	22% (40)	40% (71)	32% (57)	1% (1)	3.99	0.89	63	27

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
2% (4)	4% (7)	20% (35)	26% (47)	47% (84)	1% (1)	4.13	1.01	56	30

Departmental Core Items

CS - TA

Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
1% (2)	6% (11)	17% (31)	37% (65)	38% (68)	1% (1)	4.05	0.96	49

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
1% (1)	5% (9)	15% (27)	35% (63)	42% (75)	2% (3)	4.15	0.91	58

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	2% (3)	10% (18)	28% (50)	60% (106)	1% (1)	4.46	0.75	70

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
1% (1)	3% (5)	15% (27)	31% (56)	49% (88)	1% (1)	4.27	0.86	63

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
3% (6)	5% (9)	21% (38)	31% (56)	38% (68)	1% (1)	3.97	1.05	57

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
1% (1)	4% (8)	20% (36)	32% (57)	42% (75)	1% (1)	4.11	0.92	63

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	1% (1)	12% (21)	31% (56)	56% (99)	1% (1)	4.43	0.72	70

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
1% (2)	1% (2)	13% (23)	25% (45)	59% (105)	1% (1)	4.41	0.84	74

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
10% (17)	33% (59)	39% (69)	12% (22)	6% (10)	1% (1)	3.47	1.40	51

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
21% (38)	17% (30)	20% (36)	22% (40)	17% (30)	2% (4)	2.97	1.41	15

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
2% (3)	7% (13)	22% (39)	40% (71)	29% (51)	1% (1)	3.87	0.97	54

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
18% (32)	10% (18)	19% (34)	29% (52)	21% (38)	2% (4)	3.26	1.40	27

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					3.97
Rate the overall quality of this course.					3.99
How much have you learned in this course?					4.13
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					4.05
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.15
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.46
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.27
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					3.97
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.11
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					4.43
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.41
The course was:					3.47
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					2.97
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					3.87
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					3.26

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- She was able to explain things in an easy to understand manner during lectures.
- Teaching ability was very good.
- Explaining tricky topics
- Clear voice and mind
- very clear lecturing
- She was really good at explaining things and was always very prepared for class.
- some strengths are the flexibility with office hours. There was a lot of different times, and I attended a few when I needed to. Lecture days were quite useful when code was explained thoroughly
- They taught the material in a much more simple way than other introductory CS courses, which made it easier for me to understand.
- She did a great job of making the information as clear as possible and going over the most important information in a timely manner.
- Organization, clear statement of objectives, fair grading
- Explained very well and made sure I understood it.
- Learning more about Excel was the most beneficial part of this course
- The class is very well strcutured.
- She is very time-efficient and explains things clearly. She also is willing to help rather than redirect you to a ta like some other professors do.
- The major strengths was showing us exactly how something worked and how then we could implement it and use it by showing us how to recognize patterns
- The major strengths of this instructor/course would be the amount of work you learn from all the material and preparing yourself for future classes by understanding time management.
- There were many resources offered to help students figure out what they are doing wrong.
- Good
- Good at explaining problems
- help me learn more about cs
- I would say that the courses lab time are very interesting can be tedious and difficult.
- Graded very quickly and lots of time for assignments
- Few
- Clear explanations with examples
- I think one of the biggest strengths is the practice quizzes and exams that are provided before the real exams.
- All of the homework, quizzes, and tests were online so we got instant feedback and saw what our grade was right after.
- It helped me to learn the subject even though the structure of the course was a bit confused.
- it can help me to understand how to use python to coding
- It's very easy to get help and learn a lot of material
- Her overall teaching environment and enthusiasm.
- The instructor's passion for the course matter translated in her lectures and then to the students.
- The labs are a great way to learn more hands on.
- Had very organized curriculum
- The major strengths of the course is the websites and structure the courses uses.
- Some strengths specifically in lecture labs were going over some concepts that was considered difficult among many students.
- Helps me know about what python really is.
- I think he explains it well in the lecture. It is hard to learn in Foellinger which is out of his control. I would say the labs can be a hassle and some of the homework has unnecessary content that does not need to be learned.
- It's very well paced as I never felt like we'd sped past or dwelled too long on a subject or section. Max himself was very nice and approachable and made sure lecture was interesting and engaging IMO. He also seemed very understanding of any issues I did bring up to him over email or Edcenter.
- Is not very fast pace, instructor make sure students understand the content with multiple similar questions for students to practice. And the content of the course is not hard either.
- The instructor really cares about what the students are learning and that they get a good grade in the class. He is very lenient with homework grades and wants to make sure we get as many points as possible.
- Lecture was very engaging.
- The instructor was very nice not intimidating and made it fun to come to lecture he explained how to do code very well

- I think you can teach yourself the material pretty easily so that was nice. There is also a lot of resources and help available if you are ever stuck.
- The instructor was very responsive to student's feedback. He also replied promptly to emails and questions. There are many times available for office hours so if students are struggling, then there are allocated times where they can receive help.
- The instructor always gives the students feedback, and the instructor can explain well.
- The availability of resources to use when struggling with assignments were very easy to access and helped to quickly solve any issues.
- its thorough, we go over a certain thing multiple times in different ways
- leave space for students to thinking then talk about it
- He cares alot about the subject and wants to teach others
- The subject itself is very intriguing, and so its interest makes it an easy class to want to learn about.
- The major strengths of the instructor are communication and explaining the topic people are confused on.
- The instructor made the class more understandable and I liked how there were practice exams.
- Time to practice skills.
- The strengths of CS105 include clear explanations, engaging lectures, and well-structured content. The instructor fosters a positive learning environment, making complex topics accessible. Practical assignments reinforce learning, ensuring students gain a solid foundation in computer science for future studies.
- very useful.
- Very clear
- There are many recourses for help in this course. The instructors all care about student success and are passionate about the subject.
- The instructor explains concepts clearly and provides examples to enhance understanding. The course structure is well-organized, and the assignments are engaging and relevant to practical applications.
- I think that there is a lot of material that we were able to go over.
- It was extremely interesting to do for me. How it was taught was thorough and I felt like I have learned a great amount throughout the course.
- prairie learn assignments and labs
- How detailed they are during lecture when it comes to the in lecture problems!
- She did a good job explaining challenging subjects.
- Charlotte was always enthusiastic and excited to teach us new concepts. You could tell that she knew what she was teaching and did a great job of staying on task. It was a pleasure to learn from her, especially when many students took Friday lectures for granted. I appreciate the time and commitment to teaching this class.
- She is very knowledgeable about computer science and is a very good public speaker. She explains how to do everything very well and very clearly.
- She did a good job at explaining the material during the lectures.
- prairie learn was easy and made it easy to learn, I liked being able to study using the practice exams and the structure of exams and quizzes was good.
- They were good at explaining some things
- She was extremely effective in explaining complex code.
- The major strengths of the instructor were that she was able to assist with any guidance. She was able to explain as best as she could and gave examples.
- Explains concepts and problems very well
- Very easy to get help on assignments or topics that you don't understand in office hours and in labs. Lecture is also very helpful in reviewing topics from the homework that are harder to learn.
- It was very understandable! As long as you did the homework and readings you will have an easy time! Charlotte Did a great job explaining things in lecture and was extremely approachable!
- The course is organized, educational, structured and full of opportunities to get help.
- A solid introduction into the python coding language.
- Very good set up for tests with the practice tests given out
- instructor was very negotiable and understanding
- Very knowledgable and always knew the answers
- I felt like the TA's were did an exceptional job when it came to explain problems and help students that were have trouble with their code.
- Was able to command a lecture hall well
- The strengths of this course were all the materials offered on prarielearn which helped understand the materials we were learning much more.

- Instructor provided very good feedback and was helpful when someone was confused or stuck on a certain piece of code.
- Always came prepared, taught pretty thoroughly, and always made sure to be understanding of students and willing to listen.
- The professor was good at explaining concepts and offering help.
- nothing
- The professor and the T.A. is very enthusiastic to teach which enhances the learning ability of students
- He's a great instructor and prioritizes his students very well!
- He is very engaging.
- Charlotte did a great job at explaining topics in lectures and I could typically understand things more clearly after hearing her explanations.
- They are well prepared, patient, and helpful
- I think that there was a good attempt to try to keep the class engaged. I think that the box problems were a good way to keep everyone engaged and then also having the questions throughout the pear deck was good to help everyone.
- I think the homeworks, labs, and practice quizzes were incredibly helpful and useful throughout the course.
- Instructor seemed like he was passionate and wanted to be there.
- They were always well-prepared and explained the content thoroughly.
- the work and resources are great
- it is related with computer science.
- Enough practice and quick responses for questions
- Clear explanation
- They try to go over the hard parts the students don't understand
- The practice exams
- The course is interesting. The professor is really friendly.
- The instructor has very well explained the learning material for this course.
- The major strengths was the labs helped a lot and so did the lecture on Friday's.
- The instructor knows what he is talking about, and I really like how we do practice problems in class.
- Being able to work at your own pace.
- It helps me learn basic CS.
- good
- Good at explaining
- n/a
- Very knowledgeable on the subject. I'm sure her explanations were thorough and insightful, but most of the time I could not hear her.
- I could tell that the professor had genuine passion for the subject
- Great course, well taught, presentations are great and the TAs are always helpful
- She's very knowledgeable, and is quite good at explaining things.
- Engaging teaching style and good communication.
- The professor is very passionate about what he is teaching. Even if half the class has no idea what's going on. He is a caring person with a great personality.
- At first I hated this class then the more I practiced I actually appreciated coding and python. I think the class has a good method of homework and the quizzes/exams are graded very quickly.
- she was moreover supporting mr. fowler and most of the material she taught i taught myself a majority of that material outside of the class due to the nature of the homework
- Major strengths include flexible grading scale with nice professors.
- He does a good job of giving assignments to prepare for the exam.
- Helpful walkthrough and tips on some problem areas during lecture.
- The instructor was very good at explaining concepts in lecture and was very clear about the steps of certain problems.
- Learning the basics of code.
- We can learn everything on our own, because the interactive textbook is excellent.
- Always had a positive attitude every class session, always opened up to questions and the teaching style was very easy to follow.
- The instructors were enthusiastic and knowledgeable.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- I suggest working through some of the problems that we are given in prairie learn because class sometimes felt like a waste of time just going through the slides. I learn best when I actually do the practice.
- none
- More involved lectures
- i just feel that there is a ton to learn/memorize in such little time.
- The lecture days were quite long, sometimes it was hard to focus the whole time
- There is nothing specific I have in mind. Overall I really enjoyed the teaching style of the class.
- I would say making the labs worth more points, to incentivize people to go a little more. I get the idea that making it worth a small portion of the grade will reward the motivated students. I just feel like to help the overall majority making the labs worth more points would help.
- Not taking lecture attendance until the end
- Nothing
- honestly there needs to be better lecture content that's more focused on exam content and the homework content hence more specifics. the exam preparation needs to be improved as well as the practice exams often don't correlate to anything on the actual exam.
- More teaching, less busy work
- Less lengthy readings and more exam like coding practice.
- I really like the layout of the course. I would suggest having a practice final like there were for the other exams but other than that I think the course uses its time effectively.
- I think that they should get rid of the quizzes. They didn't really help me out that much in the grand scheme of things.
- I feel like there needs to be more teaching because I feel like it was very independent and I wasn't able to fully understand most of the material on my own and I was struggling a lot because of that.
- The lecture portion of the course was the least effective part for me because I felt the slides didn't explain the steps very well. It was confusing to watch and try to figure out.
- none
- Easier way to ask questions
- no
- I think that the course has way too long of a lecture it could be easily be split among multiple days. There is not a lot of ways too actually practice outside of the assigned problems. Difficult to get help.
- Lectures were a bit meh, I like more of the examples but lecture was just long
- Lecture is way too long and not interesting
- shorter lectures
- There is not much I would change about this course, but possible change the due dates for some assignments to over the weekend.
- Show our answers to our tests so we can go back after and see what we did wrong.
- As a art major, I do feel that the work load was a bit overwhelmed on having quiz or exam almost every week. Even though I was fine to handle some of it, but the material was confused on the class. For me, I feel like the thing I learned from zybook was different from the material I learned from lecture every week. Like the material from zybook, lab and lecture wasn't matched well.
- don't need to assign so much assignment like Zybooks which are not so useful for the course
- None
- Her ability to get people's attention during the lecture.
- I would suggest less wordy explanations on lecture slides.
- The lecture is long and is hard to stay focused for that long
- -Shorter lecture times -Smaller lecture groups
- N/A
- For the exam part, I do think the questions are too difficult sometimes and it has to fit the level of our practice exam at least.
- I would say have more people moderating the labs so that questions can be answered faster. Also removing the unnecessary questions during the homework.
- Maybe modifying the zybooks or substituting them with something more legible as I personally struggled with understanding them at points due to their density and sometime confusing to me formatting.
- not really
- Good on everything!
- The zybooks lessons, homework, labs, and lectures were kind of all over the place and we were going back and forth with concepts there was never a direct lesson we were learning which made it kind of hard.

- Nothing.
- we would usually get a break in between lecture i think students would rather get through it and leave 10 minutes earlier
- shorter lecture
- I think the lectures are sometimes confusing and near the end of them, most of the students have either left, or aren't actively listening anymore. There could be activities that make the students want to be more engaged.
- This course is a little bit stressful, maybe it can has less exam or quiz.
- Re-evaluation of the Zybooks, they seemed to never be connected to what we did in Lab or on Exams.
- less zybooks more actual teaching
- no
- honestly nothing
- too many assignments/ different websites/assignments. it didnt always relate to each other and i often found myself rushing through the work/cheating because the assignments were so long and there were so many of them
- Less busywork. I feel that this class is heavily work intensive, when it shouldn't be.
- To improve the course I would say maybe use another website other then zy-library because I find that it doesn't teach me that much.
- More TAs
- nothing
- good.
- Less online homework.
- I don't know.
- Consider adding more hands-on coding exercises or in-class workshops to strengthen programming skills further. Providing additional optional resources for complex topics could also be beneficial.
- I think that the online textbook needs to closely relate to what we were doing in class better than it is now.
- The Zy books. I understand the purpose of them, but they are tremendously monotonous. I feel as if I learn more during the post-reading assignments somehow.
- zybooks, felt like they were not helpful
- n/a
- Have the professors explain more challenging subjects in both the labs and lecture.
- I always learn better with walk-through problems, visuals, and videos. I am more of a visual learner myself, and so going through practice problems together and having videos attached to those problems would be helpful. This would allow me to understand the material better and be able to pick up on patterns and methods I otherwise would not have known.
- Do not make lecture at 12 on a Friday, it is very easy to tune out because the week starts in 2 hours.
- Make the lecture not as long on a Friday.
- make some of the prairie learn assignments shorter
- Help make it so that people who are lost in the beginning are not completely screwed.
- I would say to do more real-life examples of code during lecture.
- I think to better improve the course there has to be a physical book or even not toooo many quizzes and exams because its more overwhelming than any sort of help. I was mostly focused on the upcoming quizzes and exams rather than learning the actual material.
- make the course time shorter
- Slower pacing with the topics and making the exams not as hard and give more time.
- Maybe give extra credit or buffer points to those who did the homework on time.
- The textbook and homework are sometimes not very helpful in getting feedback about student work and doesn't help the student understanding.
- Use of more online websites that help explain the different topics. No more ZyBooks.
- The prarie learn in a lot the first 3 weeks, especially since you are just starting the course
- make the lectures shorter
- Improve the work done in lab because I feel like it isn't related
- I don't believe that there is anything I would suggest to improve the course.
- I think the structure of the course is excellent, the material is hard to that's what makes it challenging.
- I would suggest to make the lectures shorter or smaller to keep students more engaged.
- I don't really have anything that I think could really improve this course.
- Maybe make the extra videos interactive and required over some of the zybooks.

- Less homework.
- nothing
- Provide more practice exams and questions
- Honestly it's simply too hard for anyone who doesn't know how to code in the first place. To produce several lines of semi-complicated code in a 100 level class is unrealistic for many freshman.
- Maybe make it easier to learn and take the exam.
- I would love to see more review sessions for preparing for exams and quizzes.
- less reading, more practice
- I think making two shorter lectures instead of just having one long lecture would be beneficial.
- I think the textbook could be more interesting, because I didn't learn much from reading and doing the problems in it. I learned mostly from coding, which I wish there were more coding and less vocabulary problems.
- Post less ZyBooks.
- Make the questions that are on the practice exam actually on the real exams.
- the lecture, hard to pay attention and understand
- have less exams and quizzes.
- Nope
- I would say that slowing down during lectures when covering content to let the students follow along in a more comfortable space. I felt that the slides would be rushed through and that the talking would also be a little too fast-paced to follow along with effectively.
- having a better way to explain cs to non cs majors because it does get confusing, also more videos or link a youtube channel that helps
- too hard for the exam
- Hope there are videos
- The concept are hard to teach but easy to study, sometimes I just think it is better to learn by myself. Sometimes when the instructors are using worksheet, I cannot see it clearly.
- Not at this moment.
- I suggest that the teacher give us more help and better course material.
- I think a improvement that could be made is incoporating discussion groups. Having a set group to contact to help with the work I think would help connect students but also make it easier for people to ask for help.
- The lectures seem a little repetitive and maybe too long.
- It is good enough.
- good
- shorter lectures, better book and way of learning
- n/a
- Move the lecture time, 12 pm on Friday is too late. Most students either don't care because it's a Friday or already know all of the material because they learned it from the required zyBooks earlier in the week. As a result, the lecture hall is way too loud and not conducive to learning.
- Far too much busywork and the homework's were too long
- lectures are too long and i left halfway for most of them because I didn't need to be there. i am kind of overqualified to be in this class, but I feel like the lectures are somehow the least crucial part of the course.
- It might be a good idea to do away with the box problems. It's effectiveness at fostering community wanes overtime.
- Stop making Business majors take this course. It has nothing to do with what we are pursuing and only hurts our GPA which in turn hurts our resume and applications for jobs and applications. There is no reason students should start off stressing for a class that has nothing to do with their major. It is disappointing that the majority of people taking it struggle and it has been the case for the past few years.
- More emphasis on excel since a lot of people in this course are Gies students.
- less homeswork more lecture based teachig
- More online video walkthroughs for problems.
- Less zybooks assignments.
- No suggestions.
- N/A
- Having more interactive labs and helping students more.
- We can learn everything through the textbook and assignments. So it seems that the lectures and labs are not nevessary for us to be successful in this course. I think if the attendence is not required and graded, there wouldn't be many students attend the lecture (Many students leave the classroom after checking in.)
- Nothing comes to mind.

- Y'all I thought this was INTRO for NON-MAJORS. Personally, I felt like there was too much content thrown at us at once. For actual beginners I think it's overwhelming.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- I thought grading was very fair and we sometimes got curves on the exams which was nice.
- none
- the grading is fair and straightforward. If you complete the homework accurately you get the points, ad exams are graded straight forward.
- Grading was smooth. I haven't had any issues
- The grading procedures of this course is very fair.
- I think grading was really fair, and there were even extra credit opportunities that were helpful too.
- Very fair and timely
- Very good
- Exams are weighted too heavy
- They are very fair.
- I think the grading procedure is fair.
- I think that the grading procedure was fair it just took a little bit to update grades because they only got updated once a week
- The grading procedures are fair but it's hard when you fail the exam even though you know what you are doing and then your grade gets heavily impacted then.
- The grading was effective and done in a timely manner.
- good
- Grading procedure was fair
- great
- I think that the test are very difficult and confusing there are times where my code appears to work and I am unsure how I could improve form where I was at.
- I think the grading for this course is extremely fair and does not let your grade go down too low if you miss something
- Very straightforward that were put on the syllabus.
- I like how the grading goes, it just a bit surprised me on how they eventually didn't count the late penalty for the homework submission. Because I felt a bit unfair of trying really hard every night to finish before the deadline and up to 5am in the morning to finish my other work just because the homework was usually due tuesday and thursday which I have the most thing due.
- it was great
- None
- The grade you get is what based off of what you turn in and the amount of completion reflects the grade.
- They are fair.
- -Thought this was very fair, nothing bad to say
- It think it's fair and balance. They (instructor) is cognizant on the challenges people face either keeping up with work or exam mistakes.
- I believe that the grading procedures were understandable/fair.
- Overall it's great.
- I think grading is fair.
- Typical not too long but also not immediate typically a week if it needed to be graded by a person or immediate if done remotely.
- The grading procedures are pretty good and update frequently.
- I like that the homework was more than some exams because I am a bad test taker and I think the grading procedures were very good.
- They were good.
- very fair exams are graded pretty heavily but since theres a few it is fair
- lecture shouldn't be graded
- I think the grading procedures are pretty fair. Grades are given back on a timely manner and you know what grade you're going to get at the end of each quiz and exam.
- The grading is fair.
- Grading procedure was smooth with no issues.
- good :)
- maybe not make the time period between quiz and exam so close
- I really like the grading [procedure and feel it is very fair
- Very fair!

- The grading procedures are good. I think that the exams should be more curved or we should have a retake on each exam.
- The grading procedures were pretty straightforward.
- Good
- The grading procedures in the CS105 course are clear and fair
- good.
- Grades were distributed very evenly.
- They seem to be fair.
- Please give correct answer to the questions.
- Fair
- Extremely fair. A little confusing as you can get hundreds of points on post-readings and the Zy books, but only one point for attending a lecture or lab. Either way though, you get all the points if you just complete the work, so I would say it is fair.
- none
- they are fair
- The grading procedures were fair.
- I have no opinions about the grading procedures. It is a pretty straightforward process, and I believe the grading scale is fair.
- The grading should be more fair. Partial credit + added time to tests should be implemented.
- No complaints on grading.
- very good, never waiting too long for grades
- It is alright, I think that it is too heavily weighted in tests
- The grading procedures were timely and made sense.
- The grading procedure is good, although there's definitely too many exams and quizzes which affect the grades and drops immediately.
- good and fair
- Very very fair and reasonable especially with the homework.
- I liked how it was all released on Sunday.
- The grading procedures are fair and understanding over the students.
- I feel if the grades can be put in a bit earlier that would be better, otherwise it was good.
- You can be harsher, there are a lot of curves for students who aren't bothering to learn the material
- Very on time and done in a quick manner
- I believe that they are very fair with their grading.
- They are good and fair.
- The grading procedures were very fair and good within this course!
- Very fair.
- I feel that overall, the grading procedures were fair, I just feel more partial credit should be given on exams if possible.
- Very fair.
- nothing
- The grading procedure for this course is reasonable and solid. However, would help students if the grade boundaries can lower a bit
- Great at grading no problems there
- It's fair.
- I think that certain quiz and exam questions were a bit specific and nit picky, but otherwise the grading seemed fair.
- fair and kind
- I think that the grading was fair and I liked that all of the grades would go in on Sunday night
- Grading seemed very fair.
- I really liked the grading in this class, they gave us many opportunities to make up points, and curved exams.
- they're good
- Exams have different difficulties, and students should get more chances to get some extra credits to make their gpa stable.
- Very fair and transparent
- GOOD

- very fair
- Good
- It's great. I love it. Appreciated!
- The grading procedures is good.
- The grading procedures were good and the assignments really helped bring my grade up.
- I think the grading is very fair.
- Grading procedure is good.
- It is good enough now.
- good
- very fair
- n/a
- Fair and clear
- The grading was fair. Some errors, but they were fixed
- Excellent grading procedures
- Very fair
- Very reasonable.
- The tests having a pool of 200 questions to choose from is completely unfair and makes it impossible to learn the material required if the questions are random.
- Very quick and effiicent. I think I got an "A"
- Grading and curve is fair. More of a curve is always welcomed though :)
- They are fair and clear.
- Fair
- The grading was very fair.
- The grades were accurate to what you put in.
- Perfect.
- Very fair grading. The exam allows you to have a fair amount of tries and will sometimes give you partial credit
- I feel like the coding problems were too much of the grade because they are by far the most difficult and vulnerable to small mistakes.



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Spring, 2024

Section AYB, Lab-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)
M, 11am, 101 901 W Oregon

Evaluations were completed by **18** out of **36** students (50.0%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Required", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
39% (7)	44% (8)	11% (2)	6% (1)	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
11% (2)	33% (6)	56% (10)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
72% (13)	6% (1)	22% (4)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	94% (17)	6% (1)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
22% (4)	67% (12)	11% (2)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
39% (7)	33% (6)	28% (5)	-	-	-

Global Items

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	6% (1)	11% (2)	39% (7)	39% (7)	6% (1)	4.18	0.88	61	44

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	6% (1)	28% (5)	44% (8)	22% (4)	-	3.83	0.86	35	31

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
6% (1)	11% (2)	17% (3)	33% (6)	33% (6)	-	3.78	1.22	24	24

Departmental Core Items

CS - TA

Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	17% (3)	11% (2)	39% (7)	33% (6)	-	3.89	1.08	27

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	22% (4)	28% (5)	50% (9)	-	4.28	0.83	66

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	11% (2)	17% (3)	67% (12)	-	4.44	0.92	62

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	11% (2)	6% (1)	33% (6)	50% (9)	-	4.22	1.00	52

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	11% (2)	28% (5)	33% (6)	28% (5)	-	3.78	1.00	26

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	11% (2)	28% (5)	22% (4)	39% (7)	-	3.89	1.08	34

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
6% (1)	11% (2)	17% (3)	33% (6)	33% (6)	-	3.78	1.22	14

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	11% (2)	22% (4)	22% (4)	44% (8)	-	4.00	1.08	30

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	61% (11)	33% (6)	6% (1)	-	-	3.67	0.97	62

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
6% (1)	28% (5)	17% (3)	33% (6)	17% (3)	-	3.28	1.23	28

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
6% (1)	17% (3)	22% (4)	28% (5)	28% (5)	-	3.56	1.25	27

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
22% (4)	33% (6)	11% (2)	22% (4)	11% (2)	-	2.67	1.37	6

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.18
Rate the overall quality of this course.					3.83
How much have you learned in this course?					3.78
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					3.89
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.28
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.44
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.22
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					3.78
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					3.89
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					3.78
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.00
The course was:					3.67
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					3.28
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					3.56
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					2.67

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- Very helpful is making sure I understood the lab and helping me when I needed it
- This instructor helped me out a lot in the labs.
- She is great at explaining stuff that students don't understand and answering any questions.
- Charlotte is a great TA, she explains things well and prompts you to really think questions through
- He's very clear while explaining the syllabus for the day
- explaining things well, being attentive to questions
- Used Lab time to go over topics we learned the previous week. TAs were always available to answer questions
- Also was a greater instructor as she responded when I had a question very quickly and explained the material well in a way that is easy to understand for a beginner coder.
- The instructor has a very good understanding of the material and she has a good way of explaining how to do things.
- How homework assignments really did set you up for success in both exams and labs.
- The major strengths of this course was that it helped build a good foundation for my coding abilities in python script.
- Very professional and prepared for the lab materials, and really helpful when I asked questions.
- The labs help go over the lectures and you actually do the work yourself then being explained by the TA's whenever help is needed was very helpful and majority of my learning came in the labs themselves.
- The instructor does well at making sure every student gets help when they ask.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- I suggest making a sign in so that kids can sign in in the beginning and not worry about having to finish the lab on time
- None
- Going through more examples of stuff we'll see later in the lab.
- I would suggest making labs less lengthy
- No suggestions. I like the lab the way it is
- make the material more catered to the exams
- N/A
- Getting rid of code reading questions on quizzes
- I would just suggest more examples that provide an example of how to approach a coding problem.
- They need to make it so homework and labs have a bigger impact on your overall grade. Exams are far too heavy in this course and it makes the busy work seem useless.
- Not really much maybe just make it so our grade isn't solely based on only exams.
- The lab is a way too difficult, and the material should provide more sample coding at first.
- Maybe go over some lab parts together at the end for those who are stuck in certain areas.
- Not sure.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- Finish the lab and get the points
- None
- It seemed fair.
- Grading is fair and appropriate
- It was fair
- I thought grading was pretty fair for the most part. Because there are so many kids, I didn't expect grades back immediately, but graders did a good job getting things back as soon as they can. Sometimes, I didn't like how the exams were graded because getting one question wrong would drop my score a whole letter grade.
- The grading procedures were fair.
- Grading procedures were quite awful in the sense that almost everything was returned graded weeks after submitting.
- The grading was fair but also they need to fix prarie-learn exam grading because some questions were really confusing and hard to understand exactly what the question wanted.
- It's fair.
- Very fair no complaints there.
- N/A



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Spring, 2024

Section AYC, Lab-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)
M, 1pm, 101 901 W Oregon

Evaluations were completed by **18** out of **30** students (60.0%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Required", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Congratulations!

You have made it onto the List of Teachers Ranked as Excellent By Their Students!

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
17% (3)	28% (5)	33% (6)	22% (4)	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
-	50% (9)	50% (9)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
61% (11)	22% (4)	17% (3)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	83% (15)	17% (3)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
28% (5)	50% (9)	22% (4)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
44% (8)	28% (5)	17% (3)	6% (1)	-	6% (1)

Global Items**Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	6% (1)	56% (10)	39% (7)	-	4.33	0.59	75	58

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	11% (2)	11% (2)	56% (10)	22% (4)	-	3.89	0.90	39	36

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	6% (1)	17% (3)	44% (8)	33% (6)	-	4.06	0.87	47	44

Departmental Core Items**CS - TA****Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	22% (4)	44% (8)	33% (6)	-	4.11	0.76	46

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	6% (1)	39% (7)	56% (10)	-	4.50	0.62	82

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	33% (6)	67% (12)	-	4.67	0.49	88

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	6% (1)	28% (5)	67% (12)	-	4.61	0.61	87

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	17% (3)	33% (6)	39% (7)	6% (1)	4.12	0.93	59

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	17% (3)	28% (5)	50% (9)	-	4.22	0.94	72

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	22% (4)	33% (6)	44% (8)	-	4.22	0.81	42	

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	33% (6)	28% (5)	33% (6)	6% (1)	4.00	0.87	30

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
11% (2)	28% (5)	39% (7)	17% (3)	6% (1)	-	3.44	1.46	47

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
11% (2)	-	33% (6)	44% (8)	11% (2)	-	3.44	1.10	41

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	11% (2)	6% (1)	61% (11)	22% (4)	-	3.94	0.87	56

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
22% (4)	-	17% (3)	33% (6)	28% (5)	-	3.44	1.50	37

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.33
Rate the overall quality of this course.					3.89
How much have you learned in this course?					4.06
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					4.11
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.50
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.67
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.61
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					4.12
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.22
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					4.22
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.00
The course was:					3.44
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					3.44
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					3.94
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					3.44

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- Ability to answer personal questions regarding cs
- Instructor was clear in instructions and very willing to help each student. Promoted a positive learning environment
- Very interactive and good explanations
- Kind and always prepared for course. Wanted to help students.
- Explained things the best out of anyone else in the lab and was ready to help at all times. Kept a positive attitude.
- I appreciated Charlotte's lecture during the beginning of class and her attitude. She is always ready to help and makes you feel lifted. I really like how she has the time to get to know our names too.
- I think the course has a really good layout that feels like it builds up smoothly and there isn't any huge jumps of difficulty.
- Very supportive and great at explaining the topics. She appears to really care about student's learning.
- They seemed to understand to topic well.
- very clear and easy to understand
- The cheatsheets shown during the lab were nice, especially if it helps with the assignment we were doing. She explained things well both one on one and to the class.
- She was very personable, approachable, and good at explaining things without making you feel dumb.
- The TA was very helpful and receptive to students and adjusted labs to better fit students needs for understanding the course.
- Get a good understanding of python and gives you an opportunity to later use it in your work.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- Make sure students see all types of problems they may see on an exam.
- Labs are sometimes not very engaging
- Homeworks less lengthy
- More interactive. More tutorials. Less individual coding.
- Make labs connect more to the actual exams.
- I think having better assistants could help the course. Some tend to cluster together and it can be hard to reach for help if they are in the middle of a conversation. Some will also just stand there, seemingly indifferent.
- i think two separate lectures instead of one long one, since i find it hard to focus for that long.
- Prairie learn and zybooks needs to match with the discussion and lab better
- They did not translate the material well, we could tell they knew what they were talking about it was just hard to learn from them.
- In practice exam or homework or quiz, some problem have no answer and I can't understand the answer quickly. Please put all answer and it will helps us a lot.
- I suggest having more TAs like her because I was much more likely to ask her questions because of her great attitude and welcoming spirit.
- Less zybooks, and better feedback for wrong answers on homework, or more explanations.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- The exams are hard to earn good grades on.
- Grading procedures are understandable, but could be more organized so that there are less errors in canvas.
- Tests are graded harshly.
- Fair.
- Grading was fair.
- I think the grading procedures are fair in this course. Participation heavily counts, so I understand how the lab will matter on whether you show up or not.
- good no issues
- Fair
- good
- I wish the homework and other assignments like quizzes were weighted heavier because I feel like my exam scores didn't always reflect my effort and abilities that the other coursework did.
- Good, but I wish I could tell what my current grade was much more accurately.



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Spring, 2024

Section AYD, Lab-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)

M, 3pm, 101 901 W Oregon

Evaluations were completed by **18** out of **28** students (64.3%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Mixed", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
17% (3)	67% (12)	17% (3)	-	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
33% (6)	28% (5)	39% (7)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
50% (9)	-	44% (8)	6% (1)

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	78% (14)	17% (3)	6% (1)

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
17% (3)	39% (7)	33% (6)	11% (2)

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
28% (5)	39% (7)	22% (4)	6% (1)	-	6% (1)

Global Items

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	6% (1)	22% (4)	28% (5)	44% (8)	-	4.11	0.96	54	36

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	11% (2)	17% (3)	33% (6)	33% (6)	6% (1)	3.94	1.03	45	27

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
6% (1)	-	28% (5)	22% (4)	44% (8)	-	4.00	1.14	45	33

Departmental Core Items

CS - TA

Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	28% (5)	33% (6)	28% (5)	6% (1)	3.88	0.93	27

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	28% (5)	22% (4)	50% (9)	-	4.22	0.88	61

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	22% (4)	17% (3)	56% (10)	6% (1)	4.35	0.86	54

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	22% (4)	17% (3)	56% (10)	-	4.22	1.00	52

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	28% (5)	33% (6)	28% (5)	6% (1)	3.88	0.93	35

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	22% (4)	28% (5)	39% (7)	6% (1)	4.06	0.97	50

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	28% (5)	11% (2)	50% (9)	6% (1)	4.12	1.05	32

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
6% (1)	6% (1)	17% (3)	22% (4)	44% (8)	6% (1)	4.00	1.22	30

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
11% (2)	28% (5)	33% (6)	17% (3)	6% (1)	6% (1)	3.35	1.46	43

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
17% (3)	17% (3)	28% (5)	11% (2)	22% (4)	6% (1)	3.06	1.43	13

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
11% (2)	-	28% (5)	33% (6)	28% (5)	-	3.67	1.24	35

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
17% (3)	6% (1)	22% (4)	22% (4)	33% (6)	-	3.50	1.47	39

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.11
Rate the overall quality of this course.					3.94
How much have you learned in this course?					4.00
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					3.88
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.22
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.35
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.22
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					3.88
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.06
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					4.12
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.00
The course was:					3.35
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					3.06
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					3.67
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					3.50

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- good gateway into the subject
- lots of hands on learning and practice
- Helpful, always answer correctly
- The instructor engages the class
- They were always well prepared and were very good at explaining how to do problems without just giving us the answer.
- She was always prepared and came to students aid when they had a question. She knows what she's talking about and she loves it which made this class bearable.
- Charlotte was extremely helpful in explaining the material. I always attended her Wednesday office hours and it was extremely helpful and enjoyable. She explains the material well and you can see that she actually enjoys what she does.
- This instructor is very good at explaining and is always well prepared for labs. She does a great job at explaining the material to us in a way that we can understand, which isn't overly confusing.
- Charlotte was very calm and collected. She contributed to creating a positive learning environment every week. Her one-on-one help gave me confidence, and she was very motivating. Great instructor!

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- restructure the lectures
- Be more careful for students' hands when they are raising because I got ignored for a few times before
- Make the lectures spreadout
- I would keep the homework and post read but I think the zybooks are pointless.
- I would make it so the course work and lecture align more with themselves.
- More in person office hours!
- Labs are sometimes not very related to what we are learning and can be a waste of time. They are also sometimes too hard and frustrating.
- I wish there was a better way of using the labs as a studying resource. More specifically, I wish there was a readily available answer key that was posted and advertised after labs.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- no comments
- good
- The grading was fair
- The grading was fair.
- Very fair!
- Very fair
- The grading procedures were very fair.



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Fall, 2023

Section AYA, Lab-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)

M, 9am, 101 901 W Oregon

Evaluations were completed by **25** out of **39** students (64.1%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Required", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Congratulations!

You have made it onto the List of Teachers Ranked as Excellent By Their Students!

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
56% (14)	32% (8)	12% (3)	-	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
12% (3)	36% (9)	52% (13)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
68% (17)	12% (3)	20% (5)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
8% (2)	68% (17)	24% (6)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
12% (3)	60% (15)	28% (7)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
48% (12)	44% (11)	8% (2)	-	-	-

Global Items**Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	20% (5)	24% (6)	56% (14)	-	4.36	0.81	75	60

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
4% (1)	-	20% (5)	40% (10)	36% (9)	-	4.04	0.98	54	50

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
4% (1)	4% (1)	16% (4)	36% (9)	40% (10)	-	4.04	1.06	48	45

Departmental Core Items**CS - TA****Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	4% (1)	24% (6)	20% (5)	52% (13)	-	4.20	0.96	60

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	12% (3)	20% (5)	68% (17)	-	4.56	0.71	86

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	8% (2)	16% (4)	76% (19)	-	4.68	0.63	85

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	12% (3)	24% (6)	64% (16)	-	4.52	0.71	77

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	4% (1)	16% (4)	24% (6)	56% (14)	-	4.32	0.90	76

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	16% (4)	36% (9)	48% (12)	-	4.32	0.75	77	

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
4% (1)	4% (1)	12% (3)	20% (5)	60% (15)	-	4.28	1.10	46

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	8% (2)	12% (3)	32% (8)	48% (12)	-	4.20	0.96	40

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
8% (2)	40% (10)	28% (7)	16% (4)	8% (2)	-	3.24	1.33	38

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
12% (3)	36% (9)	20% (5)	12% (3)	16% (4)	4% (1)	2.83	1.31	5

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
4% (1)	-	20% (5)	40% (10)	36% (9)	-	4.04	0.98	65

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
12% (3)	16% (4)	24% (6)	16% (4)	32% (8)	-	3.40	1.41	36

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.36
Rate the overall quality of this course.					4.04
How much have you learned in this course?					4.04
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					4.20
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.56
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.68
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.52
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					4.32
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.32
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					4.28
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.20
The course was:					3.24
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					2.83
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					4.04
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					3.40

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- Help out each student
- Charlotte was very nice and helpful during my lab sections. She would always help and explain what to do, and very frequently she was the one to answer questions online if anyone had them as well. The course did teach me a lot about a topic I had never tried before.
- The TA was really helpful.
- Having different sections of Lab so students could get more of one-on-one with TA's.
- The instructor and Ta's were excellent and very helpful. This course made you think and read and study to find answers to difficult problems.
- The major strengths may be the lab practicing.
- The major strengths include the ability to explain problems thoroughly. As for the course, labs allow for a one-on-one conversation which helped me learn a lot of content than compared to just lectures and doing things on my own.
- Always well prepared, can explain work in a manner that makes it easy to understand, and is very friendly.
- She was really good at retaching the lessons. Her help was also very valable.
- She was always willing to explain any questions even if they took a long time to answer. And she was one of the only people who actually helped me understand the content.
- Very good at answering all questions and helped to make sure you understood the topic.
- She was very nice, and I could tell she wanted us to learn
- Very attentive and organized for discussion.
- They're really good at teachign the material
- The major strengths of the instructor were they were always able to explain things in an understandable way. If you were confused about a question they were able to explain what the question was asking and guide you in different ways to solve it. They were also great at explaining why things worked if people were confused about how their answer was correct.
- Self assessment
- This instructor was very helpful and friendly.
- They were prepared and always helped when I asked a question
- The major strength is the ability to practice coding through the course.
- She was a great speaker in front of class and helped explain difficult topics many students were stuck on in class.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- More time to teach
- Charlotte did seem a little unsure of how to explain things to a whole class at first, but as time went on, she got better and was able to help everyone on class-wide issues easily. Overall, the course needs major work. See my report on Hossein for more info, but the course is way too intensive, and the grading system is terrible. I need grades faster, and I don't want to see a 50% for an assignment that isn't due for another 2 weeks. It's really lazy, annoying, and needs to be changed. Also, some of the lessons you teach were literally not useful. There were times Craig or another sub-instructor would say "you're not going to need this in this class, but we're teaching it" and that is really annoying when I just want to learn and practice what I NEED for the class.
- I would suggest that there be more TAs.
- No suggestions
- None
- I would suggest other lab content that is more relevant to the exams because I feel like a lot of things we do in lab are different from the actual exams.
- N/A
- I think if the labs were a bit harder that would be great. it would give a much harder chalange.
- more individual practice time
- Having a more organized schedule sometimes felt like there was too much work to do but never the time to do it.
- Go over the way things are graded and syllabus matters in discussion to make sure there is no confusion about due dates and other expectations.
- Having 1-2 breaks during discussion like a checkpoint in which as a class we go over a question that many people have been struggling with.
- Make grading more constructive
- To help improve this course explaining keywords/a little more vocabulary during the lab would help people understand and retain more about the concepts. Also making the practice exam questions more slightly similar to the actual exams can be an improvement.
- nothing
- N/A
- none
- No suggestions.
- I would suggest to give easy examples so we can understand the basics.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- Great
- Grading is terrible. The importing of grades is extremely stupid and should be done away with. Usually, it takes forever to get grades back, sometimes they're wrong, and sometimes they add grades for assignments you haven't even done yet because they weren't due for another week or so. It's lazy, annoying for students, and honestly for a technology course, shouldn't be happening. However, that being said, grading exams and quizzes and HW is extremely fair, and the online format with prarielearn works very well.
- N/A
- Grading was fair.
- The labs have not been graded yet so I am not sure if the grading procedure is good or not. I guess the grading procedure is to give the grade after the entire semester of labs has been completed. It should be fine.
- The grading procedure is great
- Pretty fast and straightforward
- Everything is gradely fairly, I would just wish that homework had more weight than they do. I am a terrible test taker and so that's why my grade will be low for this class.
- I thought it was fair
- fair
- I think the grading in the class was always fair, just that exams were always harder because of how easily you could lose a point for forgetting something as simple as a space.
- they were fair
- n/a
- Make grading more constructive
- The grading procedures seem fine, but I believe the exams can be worth a little less than what they are worth now since messing up one exam can really tank a grade.
- Good
- Fair
- very faire
- I believe that it is fair, but tough.
- I feel that the tests were to difficult and that being a major part of the grade messed it up for a lot of people.



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Fall, 2023

Section AYB, Lab-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)
M, 11am, 101 901 W Oregon

Evaluations were completed by **15** out of **30** students (50.0%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Required", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Congratulations!

You have made it onto the List of Teachers Ranked as Excellent By Their Students!

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
33% (5)	53% (8)	13% (2)	-	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
7% (1)	33% (5)	60% (9)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
73% (11)	7% (1)	20% (3)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	87% (13)	13% (2)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
33% (5)	47% (7)	20% (3)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
53% (8)	47% (7)	-	-	-	-

Global Items**Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	60% (9)	33% (5)	-	4.27	0.59	69	53

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	27% (4)	47% (7)	27% (4)	-	4.00	0.76	53	49

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	7% (1)	13% (2)	33% (5)	47% (7)	-	4.20	0.94	57	58

Departmental Core Items**CS - TA****Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	53% (8)	33% (5)	7% (1)	4.29	0.61	65

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	47% (7)	47% (7)	-	4.40	0.63	73

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	40% (6)	60% (9)	-	4.60	0.51	77

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	40% (6)	53% (8)	-	4.47	0.64	72

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
7% (1)	-	7% (1)	40% (6)	47% (7)	-	4.20	1.08	68

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	60% (9)	27% (4)	-	4.13	0.64	58

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	-	53% (8)	40% (6)	-	4.27	0.80	46

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	53% (8)	47% (7)	-	4.47	0.52	69

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	40% (6)	33% (5)	27% (4)	-	-	3.67	0.98	62

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
7% (1)	20% (3)	27% (4)	40% (6)	7% (1)	-	3.20	1.08	21

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	20% (3)	27% (4)	47% (7)	-	4.13	0.99	71

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
27% (4)	20% (3)	-	33% (5)	20% (3)	-	3.00	1.60	18

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.27
Rate the overall quality of this course.					4.00
How much have you learned in this course?					4.20
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					4.29
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.40
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.60
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.47
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					4.20
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.13
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					4.27
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.47
The course was:					3.67
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					3.20
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					4.13
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					3.00

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- Charlotte was great at helping one on one during the lab section. I thought she was fantastic at explaining how to do things.
- Instructors were very helpful in the lab
- The major strengths of the instructor are being able to walk students through the thought process on how to generate code, being able to explain topics and concepts well when a student asks "but why?", and does a nice job of creating a comfortable environment! The course itself was a lot of reading and work, but that is the courses' biggest strength in that it provides a lot of information on how to start and navigate through coding!
- Being knowledgeable on the subject
- Always willing to help. Very good at explaining and leading rather than just telling the answer.
- Explaining the introduction and topics discussed for each day.
- Charlotte is very nice and always happy to help however she can. She is very good at explaining the material and is always positive and kind.
- It helps me learn basic Python and Excel.
- Ability to connect with students and provide digestible help
- Very helpful and good at explaining when you ask for assistance.
- the labs were the best way to really learn in my opinion, since it required the most brainpower.
- none
- Charlotte was very accomodating to students learning styles and how we were learning the code. She didnt make me feel dumb.
- Solve my problem very clearly

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- No suggestions for improving the lab section!
- Nothing much
- I would suggest to start Labs off with a question that is done together as a class to get the ball rolling.
- Less homework its so time consuming, more busy work than any other class
- N/A
- I have no suggestions.
- For someone that has never taken a computer science course before, it is pretty hard and moves very fast.
- None.
- Video modules
- More targeted instruction in the discussion section.
- nothing, but the lab is very far away.
- none
- Some other TA's couldve been more nice and understanding that not everyone is passionate about coding or is great at it. We truley struggle and it didnt help feeling worthless coming out of lab sections because a TA was not really helping me.
- None

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- Grading procedures for lab are very fair and reasonable.
- Very fair
- The grading is done mainly by AI on Prairie learn online! I really like that some questions are manually graded to ensure fairness!
- fine
- Fair.
- The grading procedures were acceptable.
- I wish the zybooks and prairie learn activities were worth a higher percentage because they are very time-consuming and not worth much weight.
- It is great.
- Clear
- They're fine.
- completion, so it was fine
- none
- good
- Good



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Fall, 2023

Section AYC, Lab-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)
M, 1pm, 101 901 W Oregon

Evaluations were completed by **17** out of **32** students (53.1%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Mixed", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Congratulations!

You have made it onto the List of Teachers Ranked as Excellent By Their Students!

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
29% (5)	47% (8)	18% (3)	6% (1)	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
12% (2)	47% (8)	41% (7)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
59% (10)	12% (2)	29% (5)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	65% (11)	35% (6)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
12% (2)	53% (9)	35% (6)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
41% (7)	41% (7)	6% (1)	6% (1)	-	6% (1)

Global Items**Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	12% (2)	41% (7)	47% (8)	-	4.35	0.70	75	54

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	18% (3)	41% (7)	41% (7)	-	4.24	0.75	70	50

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	6% (1)	18% (3)	24% (4)	47% (8)	6% (1)	4.19	0.98	57	44

Departmental Core Items**CS - TA****Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	12% (2)	41% (7)	47% (8)	-	4.35	0.70	70

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	6% (1)	35% (6)	53% (9)	-	4.35	0.86	70

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	12% (2)	29% (5)	59% (10)	-	4.47	0.72	63

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	12% (2)	24% (4)	59% (10)	-	4.35	0.93	60

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	18% (3)	35% (6)	41% (7)	-	4.12	0.93	59

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	24% (4)	41% (7)	35% (6)	-	4.12	0.78	55

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	12% (2)	24% (4)	35% (6)	29% (5)	-	3.82	1.01	15

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
6% (1)	6% (1)	24% (4)	35% (6)	29% (5)	-	3.76	1.15	12

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
18% (3)	12% (2)	47% (8)	12% (2)	12% (2)	-	3.35	1.77	47

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	6% (1)	47% (8)	12% (2)	35% (6)	-	3.76	1.03	62

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	41% (7)	29% (5)	29% (5)	-	3.88	0.86	53

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
12% (2)	12% (2)	18% (3)	29% (5)	29% (5)	-	3.53	1.37	45

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.35
Rate the overall quality of this course.					4.24
How much have you learned in this course?					4.19
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					4.35
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.35
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.47
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.35
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					4.12
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.12
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					3.82
The grading procedures for the course were:					3.76
The course was:					3.35
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					3.76
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					3.88
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					3.53

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- clear explanation
- Fun
- what she explained were all clear
- Major strengths of the instructor and course was that the actual instruction was quite enthusiastic.
- Understandable and precise when help is needed
- "Cheat Sheets" and brief review at the start of lab make completing the lab faster and easier.
- n/a
- did an amazing job going over what was taught in the lecture to help with the lab
- The instructor was very friendly, patient, and good at explaining all the concepts.
- TAs were super helpful and supportive. Zilles was great just got a little lost sometimes and sometimes felt like the lectures were disconnected from our work from the week
- plenty exercise
- responded quickly to emails, did not have that much contact with professor, couldn't really answer my questions
- TA was knowledgeable and effective during labs.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- None
- Nothing
- na
- I would have gotten better overall and gotten better grades if I had been able to make 1 on 1 appointment with a TA or CA. It was very much a downside when I would ask Charlotte if I could make an appointment and she said that it wasn't possible.
- I would suggest decreasing the duration of each lecture to improve the course.
- Grading percentage
- n/a
- n/a
- spending a little time going over one example before starting the lab can be helpful sometimes
- Less work and maybe a slower pace. Felt like a lot of it was a sort of 'figure it out' type of situation which was nice sometimes but not all the time.
- none
- be more clear with the grading scale on canvas
- None

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- great and fair
- Good
- na
- Grading was ok, only issue was that the canvas grades aren't completely accurate
- It can be confusing to know if TA's received your lab competition not if you go to a makeup lab.
- n/a
- good grading procedure
- fine
- none
- good



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Spring, 2023

Section AYA, Lab-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)
M, 9am, 101 901 W Oregon

Evaluations were completed by **12** out of **29** students (41.4%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Required", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
17% (2)	67% (8)	17% (2)	-	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
8% (1)	33% (4)	58% (7)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
75% (9)	-	25% (3)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	75% (9)	25% (3)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
33% (4)	50% (6)	17% (2)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
67% (8)	33% (4)	-	-	-	-

Global Items

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
8% (1)	-	8% (1)	42% (5)	42% (5)	-	4.08	1.16	50	40

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
17% (2)	8% (1)	17% (2)	25% (3)	33% (4)	-	3.50	1.51	14	19

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
17% (2)	25% (3)	8% (1)	17% (2)	33% (4)	-	3.25	1.60	3	8

Departmental Core Items

CS - TA

Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
8% (1)	25% (3)	8% (1)	33% (4)	25% (3)	-	3.42	1.38	4

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	25% (3)	33% (4)	42% (5)	-	4.17	0.83	53

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	25% (3)	75% (9)	-	4.75	0.45	88

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	42% (5)	58% (7)	-	4.58	0.51	78

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
17% (2)	8% (1)	8% (1)	33% (4)	33% (4)	-	3.58	1.51	17

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	25% (3)	17% (2)	50% (6)	8% (1)	4.27	0.90	68

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	17% (2)	25% (3)	58% (7)	-	4.42	0.79	59

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	8% (1)	8% (1)	25% (3)	58% (7)	-	4.33	0.98	54

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
33% (4)	33% (4)	17% (2)	8% (1)	8% (1)	-	2.50	1.51	7

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
17% (2)	25% (3)	33% (4)	17% (2)	8% (1)	-	2.75	1.22	3

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
17% (2)	25% (3)	8% (1)	33% (4)	17% (2)	-	3.08	1.44	10

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
33% (4)	-	8% (1)	33% (4)	25% (3)	-	3.17	1.70	26

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.08
Rate the overall quality of this course.					3.50
How much have you learned in this course?					3.25
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					3.42
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.17
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.75
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.58
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					3.58
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.27
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					4.42
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.33
The course was:					2.50
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					2.75
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					3.08
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					3.17

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- It is an interesting course.
- Very good at helping read through code and fix problems.
- Good at teaching during Labs and answering questions
- She was very helpful and when asked a question she made sure you understood what was going on before you finished that problem. Her presentations during lab helped me understand this class better than anything in lecture.
- Although I hated this course and thought it was far too challenging for a beginning course, the TA's were always nice and helpful. The difficulty of the course and the poor structure is not their fault. They did a great job with what they had. They were always willing to help explain things until I understood them.
- The instructor was very open to questions and she created an environment where it felt okay to not understand or make mistakes.
- It was very helpful to look online for help on the canvas and it was very easy to ask for help
- The instructor was very clear and helpful.
- Many resources to not only study course materials but practice them.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- labs are too hard.
- The lab portion of this class was very concise.
- implement more time periods to meet in person.
- changing the structure of this course with lecture at the beginning the lab in the middle and hw by the end of the week.
- I would suggest simplifying it and slowing down the content. Labs and lecture were pretty useless so adding different content would make them more helpful. Overall, I really did not enjoy this course and thought it was way too difficult for what it is supposed to be.
- I would suggest changing the lab so students can use lab time to work on problems in the homework that have been problematic for past students as well as allow them to work on problems that are difficult for them.
- better lectures pls
- Honestly, the course was well planned and executed.
- Less dependent on students learning for themselves. Because the course literally makes student learn everything by themselves and then review it in class.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- IT is a bit strict.
- Very fair
- so so
- Grading was a little slow but accurate.
- I felt like the grading procedures were fair. Everything was done online.
- The grading procedures for this course were fair.
- very fair
- The grading procedure was fair and made sense.
- Good and objective because it's graded by computer.



Course Evaluation Results

CS 105 - Intro Computing: Non-Tech

Spring, 2023

Section AYD, Lab-Discussion (Charlotte Lambert)
M, 3pm, 101 901 W Oregon

Evaluations were completed by **15** out of **48** students (31.2%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Required", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Congratulations!

You have made it onto the List of Teachers Ranked as Excellent By Their Students!

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
60% (9)	27% (4)	-	13% (2)	-	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
13% (2)	33% (5)	53% (8)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
67% (10)	-	33% (5)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	67% (10)	33% (5)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
13% (2)	53% (8)	33% (5)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
53% (8)	33% (5)	13% (2)	-	-	-

Global Items**Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
7% (1)	-	-	20% (3)	73% (11)	-	4.53	1.06	87	77

Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	7% (1)	-	20% (3)	73% (11)	-	4.60	0.83	91	92

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	7% (1)	-	13% (2)	80% (12)	-	4.67	0.82	90	93

Departmental Core Items**CS - TA****Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course. [Never Clear ... Always Clear]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	-	33% (5)	60% (9)	-	4.47	0.83	81

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	-	20% (3)	73% (11)	-	4.60	0.83	86

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	-	13% (2)	80% (12)	-	4.67	0.82	81

The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	-	13% (2)	80% (12)	-	4.67	0.82	84

Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	7% (1)	40% (6)	47% (7)	-	4.27	0.88	71

Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	13% (2)	33% (5)	47% (7)	-	4.20	0.94	60

Were assignments/projects returned promptly? [No, Almost Never ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	7% (1)	20% (3)	67% (10)	-	4.47	0.92	63

The grading procedures for the course were: [Very Unfair ... Very Fair]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	7% (1)	7% (1)	80% (12)	-	4.60	0.91	86

The course was: [Overly Demanding ... Too Easy]

1	3	5	3	1	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	53% (8)	20% (3)	7% (1)	20% (3)	-	3.00	1.31	27

How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class? [More Than Half ... None]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
13% (2)	20% (3)	27% (4)	27% (4)	13% (2)	-	3.07	1.28	9

Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course? [Much Less ... Much More]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	13% (2)	7% (1)	27% (4)	53% (8)	-	4.20	1.08	79

Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Greatly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
13% (2)	20% (3)	7% (1)	20% (3)	40% (6)	-	3.53	1.55	48

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.53
Rate the overall quality of this course.					4.60
How much have you learned in this course?					4.67
Statement of objectives and purposes throughout course.					4.47
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					4.60
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.67
The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to learning.					4.67
Completing assignments/projects was a good use of my time and effort.					4.27
Assignments were well prepared, understandable, and mistake free.					4.20
Were assignments/projects returned promptly?					4.47
The grading procedures for the course were:					4.60
The course was:					3.00
How many students do you think have cheated in any way in this class?					3.07
Compared to other courses, how much did you learn in this course?					4.20
Did this course increase your interest in the subject matter?					3.53

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- the content is great
- Friendly and understanding, very helpful
- Provided great feedback and helped when needed to students
- The instructor was very helpful in guiding me through problems I was stuck on. The way she explained them helped me realize where I was going wrong which was a great help.
- Helped students in the lab
- always helpful especially during office hours. Always tries to explain topics in a way to make the student understand better.
- Instructor felt very approachable, always felt like I could ask questions and receive helpful feedback. Instructor learned people's names which felt like she cared. Lots of interesting material and some fun labs.
- Charlotte was a great TA. She always explained everything very well and was always understanding when I wouldn't pick up the code right away. I also appreciated how she remembered my name, even with a big discussion group.
- Instructor was very nice and was good at explaining material I didn't understand. I could tell she really cares about the subject and helping her students understand.
- She knew how to give feedback without giving the answer.
- Charlotte Lambert is a knowledgeable TA.
- Instructor- very kind, patient, and helpful

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- N/A
- I was satisfied with my experiences
- nothing
- No improvements needed!
- Everything. It was very confusing and seemed like it was self taught
- add zybook sections to questions on homework if you get it wrong so you know where to go for help if stuck
- I think at times switching between excel and python felt weird but was cool to see the connection, just didn't expect it.
- Lower the amount of quizzes and exams.
- Some of the labs were extremely difficult where even some of the assistants struggled to do it.
- N/A
- Great!
- Nothing

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- fair
- Grading procedures were fair and accurate
- no comment
- Grading procedures are good.
- It is very confusing
- fair and easy to understand. I liked the 70% homework option
- Everything seemed fair and timely.
- The grading was fair and TAs and instructors were always understanding and listened if you felt you deserved a different grade. I always knew what was expected of me and when assignments were due.
- Extremely fair. I felt like there were lots of opportunities to keep my grade up even if I didn't do as good on an exam.
- It was fair
- I think we can have more in-person hourly exam in rather than online quiz. It is unfair in some degree.
- Very fair