TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Dheeraj Srivatsav (dpstm3@mail.missouri.edu)

My teaching philosophy revolves around the simple question of how can I improve a student's skills from it was the last week. That is the most important thing I keep in mind when I write a lab document, write a quiz, give a lecture or create an assignment. How is this improving the student from last week, by how much will their problem solving skills improve by doing this assignment, what will they learn by taking up this quiz. Those are the questions I tend to focus on while teaching.

I have been a TA for Algorithm design and Programming-1 for the past 5 school semesters, the course involves introduction to problem solving, algorithms, C programming, and Data structures. I have also worked as a Tutor helping Student athletes with one-one help sessions and reviewing course materials and providing study guidance/tips by clocking in over 500 hours while achieving a College Reading and Learning Association Level-1 status. Teaching in the field of computer science is an important job as we will be grooming students who will most likely go on to be the problem solvers to solve the various problems in this fast paced ever growing world which is heavily dependent on technology and its various benefits.

One of the main qualities of a good teacher is they must be able to put themselves into the shoes of a student and think in their mindset, doing that will help me deliver the ideas better as I can clearly articulate the whole thought process from the other side. I believe I must always give them the right resources and point them in the right direction towards success. This involves developing a reaction mechanism when there is a failure, one of the satisfying things I notice as a TA are the students who completely look lost on week 2 but slowly crawl up to finish the semester on a high in week 16, that is what makes me love this field. That change from the student is possible when as a teacher I can provide all the right resources and think what they are going through in week 2 and how I can put in that extra effort to aide that kind of a transformation, typically I would hold additional office hours and give extra reading materials/links so that they understand the basics and get it interested in the subject. All I want is to give them a canvas to try and see how the picture comes out, if they mess the drawing, guide them on a route which can get them closer to the beautiful final picture. The point I am trying to convey here is there should be a path on which a teacher should lead the students, harness them in a way which would improve them day by day and then finally point them to the success. This should be repeated consistently with a passionate attitude towards the field, being the TA for the same course for 5 semesters never have I ever treated a semester differently than the previous one, it is the passion to meet a new batch of students and to help them get started in this ever-so important science field keeps me going.

As American novelist Thomas Berger said *"The art and science of asking questions is the source of all knowledge "*, as a teacher that is one of the main habits to cultivate. Yes, giving answers to student questions is one the duties, but one of the tools to have the student experience the learning process better is asking questions back to them, provide a concept or a problem and ask the student to come with an answer, so at this point I am allowing them

to think towards solving the problem, if I get a question, the next thing I always ask is *"What makes you think that?"* or *"Why not think this other way?"* so this will help me plant a seed in their thought process which will lead them to the solution, not only will this make the conversation interactive and not monotonous, it will also make the learning process more comprehensive as the student will develop reasoning skills. Other variation to this method as I previously said is allowing them to fail, that can turn out to be a better teacher than I can ever be, when students learn from the mistakes it will prepare them to be better off in such a scenario again in the future. Often, while conducting lab sessions I get asked questions like asking "will this code work?", "is this the right algorithm?" I have a standard reply which I use for such kind of questions, "why not try and see what happens?", if their code breaks, I can now help them debug to see what went wrong and this will help them learn not to take that specific route again in the next step. I always resort to counter questioning tactics in such scenarios as it will encourage them to try first before getting a solution from my end. If I get asked questions about the logic of the program they are developing, I tend to ask them why do you think so, and get their thought process, if it a flawed process, I then turn their current thought process by asking questions in the direction which will eventually get them to the answer. The moment I see the wry smile of approval when I lead them to a solution in such a manner makes me feel happy that I was able to ignite a process where I was able to get the student to get to the solution themselves rather than me just giving it out directly. Thus, a good teacher is someone who can develop this kind of training mechanism which involves constant interaction and brain storming. A teacher should always evaluate how they can make their instruction and the learning environment better for the entire audience.

Feedback, another key tool in developing a good learning environment. Yes, the end of semester anonymous feedbacks from students towards their teachers, has helped me improve and rectify my flaws, so has the valuable inputs I get from the higher ups regarding my performance. But, the most important kind of feedback I believe is in the one which I develop with my student's every time I meet with them. I make it a point to always review past meeting's material before going forward and make sure I ask for questions, because the student would have spent time on it at home before coming to the lecture and might have something new to get clarified, so this will not only help me answer all the doubts students might have from previous interaction it will also give me insight into students thinking process. Then I start to think, "What did I miss in the previous lecture which made them to come up with a question like this? did I miss an important concept? did I not stress effectively on a particular topic which made them to have doubts/questions?". So for the next lecture I will try my best to address those questions so that students get complete information of the topic which I had planned to teach. This kind of real-time feedback helps me adapt and improve on the fly thus allowing me to be robust and dynamic. A good teacher must possess a good proportionate of pro-active and reactive skills in order to deliver the best in their jobs. Tests and quizzes will provide feedback with which part of class is struggling, and in which topic, so analyzing them will help me improve for the next quarter. While grading the lab assignments, I get to see which part of the programming assignment made the students uncomfortable, which part was too difficult, I tend to make sure the next week I write the lab document in such a way where it will help them learn and improve from their previous

mistakes. Teaching a big class makes me realize the need to have good understanding of the class, the pulse, where they are in terms of how much they are following the course material. Every student or a group of students I interact with depicts that each one of them learn in a different way, so I have to adapt myself accordingly to help all of them succeed, I ask for feedback in course are they satisfied with the teaching techniques being followed, the assignment techniques being followed and do they match the deadlines being set, even these simple "show of hands" questions provide me with an opportunity to learn, improve and grow. Along with these techniques the constant feedback/critique I get from the course instructor and my peers makes me become a better teacher.

Innovate and learn, just because I teach doesn't mean I should stop learning. Me being a TA while being a Graduate student has helped me appreciate this fact. The more I learn about the different nuances in this broad field better equipped I am to face the students. The summer internship in a software development environment and the programming experience I gain while working as a part time application developer helps me fine tune my skills and keeps me updated with the changing technologies and frameworks. The research aspect involved with being a grad student helps me become a better student in this field, which in turn I can translate to becoming a better teacher. The core aspect of software development is not writing the code but importantly analyzing the user requirements and understanding the specifications something I have learnt and appreciated during my time as a developer be it on course projects, research projects or work projects. That is the exact same thing I relay it back to my students when I hand out a lab document every week in the labs, I instruct them to read the requirements of the lab and the instructions before starting to code in a hurry, there is no point developing a system if you don't understand the exact requirements. I always try to train them early for the requirements of the computer science field. Breadth of knowledge facilitates inter- and multi-disciplinary study and enables me to communicate with students about how the course material relates to their specific background and interests. Depth of knowledge is gained by combining research with teaching so that the teacher is constantly exploring new concepts and re-evaluating well known results. Thus the experience I gain in this field is very important in performing my duties as a teacher.

Students will respect a teachers input once they realize how passionate the teacher is and how much the teacher cares about their success. A good teacher must possess good interpersonal skills to interact, understand student mentality and articulate their ideas and constantly communicate with all the parties involved. Finally, "I want to inspire and be inspired", my past and current experiences in this field has given me the inspiration to devote my strengths to the respected field of teaching.

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for: Srivatsav,Dheeraj Prabhakar; Course: ALGORITHM DESIGN/PROG 1

Course: **CMP_SC 1050** Section: **01D** Semester: **FS2015** Class Number: **61303**

 # Respondents: 13

Standard Form Report							
Choices: **S**trongly **A**gree, **A**gree, **N**eutral, **D**isagree, **S**trongly **D**isagree	**Percent of Responses**						
Course Content and Structure	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
The syllabus clearly explained the course objectives, requirements, and grading system.	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	11	4.55
Course content was relevant and useful (e.g., readings, online media, classwork, assignments).	50%	42%	8%	0%	0%	12	4.42
Resources (e.g., articles, literature, textbooks, class notes, online resources) were easy to access.	42%	42%	17%	0%	0%	12	4.25
This course challenged me.	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	11	4.55
Teaching Delivery	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
This instructor was consistently well-prepared.	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	12	4.33
This instructor was audible and clear.	42%	25%	25%	8%	0%	12	4.00
This instructor was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the topic.	42%	42%	17%	0%	0%	12	4.25
This instructor effectively used examples/illustrations to promote learning.	45%	36%	18%	0%	0%	11	4.27
This instructor fostered questions and/or class participation.	45%	45%	9%	0%	0%	11	4.36
This instructor clearly explained important information/ideas/concepts.	36%	45%	18%	0%	0%	11	4.18
This instructor effectively used teaching methods appropriate to this class (e.g., critiques, discussion, demonstrations, group work).	33%	50%	8%	8%	0%	12	4.08
Learning Environment	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
This instructor responded appropriately to questions and comments.	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	12	4.17
This instructor stimulated student thinking and learning.	42%	33%	25%	0%	0%	12	4.17
This instructor promoted an atmosphere of mutual respect regarding diversity in student demographics and viewpoints, such as race, gender, or politics.	50%	42%	8%	0%	0%	12	4.42
This instructor was approachable and available for extra help.	50%	33%	8%	8%	0%	12	4.25
This instructor used class time effectively.	42%	42%	17%	0%	0%	12	4.25
This instructor helped students to be independent learners, responsible for their own learning.	33%	58%	8%	0%	0%	12	4.25
Assessment	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
I was well-informed about my performance during this course.	67%	17%	8%	0%	8%	12	4.33
Assignments/projects/exams were graded fairly based on clearly communicated criteria.	58%	25%	8%	8%	0%	12	4.33
This instructor provided feedback that helped me improve my skills in this subject area.	42%	42%	8%	8%	0%	12	4.17

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Teaching Effectiveness	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor taught effectively considering both the possibilities and limitations of the subject matter and the course (including class size and facilities).	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%	12	4.17

Feedback for Other Students (IDK = I Don't Know)	% Yes	% No	% IDK	# Rsp
Would you recommend this class to other students regarding...?				
CLASS CONTENT	75%	8%	17%	12
CLASS STRUCTURE (E.G., ORGANIZATION, PACING)	67%	17%	17%	12
POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	67%	8%	25%	12
INSTRUCTOR'S TEACHING SKILL/STYLE	58%	8%	33%	12
FAIRNESS OF GRADING	67%	17%	17%	12

Student Information (NA = Not Applicable, NR = No Response)

Course		Expected Grade		Gender		Class Year		Classes attend		Extent use online		Outside hours per week		Complete work	
Requireme	85%	A	38%	Male	77%	Freshman	23%	0-25	9%	None	0%	0-3	45%	0-25	8%
Elective	8%	B	31%	Female	23%	Sophomore	31%	26-50	9%	Little	18%	4-7	18%	26-50	0%
Other	8%	C	23%	Transgend	0%	Junior	38%	51-75	0%	Some	27%	8-11	27%	51-75	0%
NR	0%	D	8%	Prefer no	0%	Senior	0%	76-90	18%	Moderate	9%	12-15	9%	76-90	25%
		F	0%	NR	0%	Graduate	8%	91-100	64%	Large	27%	> 15	0%	91-100	58%
		S	0%			Other	0%	NA	0%	NA	18%	NA	0%	NA	8%
		U	0%			NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%
		None	0%												
		NR	0%												

Grade A & B = The mean score of students who reported an expected grade of A or B.

Construct Means (21 Questions)

Content/Struct		Teaching		Environment		Assessment		Effectiveness	
Mean	4.43	Mean	4.21	Mean	4.25	Mean	4.28	Mean	4.17
Grade A & B	4.55	Grade A & B	4.49	Grade A & B	4.54	Grade A & B	4.63	Grade A & B	4.38

COMPOSITE SCORE of the 21 Construct Questions

Mean	**4.27**
Grade A & B	4.53

Construct Means and Composite Score are calculated based on the number of respondents for each question in order to apply less weight to questions not applicable to a class.

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for: Srivatsav,Dheeraj Prabhakar; Course: ALGORITHM DESIGN/PROG 1

Course: **CMP_SC 1050** Section: **01D** Semester: **FS2015** Class Number: **61303**

Section VI: Your Comments Are Valued

What aspects of the teaching or content of this course were especially good?

Dheeraj was an excellent TA. He took the time to help me understand important concepts when I saw him in Sunday help sessions. He helped a lot of the concepts "click" for me.

Great job

n/a

good

all good

Dheeraj is a wonderful guy and a very knowledgable instructor. He is amazing at C coding. Thanks for your patience and help!

Dheeraj provides excellent help and he was understanding that everyone had a different propensity and skill-level in programming. He was patient and he pushed us to be the better no matter where we were on the spectrum. Best TA I've ever had.

Dheeraj was very approachable and very helpful when asked for help. He displayed both an amiable sense of humor and a very high level of patience with students.

Readiness to help any student who had problems

all

What changes could be made to improve the teaching or the content of this course?

none

Sometimes the handwriting was a bit hard to read, other than that it was good

Nothing comes to mind.

I will fully admit I am not good at C coding. I felt as though a lot of the TAs were the type of people that coding came a bit naturally to them. So when faced with a student who didn't just GET it, they were unable to help that student come to terms with what needed to be done to get the code to work. Basically, I don't think the TAs, any of the ones that I interacted with, knew how to really talk and explain items in the course well. They obviously understood what they were doing..Just not how to teach it.

idk

n/a

none

He should make his office hours later in the week

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for: Srivatsav,Dheeraj Prabhakar; Course: ALGORITHM DESIGN/PROG 1

Course: **CMP_SC 1050** Section: **01K** Semester: **FS2015** Class Number: **62797**

 # Respondents: 9

Standard Form Report							
Choices: **S**trongly **A**gree, **A**gree, **N**eutral, **D**isagree, **S**trongly **D**isagree	**Percent of Responses**						
Course Content and Structure	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
The syllabus clearly explained the course objectives, requirements, and grading system.	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	7	4.86
Course content was relevant and useful (e.g., readings, online media, classwork, assignments).	88%	0%	13%	0%	0%	8	4.75
Resources (e.g., articles, literature, textbooks, class notes, online resources) were easy to access.	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.88
This course challenged me.	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	7	4.71
Teaching Delivery	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
This instructor was consistently well-prepared.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	5.00
This instructor was audible and clear.	63%	38%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.63
This instructor was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the topic.	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.75
This instructor effectively used examples/illustrations to promote learning.	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.75
This instructor fostered questions and/or class participation.	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	8	4.50
This instructor clearly explained important information/ideas/concepts.	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.75
This instructor effectively used teaching methods appropriate to this class (e.g., critiques, discussion, demonstrations, group work).	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	7	4.86
Learning Environment	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
This instructor responded appropriately to questions and comments.	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.88
This instructor stimulated student thinking and learning.	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.88
This instructor promoted an atmosphere of mutual respect regarding diversity in student demographics and viewpoints, such as race, gender, or politics.	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.88
This instructor was approachable and available for extra help.	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.88
This instructor used class time effectively.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	5.00
This instructor helped students to be independent learners, responsible for their own learning.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	5.00
Assessment	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
I was well-informed about my performance during this course.	78%	11%	11%	0%	0%	9	4.67
Assignments/projects/exams were graded fairly based on clearly communicated criteria.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9	5.00
This instructor provided feedback that helped me improve my skills in this subject area.	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	8	4.88

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Teaching Effectiveness	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor taught effectively considering both the possibilities and limitations of the subject matter and the course (including class size and facilities).	75%	13%	13%	0%	0%	8	4.63

Feedback for Other Students (IDK = I Don't Know)	% Yes	% No	% IDK	# Rsp
Would you recommend this class to other students regarding...?				
CLASS CONTENT	100%	0%	0%	9
CLASS STRUCTURE (E.G., ORGANIZATION, PACING)	89%	11%	0%	9
POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	100%	0%	0%	9
INSTRUCTOR'S TEACHING SKILL/STYLE	100%	0%	0%	9
FAIRNESS OF GRADING	100%	0%	0%	9

Student Information (NA = Not Applicable, NR = No Response)

Course		Expected Grade		Gender		Class Year		Classes attend		Extent use online		Outside hours per week		Complete work	
Requireme	67%	A	56%	Male	78%	Freshman	56%	0-25	13%	None	25%	0-3	50%	0-25	0%
Elective	33%	B	33%	Female	22%	Sophomore	0%	26-50	0%	Little	0%	4-7	13%	26-50	0%
Other	0%	C	0%	Transgend	0%	Junior	33%	51-75	0%	Some	0%	8-11	38%	51-75	0%
NR	0%	D	11%	Prefer no	0%	Senior	11%	76-90	13%	Moderate	0%	12-15	0%	76-90	13%
		F	0%	NR	0%	Graduate	0%	91-100	75%	Large	38%	> 15	0%	91-100	88%
		S	0%			Other	0%	NA	0%	NA	38%	NA	0%	NA	0%
		U	0%			NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%
		None	0%												
		NR	0%												

Grade A & B = The mean score of students who reported an expected grade of A or B.

Construct Means (21 Questions)

Content/Struct		Teaching		Environment		Assessment		Effectiveness	
Mean	4.80	Mean	4.75	Mean	4.92	Mean	4.85	Mean	4.63
Grade A & B	4.77	Grade A & B	4.71	Grade A & B	4.90	Grade A & B	4.83	Grade A & B	4.57

COMPOSITE SCORE of the 21 Construct Questions

Mean	**4.81**
Grade A & B	4.79

Construct Means and Composite Score are calculated based on the number of respondents for each question in order to apply less weight to questions not applicable to a class.

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for: Srivatsav,Dheeraj Prabhakar; Course: ALGORITHM DESIGN/PROG 1

Course: **CMP_SC 1050** Section: **01K** Semester: **FS2015** Class Number: **62797**

Section VI: Your Comments Are Valued

What aspects of the teaching or content of this course were especially good?

Helpful all the time, graded fairly.

Made labs enjoyable to go to. Very good about answering questions in a way that helped us understand rather than just telling us. Very nice guy and approachable. Overall, it was a great lab lead by a great TA so just keep it that way. Thanks for helping me learn the material and get a good grade in the class.

In this class, I liked how we are essentially just set free to work on our own. That's how I learn best, so I appreciated it.

Dheeraj is a great TA

Dheeraj fostered an environment where he encouraged students to come up with code and fix mistakes before asking for help, making the student a more comptent programmer. Nonetheless, when help was needed he was very capable and helpful.

Dheeraj was very helpful with problems.

Very helpful and points students in the right direction.

You did a great job in this course! Lab was fun to do. Thanks! Keep up the good work!

What changes could be made to improve the teaching or the content of this course?

None

Nothing

Adding another TA would improve the class a lot as a lot of people have quesions and having only one TA causes people to wait a long time before they can have their question answered and move on.

More energy? I'm not really sure, the class was enjoyable and pretty interesting overall.

NA

maybe encourage students to not be afraid to ask questions.

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for: Srivatsav,Dheeraj Prabhakar; Course: ALGORITHM DESIGN/PROG 1

Course: **CMP_SC 1050** Section: **01K** Semester: **SP2015** Class Number: **68026**

Respondents: 7

Standard Form Report							
Choices: **S**trongly **A**gree, **A**gree, **N**eutral, **D**isagree, **S**trongly **D**isagree	Percent of Responses						
Course Content and Structure	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
The syllabus clearly explained the course objectives, requirements, and grading system.	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	7	4.29
Course content was relevant and useful (e.g., readings, online media, classwork, assignments).	29%	71%	0%	0%	0%	7	4.29
Resources (e.g., articles, literature, textbooks, class notes, online resources) were easy to access.	14%	86%	0%	0%	0%	7	4.14
This course challenged me.	29%	71%	0%	0%	0%	7	4.29
Teaching Delivery	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
This instructor was consistently well-prepared.	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.00
This instructor was audible and clear.	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	5	4.00
This instructor was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the topic.	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.20
This instructor effectively used examples/illustrations to promote learning.	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%	5	4.20
This instructor fostered questions and/or class participation.	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	5	4.00
This instructor clearly explained important information/ideas/concepts.	0%	80%	20%	0%	0%	5	3.80
This instructor effectively used teaching methods appropriate to this class (e.g., critiques, discussion, demonstrations, group work).	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.20
Learning Environment	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
This instructor responded appropriately to questions and comments.	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.20
This instructor stimulated student thinking and learning.	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.00
This instructor promoted an atmosphere of mutual respect regarding diversity in student demographics and viewpoints, such as race, gender, or politics.	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.40
This instructor was approachable and available for extra help.	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.60
This instructor used class time effectively.	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.40
This instructor helped students to be independent learners, responsible for their own learning.	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.60
Assessment	**SA (5)**	**A (4)**	**N (3)**	**D (2)**	**SD (1)**	**# Rsp**	**Mean**
I was well-informed about my performance during this course.	29%	71%	0%	0%	0%	7	4.29
Assignments/projects/exams were graded fairly based on clearly communicated criteria.	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%	7	4.57
This instructor provided feedback that helped me improve my skills in this subject area.	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.40

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Teaching Effectiveness	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor taught effectively considering both the possibilities and limitations of the subject matter and the course (including class size and facilities).	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%	5	4.40

Feedback for Other Students (IDK = I Don't Know)	% Yes	% No	% IDK	# Rsp
Would you recommend this class to other students regarding...?				
CLASS CONTENT	100%	0%	0%	5
CLASS STRUCTURE (E.G., ORGANIZATION, PACING)	100%	0%	0%	5
POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	100%	0%	0%	5
INSTRUCTOR'S TEACHING SKILL/STYLE	100%	0%	0%	5
FAIRNESS OF GRADING	100%	0%	0%	5

Student Information (NA = Not Applicable, NR = No Response)

Course		Expected Grade		Gender		Class Year		Classes attend		Extent use online		Outside hours per week		Complete work	
Requireme	86%	A	29%	Male	100%	Freshman	29%	0-25	0%	None	0%	0-3	20%	0-25	0%
Elective	14%	B	71%	Female	0%	Sophomore	14%	26-50	0%	Little	0%	4-7	40%	26-50	0%
Other	0%	C	0%	Transgend	0%	Junior	0%	51-75	0%	Some	0%	8-11	20%	51-75	0%
NR	0%	D	0%	Prefer no	0%	Senior	57%	76-90	0%	Moderate	40%	12-15	20%	76-90	40%
		F	0%	NR	0%	Graduate	0%	91-100	100%	Large	0%	> 15	0%	91-100	60%
		S	0%			Other	0%	NA	0%	NA	60%	NA	0%	NA	0%
		U	0%			NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%
		None	0%												
		NR	0%												

Grade A & B = The mean score of students who reported an expected grade of A or B.

Construct Means (21 Questions)

Content/Struct		Teaching		Environment		Assessment		Effectiveness	
Mean	4.25	Mean	4.06	Mean	4.37	Mean	4.42	Mean	4.40
Grade A & B	4.25	Grade A & B	4.06	Grade A & B	4.37	Grade A & B	4.42	Grade A & B	4.40

COMPOSITE SCORE of the 21 Construct Questions

Mean	**4.26**
Grade A & B	4.26

Construct Means and Composite Score are calculated based on the number of respondents for each question in order to apply less weight to questions not applicable to a class.

Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for: Srivatsav,Dheeraj Prabhakar; Course: ALGORITHM DESIGN/PROG 1

Course: **CMP_SC 1050** Section: **01K** Semester: **SP2015** Class Number: **68026**

Section VI: Your Comments Are Valued

What aspects of the teaching or content of this course were especially good?

Very good teacher that does a good job helping students without giving them direct answers. Does a good job using examples to stimulate thinking

all

Very approachable.

What changes could be made to improve the teaching or the content of this course?

nothing much except his accent.

idk