College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Question	Mean	Count	1	2	3	4	5
11. [Course Content] Preparation: How well prepared were you to learn the material in this course? 1. Very under prepared, more pre-requisites needed 2. Under prepared 3. Adequately prepared 4. Over prepared in some areas 5. Over prepared, material largely duplicates pre-requisites	3.07	72	2	8	47	13	2
12. [Course Content] Content Organization: Did the course structure and organization facilitate your learning? 1. Very disorganized, significantly hindered my learning 2. Somewhat disorganized 3. Adequately organized 4. Well organized 5. Very well organized and structured, significantly enhanced my learning	3.89	73	1	5	16	30	21
13. [Course Content] Synthesize & Apply Content: This course challenged me to synthesize ideas, think critically about the content, and apply the material to unfamiliar topics and problems. 1. Not at all 2. Occasionally 3. Every few classes 4. Many classes and assignments 5. Nearly every class and assignment	3.95	73	1	4	14	33	21
14. [Course Content] Examples & Applications: Were the number and variety of examples and practical applications presented appropriate to the course content and for your learning style? 1. No, almost no examples 2. A few, but insufficient number and/or mostly trivial 3. Some, but more or higher quality would have been helpful 4. Yes, including some very good ones 5. Excellent use of examples and applications that significantly increased my understanding of the material	4.18	73	1	1	8	37	26
21. [Course Delivery] Lectures: As a whole, were lectures clear, well-structured, free of significant or frequent errors, and appropriately covered the course content? 1. No, usually poorly done 2. Sometimes 3. Usually adequate 4. Usually good 5. Nearly always very good	4.30	73	0	3	6	30	34
22. [Course Delivery] Context: Did the lecturer motivate the course content and place it in the context of your major or your overall engineering education (beyond fulfilling a degree requirement)? 1. No 2. Somewhat 3. Adequately 4. Mostly 5. Absolutely	4.29	72	0	2	12	21	37
23. [Course Delivery] Engagement: Did the lecturer present material in an engaging way, which improved your understanding of the course content? 1. No, generally boring 2. Rarely engaging 3. Generally held my attention 4. Engaging 5. Very engaging and often required actively thinking about material	4.11	73	1	4	11	27	30

Question	Mean	N	1	2	3	4	5
31. [Recitation or Discussion Section] Was the section effective in increasing your understanding of, and ability to use, the course material? 1. No, usually poorly done 2. Sometimes 3. Usually adequate 4. Usually good 5. Nearly always very good	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
41. [Laboratory Activities] How valuable were laboratory activities in enhancing your learning in this course (e.g., taught specific skills, provided experience with real equipment and data, provided hands-on experience, increased my understanding of the material)? 1. Minimal value 2. Occasional value 3. Moderate value 4. Significant value 5. Very valuable, well worth time spent on them	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
42. [Laboratory Expectations] Lab expectations (goals, tasks, reports, deadlines, etc.) were clear and realistic. 1. Not at all 2. Partially 3. Adequately 4. Usually clear and realistic 5. Almost always very clear and realistic	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
43. [Laboratory Resources] Lab resources (equipment, software, information, instructions, etc.) were sufficient to provide a positive experience. 1. Rarely sufficient, severely detracted from the experience 2. Sometimes sufficient 3. Usually sufficient 4. Almost always sufficient 5. Excellent resources that enhanced the laboratory experience	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
44. [Laboratory Staffing] Support and help, during lab and for lab reports, were sufficient to successfully complete and analyze experiments. 1. Rarely sufficient 2. Partially sufficient 3. Adequate 4. Almost always sufficient 5. Excellent, significantly enhanced the laboratory experience	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
51. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Workload: How many total hours outside of class, per week, on average, did you spend on this course (beyond lecture, recitation or discussion section, and lab sessions)? 1. <3 hours 2. 3-6 3. 7-10 4. 11-15 5. >15 hours	1.68	73	34	30	8	0	1
52. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Workload Value: The time spent on various assignments (homework, lab reports, coding, projects) was reasonable for the amount it improved my understanding of the course content. 1. Little value relative to the time required 2. Some value 3. Reasonable value for the time spent 4. Good value for time spent 5. Excellent value to time ratio	3.82	72	0	8	19	23	22
53. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Resources: How valuable were outside of class-time resources (e.g., readings, videos, online content, course notes) in building your understanding? 1. Minimal value 2. Occasional value 3. Moderate value 4. Significant value 5. Very valuable, well worth the time spent on them	3.90	72	0	3	20	30	19

Question	Mean	Count					
54. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Value of Assignments: Independent of the time required, overall, did assignments (e.g., homework, labs, programming assignments, projects, papers, presentations) improve your understanding of, and ability to use, the course concepts and content? 1. Minimally 2. Sometimes 3. Usually 4. Almost always 5. Reliably and significantly increased my understanding and ability	3.95	73	0	6	16	27	24
55. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Exams & Grading: Were exams and grading a fair and reasonable measure of your learning? 1. No 2. Significant issues exist 3. Generally fair assessment of my learning 4. Well developed and fair 5. Yes, definitely	4.23	69	0	2	14	19	34
61. [Course Environment] Diversity & Inclusion: To what extent have the professors and teaching staff fostered an inclusive environment such that the class is welcoming to all, everyone is encouraged to participate, none are made to feel different, and all are treated fairly? 1. Extremely non-inclusive with inappropriate comments and/or behaviors 2. Actively not inclusive with certain students ignored, left out, or treated dismissively 3. Passively not inclusive; comments or contributions by some students are valued less than those of other students 4. Passively inclusive where everyone is welcome to participate, nothing specific to encourage or discourage anyone 5. Actively inclusive, all are fully encouraged to participate and are supported	4.43	72	0	0	7	27	38
62. [Course Environment] Access to Assistance: Was there sufficient access to assistance (through office hours, online forums, in-class or section questions and/or activities, special accommodations met, etc.)? 1. Almost no access and/or help was ineffective 2. Limited access or value 3. Acceptable access and help 4. Good access with quality help 5. Abundantly available high quality help	4.16	73	0	1	11	36	25
63. [Course Environment] Academic Integrity: Was the code of academic integrity maintained in the class (e.g. with respect to cheating, copying, plagiarism, use of unauthorized sources, etc.)? 1. Blatant disregard for Academic Integrity 2. No, violations clearly occurred that were not addressed 3. Not strongly, violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any) 4. Yes, instructor took reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity 5. Yes, academic integrity was clearly and intentionally maintained	4.39	72	0	0	7	30	35
91. [Comparison to Other Courses] Instructor: Rate the overall teaching effectiveness of your lecturer compared to others at Cornell. 1 = Worse than average 5 = Much better than average	4.16	73	0	1	13	32	27
92. [Comparison to Other Courses] Course: Overall, how does this course compare with other comparable (technical or non-technical, as appropriate) courses you've taken at Cornell? 1 = Poorly, not educational 5 = Excellently, extremely educational	4.01	73	0	3	12	39	19

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments On Course Content

597: One of the best organized CS courses I have taken.

1495: The course content was always engaging

2209: I thought the lecture slides were very clear and helpful

2782: Good, bit fast paced but that's the nature of the course

3581: A bit too widespread in terms of topics covered but nonetheless a good all-around introduction to other areas of CS like scripting, using Linux systems and navigating using the terminal.

3617: Challenging but interesting.

5669: Awesome 2 credit course!

5700: It is a good class, which i am introduced to Unix completely.

7627: I learned so much more than I thought I would.

7694: I LOVED this course and Matthew Milano should be given his pHD immediately. This is the type of class structure I expect out of every CS class and it's a shame it was just a 7 week course. It should also be part of the core CS curriculumn because every damn class uses it but there is no formal requirement to pick up these tools.

8153: nice, would have liked to see more examples/work through problem in class
think course would benefit from being semester long

8566: Great! This is one of my greatest short course taken by content.

8605: Course content taught me a lot that I've applied to other classes and everyday life.

8649: Course content was very engaging and lots of good examples/applications were presented in lecture and through the assignments.

8650: good course content, sometimes could be a little unorganized or random

9247: Very well designed!

9533: Having previous experience with Unix commands and Git from CS 3410, the first half of the course was a little repetitive.

9818: Really great and interactive and chill enough that it doesn't feel like a huge demand.

10995: The content was very interesting and contained very good skills to learn.

12807: Kinda slow, but very well organized.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments on Course Delivery

407: Matt was great

597: Excellent use of definitions and examples in lecture.

1495: The lectures were always delivered in a fun and understandable way

2782: Lectures were quite engaging, instructor was very personable & humorous

3617: Prepared with powerpoint slides and demos.

5669: Milano is a clear and engaging lecturer.

5700: I am doing my research using things that I have learnt from this class.

6366: Good lecturer, definitely one of the more enjoyable and funnier professors

7627: One of the best teachers I've ever had at Cornell. Please don't lose him, make him teach more courses. ;-;
He knew everything he was talking about, which gave him the confidence to teach at levels and at a pace you can only do while being extremely comfortable. He was able to push jokes into the class now and then but yet balance it with the seriousness of needing to understand the concepts properly. Matthew Milano is what all professors who teach should be like.

7694: Should've been a smaller lecture hall because the tendency is to always get distracted whenever you're not close to the front. Partly my fault, partly the fact thatt

8566: Milano is very engaging.

8605: Great delivery of course content

8649: The lecturer was very funny and explained concepts in an engaging manner.

8650: funny guy, lots of charisma

9247: The lecture is very good at presenting materials in an interesting manner.

9818: Could not have been taught better, keep it up Milano!!!

10995: The professor was so enthusiastic about the information and it really came across and made the material more interesting for me to learn as well!

12807: Very engaging.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments on Environment-Academic Integrity

3617: None.

5700: I think yes, but I don't know the fact.

7694: There was no need to cheat on anything? It was all intuitive and the deadlines were reasonable. There was no incentive to cheat which was good!

12807: N/A

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments on Environment-Assistance

3581: Piazza postings were quite useful.

3617: The website was most helpful.

5700: Some of the online sources are not clearly delivered, which I hope it could be improved in the future.

7627: HIghly recommend going for Mr.Milano's OH, as they teach you so much more than what you come in for and you don't feel forced but want to know more anyway.

7694: The Piazza was moderated well, stupid posts were called out and informative posts were responded to quickly.

12807: Office hours were very helpful.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments on Environment-Diversity

3617: None.

5700: Since this is a half semester course, the lectures were very packed, but still leaving time for Q&A.

12807: N/A

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments on Strengths

597: This was one of the best computer science courses I have taken. Matthew Milano gave better lectures than most CS faculty members. He was also more caring than most CS faculty members.

2209: I think the instructor taught the course very well and the lecture slides were very clear and helpful

2782: Instructor had great hair

3581: Interesting course material.

3617: The website was very useful.

5700: Delivery style is inspiring and clear.

6230: The teacher was great in delivering the material in a fun, organized manner.

6285: Milano was so knowledgeable; it really was a treat to hear him answer questions. One reason for this is that he often incorporated extra information into his answer that had not already been brought up in class. In one answer about how your OS retrieves packages, he was able to list the closest mirrors to Cornell for some linux distro. It might not sound that significant, but extra info like that really makes you feel like you're talking to an expert. Other highlights of the semester were when he explained that containers were mostly chroot + LXC, when he explained that git push is really the remote pulling from you, and when he explained the steps your computer goes through to communicate with a server, starting from when your computer doesn't have its IP address yet.
He also made good jokes and seemed like he had prepared a lot for lecture.

7694: Has GREAT anecdotes.

8566: A great short course covering a lot of topics not covered in required courses. Doing assignments is greatly helpful and it sparked my interest in databases/networking, and I believe this will prepare me better for 4410.

8605: Instructor is very engaging and helpful. Very approachable and made the class extremely enjoyable.

8649: Lecturer was very engaging

8650: interesting course material

9818: Great interaction with the wash server and the content taught in class.

10995: The strengths were definitely in the professor and the assignments since they were very hands on and enjoyable.

12807: Instructor was very entertaining and kept the class engaged.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments on TA

3617: None.

5556: Aayush Beri was a great TA

5700: TAs are helpful, who helps me a lot when the class start and they guide me through the assignments.

12807: N/A

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments on Weaknesses

597: Docker assignment was god awful. Poorly documented, unclear, boring.

Please do not hold this against the rest of the class, which was exceptional.

631: The course did not help me learn the concepts or the material

2782: Goes a little fast

3581: Topics were a bit too widespread and not enough assignments for practice for some of the topics.

3617: None.

5700: I think the class went through so fast, if there could be more time, and the pace of the class could be slower, it could be better for me to interpret the content and do assignments with more patience.

6230: The TA's often lacked the background information to help students with assignments. In other words, TAs should either have the assignment answers to better assist students, or the TAs should spend more time learning the material fully to help other students.

6285: I don't feel like I got much out of the Google Cloud assignments.

6877: I think the slides during lectures are a bit too detailed.

8566: Nope!

8605: Course could be made longer to further elaborate on material. I feel this material is incredibly helpful and a lot of CS Majors are missing out on this gem.

8649: Some assignments took up an unnecessary amount of time

8650: not presented in a way that would cause people to take it too seriously

12807: The lectures were repetitive and the slides were a little difficult to follow since there was so much information on each slide.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2019   Course Owner: CS
Course: CS 2043 Lec 1   CID: 17167
Instructor: Milano
74 Responses, 130 Enrolled, 56.92% Response

Comments on workload, resources, assignments, and assessments

597: All assignments were useful and easy to follow, except the Docker assignment was *very* poorly documented and messy.

2209: I wish solutions for assignments were posted or shown in some way so i could see how I should've done things.

3581: Not enough assignments! I wish there were more to practice.

3617: Good enough.

5700: I felt since I was not a computer science student, the assignments were little bit complicated to me.

7627: Each were engaging enough.

7694: Good. Did not make me stressed but also taught me a lot.

8566: Assignments are greatly designed and presented. They helped me to be familiar with a lot of parts in CS!

8605: Great balance of workload, resources, assignments, and assessments:

8649: While some of the projects took a reasonable amount of time and greatly improved my understanding, some took up and unnecessary amount of time and didn't add much value for the time spent.

8650: some assignments took longer than others, but generally fair workload

9247: The time I spent on assignments are very worthwhile. I like how the assignments are designed in an engaging and hands-on manner.

9533: Assignment 4 was difficult but taught me much about scripting.

10995: Sometimes there were errors in grading, but overall the grading was fair.

12173: There were no exams, honestly could not tell how grades were being decided (for assignments).

12807: The workload was very un-uniformly distributed between assignments.