

CS 2150-002 Program & Data Representation - Spring 2018

ENGR (18248)

INSTRUCTORS: Floryan, Mark (mrf8t)

Respondents: 111 / Enrollment: 154

Summary: CS 2150-002 Program & Data Representation - Spring 2018 (18248)	
Overall Course Rating CS-2150-002 Mean 3.94 CS-2150-002 Std Dev 1.27 CS-2150-002 Response Count 553 SEAS, 2000-level courses Mean 4.03 SEAS, 2000-level courses Std Dev 1.01 SEAS, 2000-level courses Response Count 21225	Overall Instructor Rating <i>INSTRUCTOR:</i> Floryan, Mark Mean 4.30 Std Dev 0.94 Response Count 775 SEAS, 2000-level courses Mean 4.23 SEAS, 2000-level courses Std Dev 0.91 SEAS, 2000-level courses Response Count 31281

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~		~ ANSWER MATRICES ~									
<div>1. What is your major (and whether you are declared or not)?</div> <div>Question Type: Multiple Choice</div> <div>contributed by Floryan, Mark (mrf8t)</div>	Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark										
	Total	BS CS (declare d) (NA)	BA CS (declare d) (NA)	BS CpE (declare d) (NA)	Undeclared, but aiming for BS CS (NA)	Undeclared, but aiming for BA CS (NOT Deferred) (NA)	Undeclared, but aiming for BS CpE (NA)	Deferred from BA CS (NA)	A SEAS major that is not listed above (NA)	A major outside the SEAS school not listed above (NA)	
	111	67 (60.36%)	10 (9.01%)	26 (23.42%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (4.50%)	3 (2.70%)	
<div>2. How many credits should the course be worth? Please add your comments here.</div> <div>Question Type: Short Answer</div> <div>contributed by Floryan, Mark (mrf8t)</div>	Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses										
	Total	BS CS (declare d) (NA)	BA CS (declare d) (NA)	BS CpE (declare d) (NA)	Undeclared, but aiming for BS CS (NA)	Undeclared, but aiming for BA CS (NOT Deferred) (NA)	Undeclared, but aiming for BS CpE (NA)	Deferred from BA CS (NA)	A SEAS major that is not listed above (NA)	A major outside the SEAS school not listed above (NA)	
	111	67 (60.36%)	10 (9.01%)	26 (23.42%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (4.50%)	3 (2.70%)	
	Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark										
	Total	Individual Answers									
	111	See below for Individual Results									
	The course should be worth 4 credit hours.										
	10 - because I put in so many hours a week into the class. 1- because I don't want my grade in this class to hurt my GPA that much.										
	This course should be worth 4 credits.										
	4 no doubt. The lab section could be treated as a discussion and that would take care of the additional instructional hour. Given that there are three assignments a week, some of which taking (worse case) 10+ hours, students should expect to spend 8-10 hours at the MINIMUM for a usual week in the course. Labs 1-4 were pretty easy, but after that the hammer really came down. Lab 10 was easily 15 hours, which is on par with a four credit hour course.										
	3. It is the standard for meeting 3 days a week and I think the workload is very manageable with decent time management skills. There are weekly assignments that correspond to what is done with class that I think do not take too long to do.										
	4. A lecture with as much homework as this class had combined with a lab section really seemed like more work than just 3 credits. This class had the more weekly work than any 3 credit class I have taken but I felt like if this had been a 4 credit class the workload would have been reasonable.										
	This course should be worth 4 credits due to the amount of work that is required per week.										
	At the very minimum 4. No one can argue against the substantial amount of time these labs take to hash out.										
	4. Having three labs that take multiple hours to complete each week. I spent more time doing the homework for this class than the work for my actual 4 credit course, FUN2.										

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

3-4 credits as the course was pretty rigorous in regards to the amount of work expected to put in for the labs with even the in-lab portions sometimes taking more time than allotted in lab.

4, because Lab is tough and is most of the course. Duh.

5. 3 major assignments a week was a killer, even if you disregard any other credits I'm taking.

I think it should be a 4 credit course, this is because the 3 part labs each week take up a lot of time and require more time than other 3 credit classes, and this doesn't include time needed to deepen your understanding of the material.

This course should be worth 4 credits. I have been in similarly structured classes with lecture and lab that have been 4 credits and I think that, given the workload for this class, it should be 4 credits.

4. I think that the lab should count as an extra credit.

I think the class is fine at 3 credits. In my experience, I believe the amount of work that I have put into the class is representative of the 3 credits that this class is.

4, due to the amount of time it requires per week

Probably 4 credits, but I don't think it would encourage people to take fewer classes/

4, because the lab should add to this total, considering it is an hour+ by itself.

However many it is now

4 The class material was not difficult but the time required to complete the labs exceeded other 3 credit courses in the CS department and otherwise.

This is hard to say, on one hand the course was a very heavy workload. On the other hand, I learned relatively little. I am shocked that from doing so much work I have learned so little when from my previous experience taking advance computer science courses such as AI and Parallel Computing I had learnt more doing less tedious works. I think a complete restructure of the course such as the pilot program would be a large improvement.

4. This course requires a lot of work outside of class, so it would be nice to have that extra credit to show for all of the work that you had to do.

4~5, the labs are just too much for just one class. There were some labs that took barely any time to complete but there were a lot more that took almost all the time of the week so there wasn't much time for any other classes.

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

2

4. This course essentially has 3 full assignments due every week. I spend most of my time working on these assignments. We meet 4 times a week so this class should definitely be worth more than 3 credits, especially when a lot of College classes get 4 credits just for having a 45 minute discussion in addition to lecture.

Honestly, 4 makes the most sense for the level of worth. Its basically like taking physics with a lab.

4, because the labs take up a lot of time each week.

4+, there is a huge amount of time per week devoted to this course.

4. Lab PLUS lecture, it is unfair this is only 3 credits

6

6

5

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

5

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

4

The lab should be worth at least an additional credit-- making 2150 a total of 4 credits.

4-5 credits

4. The workload and hours spent lends itself to a 4-credit class.

I think the course should be worth 4 credits. I don't agree with a lot of the complaining that surrounds this course but I definitely spend more time on this course than any other course and some of those other courses are 4 credits, such as differential equations.

I think three credits is good for the amount of work we do in this class. Comparing this class to my fundamentals of electrical engineering classes... it's not enough work to be considered a 4 credit class.

3 - But could be 4 if added more material.

4. It makes no sense to make this class three credits given the amount of work it take. The credit limit should not have to do with just the hours in class.

I had a professor say once that, a class being three credits means that you should expect to do 9 hours of work (number of credits * 3), outside of class time per week. If I were following this standard for this class, for me personally it'd be 5 credits (at least). As far as I know, that's not really possible, so I'd give it 4 credits.

3 credits

Honestly, I have taken many classes worth 4 credits that had a laughable amount of work and complexity compared to this class. There is no reason for it to not be 4 credits.

Surely 4 if not 5.

4, the workload is on par with some other 4-credit classes

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

If the amount of course work is kept consistent, this course absolutely has to be at least 5 credits. This class was the biggest influence in keeping me behind and struggling in all of my other courses, because the absurdly frequent scheduling of due dates kept me busy for the majority of at least 3 week days.

4 credits. This course is indeed really time consuming.

4 for sure. Inhad about as much work in this class as fun2 and that's 4 credits

5. It was so much work.

4, we were told that 3 hours should be spent on homework for every credit of class. On average, I spent 15-20 hours on the labs. However, I do not think this one class should be 5 credits.

5 If I was home, I was working on the labs for this class. The only time during the week I had time to work on homework for other classes was literally my time between classes while I was on grounds. I probably spent 15-20 hours a week working on the homework for this class.

On one hand, I wanna say 4, but then again I think that would make people more scared for their grade in the class. Also, since most CS courses are 3 credits, keeping it at 3 should be ok.

4 If calc 3 is 4 credits, than this class should be 4 credits as well.

At the very least 4. It is an extreme time commitment but I am not sure if there are 5 credit courses.

Definitely four. The labs take an extremely long time outside of class, especially if there is a copious amount of debugging involved.

At least 4. The amount of work and time needed for this class greatly exceeds that of a normal 3 credit course and the three part weekly labs can take large amounts of time even with TA help

4 It definitely is a lot of work.

3 or 3.5

Whatever it currently is (3 I think). I feel like that is an adequate credit amount.

4; 3 for the lecture and 1 for the lab

4 credits. It's an incredibly time-consuming amount of work.

At least 4.5 - the amount of work that is required for the lab and the number of hours that students spend on each assignment should be reflected by increasing the number of credits this class is worth. Ideally 6 - With Organic Chemistry, the lecture is 3 credits and the lab is an additional 3 credits. I feel like this class is easily comparable to the amount of work that is required for Organic Chemistry and should be reflected.

4 It's much more work than any 3 credit class I've taken

It could be 4 because labs require so much work.

Lecture should be 3, lab should be 1.

Definitely 4, but seeing how the class is being split in the new curriculum, I'm pretty sure that's not going to happen.

4 because we meet 4 times a week (including the lab)

3.5

4 credits. I averaged about 8-10 hours of work a week (studying & working on labs). Some weeks I put in upwards of 15+ hours. The labs were crucial to my understanding of the material, but 3 50-minute lectures, a lab period, and 3 separate lab assignments over the course of the week deserves more than 3 credits.

4 credits - I think there is enough work in this class with labs to justify an extra credit.

10

3 or 4. The class is a significant amount of work reviewing and understanding concepts, doing the 3 weekly lab assignments, and preparing for exams.

4 credits

4, it is the most work I've ever done in a course.

I believe that three credits is a reasonable number for this class, although I can understand how some people would argue that it should be increased to four, the labs took a good portion of time throughout the week.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

4. I found this course very interesting in rewarding, but I put more time and effort towards this course than I have for some other 4 credit classes.

4 credits

4 credits

4 credits

4. This was my HARDEST class this semester, and I was taking a variety of other 4 credit courses that did not give nearly enough work as this one.

4+; this course was by far my most time consuming course. By the weekly demands of the course alone, we should receive a significant amount of credit.

3. Please list any comments (pro or con) about the teaching assistants here. These results will be passed onto the TAs so that they also have some feedback from the course evaluations.

~
Question Type: Short Answer

~
contributed by Floryan, Mark (mrf8t)

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Individual Answers
93	See below for Individual Results

TAs were fantastic. No criticisms here.

thanks to the TAs for being so patient with us at office hours. your help is so appreciated!!!

They're useless

Kyra Ballard and Sara Innis are wonderful TAs

I think that the TAs did a good job of explaining everything and were very helpful throughout the course.

N/a

They were helpful.

Some of the TAs seemed more interested in chit-chatting than helping students with questions. Sometimes TAs were so busy helping students on the harder lab that it made getting answers to questions and making progress on the lab a very stagnant process.

Did not have many interactions, but all of them were nice and helpful when I did.

Some TAs were not helpful at all, I dont know the names

pro: give good suggestions for each lab cons: too many students to care of

Zachary Danz was a little off-putting on Piazza sometimes.

I only went to office hours one or two times, so the most I know about the TAs is from lab. I found my TAs very useful. They themselves very available throughout the whole lab period.

I did not talk to the teaching assistants much, but when I did they were knowledgeable on the subject matter and were always super willing to help out.

I think most of them are really good. All really smart. I like when they explain step to step and wait to see if I fully understand. Sometimes they'll explain something generally and ask do you get it? How do you think you;d solve this? And I would try my best and if I'm off they'll help me or help me build my way to the answer but giving small hints, thus helping me.

I have never interacted with the TA's but they seem fast at grading :)

Most of the TA's were very helpful during lab time and office hours. However the queue for office hours would get extremely long sometimes (waiting almost up to 2 hours) and as a result, TA's would rush to get to each student and not fully answer questions.

I think that most of them had a decent idea for what had to be done for the labs, but relied too much on the code they wrote for the different labs. Which made it hard to get hints from them other than being told to do what they did when they took the course.

Con: They seemed mostly unable to help in nearly any instance I had a question relating to most subject matters and labs. con:~~~~~ Con: the senior grading TAs were unapproachable

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

TAs were helpful to an extent where they couldn't help you beyond a certain point because they don't wish to "cheat" which is understandable but sometimes really unhelpful in terms of completing the assignments.

Sometimes they come off a little condescending on Piazza, but very helpful during labs.

In my experiences the TAs have always been very helpful

none

Overall, I found the TAs very helpful in lab and office hours.

The TA's were very good and really worked to help understanding when asked questions.

Overall, I've had positive experiences with the TAs and find that a lot of them are willing to sit down and thoroughly help me. Although I did feel that as labs became more advanced that some TAs weren't as comfortable with the material. Therefore, if I approached my lab in a different way, each TA would tell me to change everything I did because they didn't know how to do it in a different way. This got to be really frustrating when different TAs were telling me to approach my code in completely different ways, essentially rewriting it.

I have never received so many points off on assignments for doing things correctly. I have pretty much had to submit a regrade on every post lab as a TA has incorrectly graded something. I fully understand that the TAs have to grade 100s of labs and fully respect the effort that they put into being teaching assistants, they're always there when you need them! I also understand that they are bound to make mistakes, but there are things that are so blatantly obvious in my submissions that I've lost points on, for example, citations. I would not be complaining if this occurred on a few labs, but this happens almost every time, and it's frustrating because not only do I put a lot of time and effort in completing the labs, but also commenting my work so make grading easier, which has apparently proven to do the exact opposite. Then, I have to wait weeks, even months, for my labs to get looked at again. While I fully agree with the Piazza post from the head TA talking about students complaining about regrades, I feel that if the labs were graded more slowly and carefully the first time around, this would not be the case to begin with. I would much rather wait longer to receive a more accurate grade than to receive them quickly with errors. On the topic of Piazza, I've noticed some exceedingly sassy remarks in the responses from some of the TAs that I find to be unnecessary. Although I've never made a post on Piazza, I regularly check it as there are many times when another student has asked a question that I have. I find it useless when a TA responds saying something like "go look at the lab document again." With the same rationale as the head TA's post about regrades, sometimes us students can miss things too, and there's no reason to leave a sassy comment in return, which, if you think about it, really does nothing. I know it seems like I've been bashing the TAs in this feedback, but I believe that these are things that need to be addressed. The TAs are super helpful and friendly in person, and I'm never reluctant to approach a TA if I need anything, which I find is an important quality for a TA to have. The TAs have also done a great job at explaining things in detail, which has been super helpful in the lab sections. With that being said, I think the TAs are doing a great job, but there are just a few things that would make them even better than they already are!

Teaching assistants were very helpful in guiding people to the right direction along with helping people who were stuck. Nothing negative comes to mind.

TA's were really, really good. (Some of them). Akhil was so awesome. So was the other Indian guy. also the girl with bushy brown hair.

N/A not much interaction with them. Helped when I needed to.

The TAs were great, helpful, and overall very knowledgeable. Zach Danz was quite rude on Piazza though.

TAs were SO helpful. Without them, I definitely would not have been able to do the labs.

TAs were great. Sometimes condescending during midterms/in-lab to the point where I felt embarrassed for not knowing certain things.

Overall, I thought the TAs did a very good job. There were some labs that were complex and long enough that a TA wouldn't really be able to provide concrete advice without sifting through tons of code, but I'm not sure how that can be fixed exactly.

Most of the TAs were absolutely wonderful. They were very helpful and understanding. There were a couple that could have been a bit more understanding and not so harsh, but overall the TAs were a tremendous help.

They were generally very helpful when posed with direct questions, but sometimes it can be hard wrap your mind around how to get started and in that case I sometimes found it difficult to get help from them.

Some in office hours are good, some are terrible. It's a mixed bag really.

Extremely helpful

The TA's were often pretty helpful. Sometimes during exams, the TA's would give us information that ended up being wrong and made the understanding of the question incorrect. I would then have to submit regrades to deal with the TA telling me wrong information.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

Please pay attention to how TA's perceive the skill level of students in the course. Before the lab 5 disaster, a TA came into lab and he claimed that "the post lab is my baby." For someone to put so much work into an assignment and have it fail so miserably to meet the expectations of the course makes it seem like it was a failure of the TA's to empathize with our skill level. I overheard many of the TA's during lab complain about having to help students on what they thought were trivial tasks, even though the students they were helping had no experience with the material and the TA's had taken the course before. The goal is to create a comfortable environment for learning, but instead the TA's promote a sense of superiority within their group. The leadership of the TA's should aim to degrade this sense of superiority.

They were fine - didn't use them all that much, a little at the start and for checking practice exams. They all seemed knowledgeable on the subject.

I have mixed feelings about Zach Danz. He is often pretty helpful, but is also often unnecessarily mean. I understand he may have some philosophy behind this, but personally I think it detracts from our learning environment more than it adds. All the other TAs are helpful, but Ryan McCampbell is exceptionally helpful!! :-)

The TA's need to stop talking down on the students. I honestly felt like at some points that I was being treated like trash, especially by one of the female TA's with blonde hair.

I haven't had too many interactions with TAs mostly because office hours are busy, which made getting help very costly. It would be nice if there could be review sessions for exams, since those help a large amount of students.

I felt that the TAs were very knowledgeable in the subject and overall I have no complaints.

TAs do a good job but there should be much more TAs.

They are really helpful~!

The TA's are great!

Were not as helpful/knowledgeable as necessary for lab 5, with a few exceptions

Good TAs

High variation in knowledge, availability, and willingness to help. Some TAs were not helpful at all, while others I am very very grateful for.

The TAs were good, in my opinion. I did not interact with them enough to make any productive comments, however.

The TAs are very knowledgeable about CS 2150! However, please don't make the labs too hard when trying to change the labs.

The TAs were very knowledgeable and helpful

The teaching assistants were all very helpful and not only worked with me to overcome particular issues with an assignment, but would also go over other approaches to the problem. They discussed other aspects of certain problems or algorithms that were not covered in class, which I personally found really interesting.

pro: helpful in explaining stuff cons: sometime TA didn't know how to exactly help with coding homework as they would do it a different way.

The TA's were not knowledgeable about many of the labs. They usually did not come prepared when there were changes to the labs. They also gave incorrect answers to test old tests, which are key aspects of studying for these classes.

Some of the TAs are very good at explaining concepts.

They always went above and beyond. They often would stay extra hours to help out and made themselves available when they were off the clock.

They are good but I think you should give them the answer keys to previous exams as it wastes some time when having them check during preparation for this class' exams

Didn't go to the TA's very much, but I've heard they're pretty good.

Got help from a TA a few times, as well as a confirmation that my code was working properly but when I got back my grade it said incorrect output. TA's are not sufficiently equipped with test cases to know if the code is working properly.

I never went to OH for assistance but overall it seemed that the TAs were on top of their stuff and did a good job

I didn't really interact with many TAs for this course. Mainly just the TAs in lab and they were pretty helpful.

The TA's were fantastic. The ones I worked with both in lab and in office hours really cared about helping me and were very knowledgeable.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

Some TAs were not useful at some times

They are good but somewhat condescending (Zachary Danz, please be less arrogant and more helpful on Piazza instead of referring us to just "go read the lab writeup")

The TAs were helpful whenever I went to them about conceptual questions, but they had no control over anything when it came to grades. Whenever I asked to appeal a lab grade or exam grade, they would just say "sorry I can't do anything" and move on.

Honestly didn't have much interactions with the TAs but they were very helpful whenever I did ask for help.

I thought the tas were generally helpful

I didn't make much use of the TAs so I can't comment here.

TAs were very knowledgeable

I thought TAs made themselves available and helpful throughout the semester.

The TA's all seemed fine.

The TAs are typically very helpful and I'm always impressed with how much they know. I have only had positive experiences.

The keyboard warrior of a head TA could have been much more respectful in his responses to his students. I understand that responding to asshole students all day must get frustrating, but that doesn't mean all of us are assholes. His responses to reasonable requests and questions were often extremely blunt, and he was ridiculously harsh with regard to regades. Check yoself mr. head TA. The rest of you did a fantastic job. You helped me through rough points in just about every lab, and gave me a deeper understanding of the topics.

So many of the TA's in office hours were really helpful. I didnt get to truly appreciate this until I got someone once that wasnt helpful - which was mainly because when i tried to explain my thought process to them they werent really listening and that person didnt care to look at the code i wrote or try to understand it, but rather just told me a completely different approach to the assignment that i should restart and change my code rather than helping me pinpoint where I went wrong. But other than that one time I found it really really helpful when a TA would help me by trying to understand my code specifically. Also I found it really helpful when a TA helped me debug my code using the debugger near the beginning of the curse when i was still new to using lldb/gdb

Difficult to communicate with, don't feel like they care or want to be there

TAs were fine, didn't have too much interaction with them.

They are usually helpful but sometimes seem to not be familiar with the material

The TAs were always very helpful and available to address the questions that I had.

TA's were willing to help a lot.

TA's were very helpful and knowledgeable. Never quit until they found an answer to my question.

The teaching assistants I came across were for the most part very helpful. They were accessible and tried their best to help.

I think that the TAs were fairly consistent with providing help and tried to answer questions to the best of their knowledge.

They were helpful for the most part.

I didn't interact with them all that much, but when I did they were very good at explaining things.

ben cohen is the best FUN 2 lab partner in the world

TA's were phenomenal, they are a big part of me making through the course.

Kyra was a fantastic TA and was very helpful.

TA's were really good when I needed help.

They did a good job helping us out with labs and stuff.

I rarely went to the TA's for help since there were simply too many students seeking assistance. Additionally, the grading was quite harsh.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

4. The course addressed technically rigorous subject matter consistent with the course objectives.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
110	4.68	0.59	81 (73.64%)	24 (21.82%)	4 (3.64%)	1 (0.91%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4243	4.35	0.76	2031 (47.87%)	1814 (42.75%)	266 (6.27%)	69 (1.63%)	43 (1.01%)	20 (0.47%)

5. The instructor used methods other than/in addition to traditional lectures (for example, active learning, in-class problems, collaborative learning, in-class discussion) effectively in this course.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
111	3.93	1.12	41 (36.94%)	39 (35.14%)	19 (17.12%)	6 (5.41%)	6 (5.41%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4472	4.08	1.01	1755 (39.24%)	1661 (37.14%)	529 (11.83%)	264 (5.90%)	120 (2.68%)	143 (3.20%)

6. There was a reasonable level of effort expected for the credit hours received.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
111	3.20	1.56	34 (30.63%)	21 (18.92%)	13 (11.71%)	19 (17.12%)	24 (21.62%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4251	4.09	1.01	1684 (39.61%)	1803 (42.41%)	339 (7.97%)	270 (6.35%)	138 (3.25%)	17 (0.40%)

7. The homework assignments helped me learn the subject matter.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
110	4.41	0.98	69 (62.73%)	28 (25.45%)	6 (5.45%)	3 (2.73%)	4 (3.64%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4245	4.16	0.93	1675 (39.46%)	1710 (40.28%)	388 (9.14%)	188 (4.43%)	86 (2.03%)	198 (4.66%)

8. The textbook increased my understanding of the material.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
111	2.95	1.22	6 (5.41%)	3 (2.70%)	16 (14.41%)	7 (6.31%)	5 (4.50%)	74 (66.67%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4242	3.56	1.12	709 (16.71%)	1019 (24.02%)	836 (19.71%)	383 (9.03%)	162 (3.82%)	1133 (26.71%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

9. The course material was well organized and developed.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
111	4.24	0.93	52 (46.85%)	43 (38.74%)	10 (9.01%)	3 (2.70%)	3 (2.70%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4471	4.02	1.02	1597 (35.72%)	1812 (40.53%)	512 (11.45%)	317 (7.09%)	125 (2.80%)	108 (2.42%)

10. The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
111	4.68	0.57	81 (72.97%)	26 (23.42%)	3 (2.70%)	1 (0.90%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4473	4.51	0.71	2617 (58.51%)	1420 (31.75%)	209 (4.67%)	46 (1.03%)	34 (0.76%)	147 (3.29%)

11. The instructor was well prepared for class.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
110	4.54	0.67	67 (60.91%)	36 (32.73%)	5 (4.55%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.91%)	1 (0.91%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4469	4.32	0.87	2198 (49.18%)	1565 (35.02%)	360 (8.06%)	132 (2.95%)	68 (1.52%)	146 (3.27%)

12. I received adequate preparation from the prior courses in the curriculum to be successful in this course.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
111	3.79	1.06	28 (25.23%)	48 (43.24%)	21 (18.92%)	6 (5.41%)	6 (5.41%)	2 (1.80%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4244	3.86	1.05	1118 (26.34%)	1567 (36.92%)	620 (14.61%)	310 (7.30%)	134 (3.16%)	495 (11.66%)

13. The grading policy was fair.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
111	3.77	1.09	32 (28.83%)	42 (37.84%)	21 (18.92%)	12 (10.81%)	4 (3.60%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4473	4.15	0.93	1801 (40.26%)	1811 (40.49%)	484 (10.82%)	192 (4.29%)	89 (1.99%)	96 (2.15%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

14. The instructor responded adequately to in-class questions.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
111	4.49	0.81	68 (61.26%)	34 (30.63%)	4 (3.60%)	2 (1.80%)	2 (1.80%)	1 (0.90%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4463	4.29	0.86	2075 (46.49%)	1678 (37.60%)	334 (7.48%)	151 (3.38%)	63 (1.41%)	162 (3.63%)

15. The instructor effectively used technology in support of the learning goals for this course.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
110	4.43	0.89	65 (59.09%)	35 (31.82%)	2 (1.82%)	5 (4.55%)	2 (1.82%)	1 (0.91%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
4460	4.23	0.88	1918 (43.00%)	1711 (38.36%)	426 (9.55%)	170 (3.81%)	58 (1.30%)	177 (3.97%)

16. The average number of hours per week I spent outside of class preparing for this course was:

Question Type: Multiple Choice

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Less than 1 (NA)	1 - 3 (NA)	4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	10 or more (NA)
111	0 (0.00%)	2 (1.80%)	16 (14.41%)	30 (27.03%)	63 (56.76%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Less than 1 (NA)	1 - 3 (NA)	4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	10 or more (NA)
4246	343 (8.08%)	1211 (28.52%)	1577 (37.14%)	658 (15.50%)	457 (10.76%)

17. I learned a great deal in this course.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
111	4.57	0.75	75 (67.57%)	29 (26.13%)	2 (1.80%)	5 (4.50%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
4233	4.18	0.91	1762 (41.63%)	1791 (42.31%)	414 (9.78%)	192 (4.54%)	74 (1.75%)

18. Overall, this was a worthwhile course.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
110	4.39	1.02	70 (63.64%)	26 (23.64%)	5 (4.55%)	5 (4.55%)	4 (3.64%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
4231	4.09	1.00	1711 (40.44%)	1668 (39.42%)	482 (11.39%)	253 (5.98%)	117 (2.77%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

19. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
111	4.48	0.76	66 (59.46%)	36 (32.43%)	6 (5.41%)	2 (1.80%)	1 (0.90%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
4459	4.25	0.81	1870 (41.94%)	2046 (45.88%)	370 (8.30%)	115 (2.58%)	58 (1.30%)

20. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
111	4.21	0.98	53 (47.75%)	39 (35.14%)	11 (9.91%)	5 (4.50%)	3 (2.70%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
4462	4.25	0.89	2097 (47.00%)	1640 (36.75%)	527 (11.81%)	118 (2.64%)	80 (1.79%)

21. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-2150-002, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
111	4.41	0.89	64 (57.66%)	37 (33.33%)	3 (2.70%)	5 (4.50%)	2 (1.80%)

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
4471	4.14	0.97	1910 (42.72%)	1721 (38.49%)	490 (10.96%)	246 (5.50%)	104 (2.33%)

22. Please make any overall comments or observations about this course:

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-2150-002

Total	Individual Answers
74	See below for Individual Results

I think the course can be more organized if they put set the order of the labs better.

Good course

Share more anonymous feedback

great professor, would recommend

One of the questions asked was whether the professor does anything but lecture. The answer is no. Floryan himself does an ok job answering questions but drawing on a whiteboard at the front of the class with a barely legible expo marker isn't effective instruction in my opinion. I think that Floryan has become detached and unsympathetic to the student experience in this class, perhaps because he has been doing it a long time. It's a tough class, perhaps the closest thing to a weed out course I've taken and when jokes are continually made by him at the expense of the student it really doesn't feel fair, I just end up getting more frustrated with CS as a topic, and myself. Also, when certain labs came around (Tree Lab), the difficulty and time spent jumped a huge amount. I personally feel a well designed course should have a smooth difficulty/workload, but over the course of the 11 labs things were all over the place. I learned a lot - there's no denying that. I'm not asking that the course be made easier in the future because the subject material is hard, but certainly things could have been better. 2 other sidenotes: I still have no idea why I got points off on certain labs even after asking the tas. The test questions are sometimes worded ambiguously.

Worthwhile, heavy workload. Could be better if more reasonable workload while at the same time maintain the level of knowledge student can learn from the course.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

Between Linux, C and C++, assembly code, and bash shell scripting, as well as the programming and data representation topics, I feel like I've learned more in this course than any other CS course. The material all felt very useful and relevant (I added some of the skills I've learned to my resume). The workload was manageable in my opinion.

Wished that the some of that labs had extra time to do, especially in exams week such as before Spring Break.

It's a lot of work but very worthwhile. The exams are annoying though because one point off can be a substantial deduction in the actual grade because of how few points there are.

This class may be summed up as a necessary evil

Floryan is really good and I learned so much in this class, but the amount of work needs to be reevaluated for the sake of student health (not sure how to convey that I am not joking about this so I will add this parenthetical; this is 100% serious).

none

This class is not well created. The slides are almost useless. There are no videos of class so you cannot effectively review since the slides are usually context based. Asking questions in slides that you only answer in class is not an effective teaching tactic.

Thought the grading was a bit nitpicky on certain things, like losing points for not finishing evaluating an equation that equates to the right answer. Overall this is a very worthwhile course and honestly not nearly as bad as people make it out to be

Mark Floryan is a great teacher.

good. hard.

This is the best course that I have taken at UVA, bar none. I learned an incredible amount from it.

Extremely hard, but worthwhile course.

This was probably one of the most organized courses I have been in. I don't really have any problems with it and I am really glad to have been able to take this course and learn what I did.

Great course! Material isn't as bad as people made it out to be.

Floryan is a good teacher because he makes it fun to come to class just with his disposition. He also understands pretty much everything about the course. The exams are hard because it just feels like such a jump from lecture to exam. However, I feel like it'll work itself out.

More OH for Floryan. Too much lab work in a week. Didn't have time to breathe let alone understand material.

It was hard, but worth it

N/A

Mark Floryan made the course quite enjoyable for a subject matter that is quite dry. I was really interested in the subject matter, however I was not a big fan of the prelabs, inlabs, and postlabs. Although they did help me understand how to apply the material, I did not like the due dates of each lab section :(I would also prefer for the index.html files to be more direct on what to submit for the labs because half the time I would find myself scrolling throughout the entire document trying to figure out was to do and what to submit

I really enjoyed this class. It lives up to its reputation of being a doozy of a class but I feel as if I've learned more in this class than in any other class I have taken. It was so well organized that sometimes (not always, but sometimes) it made up for the trauma of the weekly labs. In all seriousness, however, the labs were not unreasonable (for the most part... The AVL post lab was a whole other beast). Sure, the labs took a lot of work and thinking but they really made you learn the material and understand what you needed to understand in order to succeed. I know that this class has a reputation, and rightfully so, but I also think that it is the most worthwhile class I have taken at UVA.

Floryan was the most effective teacher I've had in my time at UVA. Pretty amazing how well he is able to convey the topics learned in this course. The workload is heavy but I think this is the most I have ever learned in a class so I would say it was worth every assignment.

This class was tough, but the most worthwhile class I have taken here at UVA, as well as my favorite. Floryan is awesome and makes the learning process fun. My only complaint is that it is not 4 credits.

I wish Floryan's lectures were recorded because sometimes the material is hard to understand without watching the lecture again and the slides are very vague.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

I think this is potentially one of the most useful courses in terms of the content that is covered. Yet, this course is in desperate need of redesigning. The class itself is well-organized in terms of the content, but requires way too many overheads and takes a while to get used to the environments used in this class. The class hits home on the anxiety driven assignments; the assignments are very useful, yet, more time needs to be given for students to actively understand the material. Overall, I wish I could have learned more from this class but instead I spent more time being worried and anxious. Professor Floryan is very knowledgeable and his lectures are very worthwhile. The TA's work incredibly hard and are also very proficient at explaining concepts. Since labs are worth 45% of the grade it would only make more sense to give students more time to actually learn what they are doing and not have to resort to TA office hours to understand. The lab assignments were without a doubt high stakes but the most useful part of this course was that some of the base code could be found on the slides and this was probably the most effective way of doing the assignments. So, I would recommend that more emphasis be given on understanding how to do labs instead of throwing students into the deep end and creating panic. Overall, I definitely learned from the class (especially as I started understanding that code from class was very useful in implementing programs). However, one comment I wish to make is that the worry and anxiety associated with this class took away from the knowledge that I wanted to gain from this class.

I found this course very interesting and rewarding, although I did not find the reports very beneficial, especially for Assembly. Although the reports were intended to stimulate self study, I would encourage using more active learning through a larger variety of coding assignments for the Assembly section.

be more clear about how the lab reports are graded

Make the AVL Tree post lab more reasonable. Everything else was perfect.

This class, while extremely difficult and time consuming, does a great job of teaching the subject matter and making students engage in their work and think hard. While at times during this course I hated my life, I am very glad I took this course in retrospect.

I love Mark Floryan!!! This class was dope as hell!!!

Definitely a challenging but fun course. It's understandable how it gets its reputation.

We should implement Dijkstra's or Branch and Bound in Lab 11.

Probably the most interesting class I've taken at UVA thus far. However, it should definitely be 4 credits. Also, there were some aspects of the course that I did not find fair (e.g. a small error in code that leads to an incorrect output can cost you the majority of the points; there were some errors on the exams that made students put down incorrect answers that I don't believe were properly handled). But overall, great course.

Mark Floryan sent out an email in the middle of the semester that I found very offensive. He referred to many students as "typical UVA brat students" and seemed very emotional and unprofessional. He was referring to an issue caused by a minority of the classroom but still sent out a general message reprimanding everyone. I was not happy to receive this email and it reflected on Floryan very poorly in my peers and my eyes. He also said that "you should not submit anonymous feedback that you would not say to my face" which doesn't really make sense, because that is exactly what anonymous feedback is for. I understand that maybe students made personal attacks on him, but his email was so emotionally charged that I felt embarrassed.

This course was worthwhile and I believe I learned a lot especially through the labs. I found the most worth in the coding assignments like AVL Tree and Huffman. However, I did not find much worth in the lab write ups. I understand that they were not weighted heavily and allowed us to explain different concepts beyond just coding, but many of them took longer than I thought was necessary. Overall, this is a fair course. I wish the instructor was less sarcastic in class and more understanding towards problems that generally everyone has like with test questions or issues with the lab.

This course is the course for UVA CS. All the others kind of feel like filler in comparison.

Pretty good course, sad to see it go in 2020

Very challenging and rewarding class

Grading is a bit harsh, but you know that. :p I wish we had more/harder labs and no tests, but I'm not sure if anyone agrees with me on that haha. Maybe the "tests" can be extra-hard labs that apply all the knowledge from the previous weeks! Or maybe an in-class portion that forces you to study, followed by a take-home hard lab.

Course attempt to teach valuable concepts to students pursuing CS however due to organizational problems with delivering clear instructions. Furthermore, students spent copious amounts of time practicing tedious processes with little to know explanation on why this practice is necessary. A larger focus on techniques and applications of the concepts would a better use of student's time.

Admittedly, this course covers a wide array of content related to computer science and even introduces some low-level technicalities such as assembly languages to students. Nevertheless, the workload was outrageously immense. Also, the exams were a real challenge. It seems that the instructor has unrealistic expectations for his students.

This was definitely my favorite course of the semester and my favorite CS course I have taken thus far. While the workload was insane, the feeling of finishing each prelab, inlab, and postlab was amazing. Thank you to Professor Floryan for a great semester full of interesting and hilarious lectures and furthering my interest in CS after a questionable time in CS 2110.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

This course was too much work, it ended up negatively effecting my performance in my other courses as well. Too much of the course is dependent on coding level. We were expected to do all the coding ourselves with relatively little guidance and if we weren't the strongest coders the assignment could take hours (20+ per week)

I think that the number of hours students spend on completing the assignments for this class should be reflected by increasing the number of credits received. Also, I think this class was incredibly interesting, and I truly believe that I learned a lot, but for slower learners like myself, this class moved far too fast. We would only spend a week on a given topic, and I don't feel like that was nearly enough time for us to really develop a good understanding of the material. I think the class could be restructured so that it is not so fast paced or even split in half over the course of two semesters. A lot of real world things are C-based, so I think that it is an important language to learn, but I don't feel like I was truly able to develop a strong understanding of the material from the way that it was taught.

This class needs to be redesigned. It's too broad, not worth enough credits, and because the class isn't worth enough credits, it causes you to perform worse in your other classes.

This course was tough. For me and many of my friends it required 20-30 hrs/week on average. However, I feel I have learned a great deal. My only complaint is that some of the instructions for the labs are ambiguous. Given the lack of ambiguity in the grading guidelines, the lab instructions should be clear. They should NOT be self-contradictory, as they currently are sometimes.

This class was super tough and a whole lot of work, but I really did enjoy it a lot. I feel like I learned a lot and was challenged just the right amount (except for with post-lab 5, not a fan of that one.)

I think this course is great. I really enjoyed learning C++ and I enjoyed having Floryan as a professor.

Great class, Floryan is a great lecturer, though sometimes he would miss updating the announcement slides and the xkcd.

A lot of work.

Difficult but rewarding course. Only thing I would complain about is that the breadth of the content meant that we didn't go into too much detail about any of the subjects.

Please do not delay the restructuring of this class. The professor is great and the material is very interesting, but it would lessen the pressure that students have if grades were more than just labs and midterms.

I think one of the difficulties of the course is the variation in the amount of work per week. I was fearful of when a brutal lab (5, 6, 10, 11) might line up with a rough week with regards to my other classes. If the work could be spread out a little more evenly that might help students avoid really painful situations. Honestly this course makes me feel like a real programmer now so that's pretty satisfying. Overall, good course, even if there were some hiccups with labs.

Professor Floryan was a good lecturer and TA's were super knowledgeable. But, I believe this class exceeds the work load expected for a 3 credit course. The lab should be worth additional credits.

This class was immense amounts of effort, and often times, the labs were nearly impossible to do with just the information from the lectures. Labs took easily 7-10 hours, often times some labs took over 15 hours to do and we only would have two days to do them. The submission times every week left very little time to do the labs, and any amount of setback completely ruined you. This class was not flexible AT ALL. Floryan is funny and charismatic and knows a lot about C++, but his slides were very unorganized, hard to follow, and often very incomplete. Instead of learning about data structures well enough, I found myself spending more and more time on debugging my C++ code and figuring out how syntax worked in C++ which took away from the understanding of actual program and data representation. Instead of learning how things like trees or stacks worked, we had to implement them on our own entirely which instead of teaching us how the data structure worked, just caused immense confusion, frustration, and more time was spent debugging code instead of understanding the logic. Overall, this class takes up immense amounts of time and effort during the week, definitely more than 4 credits worth in my opinion (I spent over 10-15 hours on labs alone every week). This class is very hard to follow, and no background in any language was good enough to do the labs and assignments that this class required. Most of the labs would require immense amounts of self teaching and going to office hours. Not a class that was fun at all, and I feel like I didn't really learn a lot about program and data representation but rather just learned that C++ is a hard language to debug and write, and not being able to use an actual development platform with a built in debugger just made everything worse. The focus of the course was then shifted to more unimportant things like syntax and debugging of C++ rather than what the course is for (program and data representation).

I've seen previous feedback asking for this course to be 4 credits, and you guys have ignored it for years, but please make this worth 4 credits. Calc II was worth 4 credits and I spent like 5 hours per week in that class.

Sometimes I thought the labs were too in depth for the time allotted. I would start my prelabs early in the weekend and go to all the office hours sessions and still wouldn't be able to finish on time. I think it's really hard to manage all 3 assignments especially when the first assignment is really long and when you don't finish on time. I think really just hurts your whole week in that lab. I also felt like his tests were unfair. I appreciate that he wants us to think in a different way but there were some questions on the test that only like 20% of people got right. I think he should remove questions like that. Overall, I felt like his test was more of a reading test more so then actually testing my knowledge of the material.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

Overall, I felt that this course was well structured and gave me a well-rounded introduction to a variety of different topics in computer science. Professor Floryan was an excellent teacher and would take the time to step through examples on the board or go over and topics that seemed particularly confusing. He also stayed after class and answered any questions I had about the assignments or material. Some of my favorite units were those on machine code (IBCM) and assembly.

My main issue with this course is that you were taught the theory in class, and expected to turn that theory into code on the labs. However, I was never taught how to turn theory into code, or good practices for doing that. As a non CS major interested in learning high level programming, this was really frustrating.

Many of the lab assignments could be reduced in length without compromising their educational value. Many contained portions which required much more time to complete than was necessary to fully understand the subject matter. Success or lack thereof on the lab assignments seemed mostly proportional to the amount of time that students had to spend on this class rather than depth of understanding of the material.

I really enjoyed Professor Floryan for the most part. As far as computer science professors go, he was miles better in terms of communication, accessibility and in generally not making the class boring than any of his colleagues I have taken courses with. However, I think everyone knows that calling this a 3 credit class is an absolute joke. The CS department has to do something about this. With three homework assignments due every single week, each liable to take 5 hours or more in my experience, this class easily took more time than I was able to give to the rest of my courses, Combined. It is not fair to students to represent this as a 3 credit course, and I honestly ask that someone please do something to change this. The fact that this was listed as just a three credit, 2000-level class was enough to encourage me to switch majors from CS to Systems. Seriously.

Great course in which I learned a lot, the post-lab on AVL trees should probably be redone, as it was extremely long and we did not get nearly enough time to finish it.

holy shit this class took so much time, but I did learn a lot...

I struggle to reconcile how a relatively advanced CS class utilizes technology in teaching less than my STS classes. The inability to have recorded lectures do to Mr. Floryan's personal desire is patently offensive. Imagine a course where a great deal of dense material is only spoken and not recorded in anyway, there will be significant amount of material that even if I'm at a lecture I cannot absorb all of it and cannot refer to the slides for as its ! ! ! ! not even in the slides (which appear to be an abhorrent amalgamation of years and years of small additions with little total editing) The labs are also offensively bad English typically. They are demanding labs and I find myself struggling to simply understand what is being asked of me frequently.

Overall, I think that this course was well executed as I've learned tons of new things with great depth. I really enjoyed professor Floryan's teaching style, which made classes fun to attend. In my opinion, the class turned out not to be as bad as others had made it out to be, and in fact, it was a pleasant experience. Definitely one of my favorite classes so far (but I'm just a 1st year)!

Was definitely a worthwhile class but I feel that 3 credits doesnt accurately reflect the work that must be put in

It was a very good course although at some points, some of the labs were extremely difficult and took a while to figure out what was wanted or what the ultimate goal of the lab was. Although the labs were extreme at times, the course itself was very good and well put together.

Well. Even though it's well known, I think this class was the only thing I did all semester. There were never any breaks and now that I'm done you could say I kind of liked always being on that CS grind it felt like my brain was continously punched and pumped with CS. However sometimes the labs were really really hard and I can't even calculate how many hours I spent because literally I spend almost every day working on them and honestly towards the end I was losing motivation to keep working because it was so contious and just so much. Though I surely do feel I've learned a great deal in this course and I'm really grateful for that and I like to work hard, one think I think was totally off were the tests. They were very rigorous and because of labs I felt I never had time to study for them and my knoweldge, though gained from labs, felt a little different then what I was actually tested on. So I really hope there is an overall curve and I would greatly appreciate that. Thank you.

This class has WAY too much work. I spent hours upon hours almost every day working on this course to keep up with the pace of the course. The grading guidelines were often BS ("have at least 2 sources or you don't get any points for this section"), and there was no flexibility in lab grading. Also, I absolutely hated the long and terrible reports that we had to write for postlabs near the end of the semester. This is a CS course, not a writing course. I do not want to be spending 6 hours (this has actually happened) sitting alone at 5am writing a report about my code. Floryan had no idea how much time students spent on these reports, and had no empathy for the labs.