The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

Student Feedback Questionnaire

Instructor - Section Report

FALL 2019-20 Survey period: 22 November 2019 - 6 December 2019 CHUNG, Kai Lun Peter

COMP-3511-LA2 Operating Systems

13 student(s) have evaluated the course.

27 student(s) have not evaluated the course.

Percentage of enrolled students responding: 32.5% (13/40)

Adjusted percentage ^ of enrolled students responding: 27.5% (11/40)

About the TA

Q1. Please rate the TA overall:

		Weight	Count	Percent	age
Α	Very Good	100.0	7	53.8%	
В		75.0	2	15.4%	
С		50.0	0	0.0%	
D		25.0	1	7.7%	
Е	Very Bad	0.0	2	15.4%	
NA	Not Applicable		1	7.7%	
	Total		13	100.0%	

	Regular		Adjusted ^	
Statistics	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Survey	72.9	40.5	77.5	36.2
Section	71.5	35.2	-	-
Course	74.3	27.2	-	-

Q2. What was good about the TA?

- 1. He tried to create a good learning atmosphere by adopting the online Q&A system and encouraging students to ask questions. He is also familiar with the course materials and the difficulties that students encountered.
- 2. Nothing
- 3. The TA made one of the lab sessions more interactive by encouraging students to post their questions anonymously in an online platform and answering them in real time.
- 4. very good

Q3. How might the TA improve?

1. Both project assignments, especially but not limited to the second one, could be made much more in-depth as their scopes are currently very superficial in nature and can be easily completed within a few hours by anyone with prior experience with related stuff. This also means that the student does not gain much additional knowledge and/or experience on top of the usual labs (which themselves barely scratch the surface of OS design) by completing the project assignments. On the other hand, the TA tries to feign difficulty within the project assignments by deliberately holding back various useful edge cases from the student and making it difficult to debug by placing the student's solution and the test cases in a single file, then instructing the student not to add, modify and/or delete any existing test cases. By doing so, students have to be very careful to read the project description very carefully and include edge case handling in their code *without knowing whether their code for handling edge cases really works*. This means that the project assignment ends up rewarding students who are very careful in planning their code (but may only have a very superficial understanding of the lab contents) instead of students who really know what they are doing (but may or may not be as careful in their planning). In my humble opinion, the correct way to design the project assignments would be to separate the student's solution from the test cases, then asking the student to only submit his/her solution file, leaving the testing file for the student's own debugging purposes. By doing so, the TA can still reserve a separate file with hidden test cases for grading the student's work while allowing more able and/or hardworking students to write their own test cases and test their own solutions thoroughly before submission. The TA may additionally refer to programming assignments for recent COMP 2012H offerings to see what well-designed, thought-provoking and challenging, yet easy to test and debug assignments look like.

2. He is too arrogant, he should teach student how to do rather than laugh at them

Additional questions

Q4. English was the language of instruction in this course, including lectures, tutorials and laboratory sessions, if any. (Indicate NA if this course has been granted exemption from the University's policy that, unless specified otherwise, English should be the language of instruction in all teaching and learning activities.)

		Weight	Count		Percentage
Α	Strongly Agree	100.0	8	61.5%	
В		75.0	2	15.4%	
С		50.0	2	15.4%	
D		25.0	0	0.0%	
Е	Strongly Disagree	0.0	1	7.7%	
NA	Not Applicable		0	0.0%	
	Total		13	100.0%	

	Regular		Adjusted ^	
Statistics	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Survey	80.8	30.9	86.4	20.5
Section	80.8	30.9	_	-
Course	84.1	22.9	-	-

Q5. The teaching and learning environment of this course (including in-class and out-of-class activities, discussions, group projects and student interactions) was inclusive in the sense that it accommodated students from diverse cultural backgrounds and/or language backgrounds.

		Weight	Count		Percentage
Α	Strongly Agree	100.0	7	53.8%	
В		75.0	2	15.4%	
С		50.0	3	23.1%	
D		25.0	0	0.0%	
Е	Strongly Disagree	0.0	1	7.7%	
	Total		13	100.0%	

	Regu	lar	Adjusted ^		
Statistics	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Survey	76.9	31.4	81.8	22.6	
Section	76.9	31.4	-	_	
Course	77.7	25.4	_	-	

Q6. For the previous question, please provide details on any good practices, issues of concern, and/or suggestions for improvement, as appropriate.

- 1. Sack peter!
- 2. everyone use computer to learn.

Questions about Online Learning from Week 12 of Fall 2019

Q7. Indicate the key mode(s) of content delivery your instructor was using (you can select more than one option).

		Weight	Count		Percentage
A	Live online lectures and/or discussions (e.g. Zoom, Canvas Conference or similar)		0	0.0%	
В	Pre-recorded video lectures (e.g. Narrated PowerPoint, Remote Video Capture or similar)		3	33.3%	
С	Assigned readings (e.g. lecture notes, textbook chapters, etc.)		5	55.6%	
D	Other: (Please specify if possible)		2	22.2%	
	Total		10	111.1%	

Q8. I felt satisfied with the instructor's communication of class logistics and learning support (e.g. instruction on new course arrangements and consideration for students' needs) after switching to the online mode.

		Weight	Count		Percentage
Α	Strongly Agree	100.0	1	7.7%	
В		75.0	3	23.1%	
С		50.0	3	23.1%	
D		25.0	0	0.0%	

	Regular		Adjusted ^		
Statistics	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Survey	59.4	29.7	62.5	13.7	
Section	59.4	29.7	-	-	
Course	67.5	26.4	-		

Е	Strongly Disagree	0.0	1	7.7%	
NA	Not Applicable		4	30.8%	
	Unanswered		1	7.7%	
	Total		13	100.0%	

Q9. I felt the online learning materials were as effective as face-to-face.

		Weight	Count		Percentage
Α	Strongly Agree	100.0	0	0.0%	
В		75.0	2	15.4%	
С		50.0	3	23.1%	
D		25.0	1	7.7%	
Е	Strongly Disagree	0.0	1	7.7%	
NA	Not Applicable		4	30.8%	
	Unanswered		2	15.4%	
	Total		13	100.0%	

	Regular		Adjusted ^		
Statistics	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Survey	46.4	26.7	50.0	17.7	
Section	46.4	26.7	_	-	
Course	60.7	26.7	-	-	

Q10. I felt satisfied with the new arrangement for the assessments.

		Weight	Count	Percentage	
A	Strongly Agree	100.0	0	0.0%	
В		75.0	3	23.1%	
С		50.0	2	15.4%	
D		25.0	1	7.7%	
Е	Strongly Disagree	0.0	1	7.7%	
NA	Not Applicable		4	30.8%	
	Unanswered		2	15.4%	
	Total		13	100.0%	

	Regu	lar	Adjusted ^		
Statistics	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Survey	50.0	28.9	55.0	20.9	
Section	50.0	28.9	_	-	
Course	65.5	27.9	_	-	

Q11. Based on your ratings in the previous set of questions, please list up to three ways your overall learning experience could be improved or better supported in the online mode of learning.

Note: Please note that the aggregate statistics for department, school and university will be subjected to an updating and finalized on 19 February 2020

- ^ Explanatory notes on adjusted percentage, mean and SD (collectively referred to as "adjusted statistics" below):
- 1. Adjusted statistics are calculated to provide a reference with extreme responses being excluded.
- 2. If a survey recorded 3 or more responses, the top 1.5% AND bottom 1.5% responses will be discarded. The number of discarded response(s) of each end is rounded UP to the nearest integer. The resultant data set will then be used to calculate adjusted statistics in this report.
- 3. Adjusted statistics will be provided up to course level if and only if they meet the following conditions:

Level of adjusted statistics	Conditions		
Survey level	The survey receives 3 or more responses.		
Section level	(1) All surveys receive 3 or more responses; AND		
	(2) This section is taught by One teaching staff only (instructor / TA).		
Course level	(1) All surveys receive 3 or more responses; AND		
	(2) This course is taught by One teaching staff only (instructor / TA).		

If no adjusted statistics is provided, it will be marked as "-" in this report.