CourseWorks @Columbia

Program Evaluation System

Report: **Stats Distribution**

Course:	**PARALLEL PROGRAMMING (COMSW4130_001_2011_3)**
Instructor:	**Kim Martha Allen** **Saraswat Vijay**
Evaluation:	**F11_CS_Final**
Dates:	**December 06, 2011 - December 15, 2011**
No. of Respondents:	19
No. of Students:	36
Percent Completed:	**53%**

Section: Class Questions

1: Instructor: Organization and Preparation   n =19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	5.26
Fair	2	1	5.26
Good	3	8	42.11
Very Good	4	4	21.05
Excellent	5	5	26.32
	Mean: 3.58	Median:3	Std. Dev.: 1.12

2: Instructor: Classroom Delivery   n =19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	5.26
Fair	2	1	5.26
Good	3	6	31.58
Very Good	4	4	21.05
Excellent	5	7	36.84
	Mean: 3.79	Median:4	Std. Dev.: 1.18

3: Instructor: Approachability   n =19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	5	26.32
Very Good	4	6	31.58

Excellent	5	8	42.11

Mean: 4.16   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 0.83

4: Instructor: Overall Quality   n = 19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	2	10.53
Fair	2	1	5.26
Good	3	3	15.79
Very Good	4	6	31.58
Excellent	5	7	36.84

Mean: 3.79   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 1.32

5: Course: Amount Learned   n = 19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	2	10.53
Good	3	3	15.79
Very Good	4	8	42.11
Excellent	5	6	31.58

Mean: 3.95   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 0.97

6: Course: Appropriateness of Workload   n = 19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	2	10.53
Good	3	5	26.32
Very Good	4	9	47.37
Excellent	5	3	15.79

Mean: 3.68   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 0.89

7: Course: Fairness of Grading Process   n = 19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	5.26
Good	3	6	31.58
Very Good	4	8	42.11
Excellent	5	4	21.05

Mean: 3.79   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 0.85

8: Course: Overall Quality   n = 19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	5.26

Fair	2	1	5.26
Good	3	6	31.58
Very Good	4	5	26.32
Excellent	5	6	31.58
	Mean: 3.74	Median:4	Std. Dev.: 1.15

Section: CS-Wide Course Questions

1: **Do you feel that the pre-requisites for this course adequately prepared you for the course?**   n =19

1. Not at all
2. Not enough
3. Yes, just right
4. Yes, I even felt a little over prepared
5. I feel like I already took this course

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
1	1	0	0.00
2	2	3	15.79
3	3	13	68.42
4	4	2	10.53
5	5	1	5.26
	Mean: 3.05	Median:3	Std. Dev.: 0.71

2: **How did the workload of this course compare to that of other courses you've taken in Computer Science?**   n =19

1. Much heavier
2. Slightly heavier
3. About the same
4. A bit easier
5. Much easier

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
1	1	3	15.79
2	2	3	15.79
3	3	9	47.37
4	4	3	15.79
5	5	1	5.26
	Mean: 2.79	Median:3	Std. Dev.: 1.08

3: **How did the workload of this course compare to that of other courses you've taken in other departments?**   n =19

1. Much heavier
2. Slightly heavier
3. About the same
4. A bit easier

5. Much easier

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
1	1	4	21.05
2	2	6	31.58
3	3	6	31.58
4	4	2	10.53
5	5	1	5.26
	Mean: 2.47	Median:2	Std. Dev.: 1.12

4: **Do you feel that the workload of this course helped you learn the material well?**   n = 19

1. I was too busy working to learn
2. Yes, I'm glad I was pushed
3. Yes, it was perfect
4. Yes, but I wasn't challenged enough
5. The work seemed extraneous

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
1	1	1	5.26
2	2	6	31.58
3	3	8	42.11
4	4	2	10.53
5	5	2	10.53
	Mean: 2.89	Median:3	Std. Dev.: 1.05

5: **Of all the CS courses you have taken, how does this course rank?**   n = 19

1. Very high
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Worse than average
5. Very low

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
1	1	2	10.53
2	2	5	26.32
3	3	8	42.11
4	4	2	10.53
5	5	2	10.53
	Mean: 2.84	Median:3	Std. Dev.: 1.12

Section: Distinguished Faculty Award

1: **Would you nominate this professor for the SEAS Distinguished Faculty Award?**   n = 19

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent

Yes	1	6	31.58
No	2	13	68.42
	Mean: 1.68	Median:2	Std. Dev.: 0.48

TA Rating

1: **Overall Quality Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	20.00
Very Good	4	3	30.00
Excellent	5	3	30.00
Not Applicable	0	2	20.00
Mean: 4.13 Median:4 Std. Dev.: 0.83			

2: **Overall Quality Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	22.22
Very Good	4	1	11.11
Excellent	5	6	66.67
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00
Mean: 4.44 Median:5 Std. Dev.: 0.88			

3: **Knowledgeability Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	20.00
Very Good	4	3	30.00
Excellent	5	3	30.00
Not Applicable	0	2	20.00
Mean: 4.13 Median:4 Std. Dev.: 0.83			

4: **Knowledgeability Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	22.22
Very Good	4	1	11.11
Excellent	5	6	66.67
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.44   Median:5   Std. Dev.: 0.88

5: **Approachability Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	20.00
Very Good	4	3	30.00
Excellent	5	3	30.00
Not Applicable	0	2	20.00

Mean: 4.13   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 0.83

6: **Approachability Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	22.22
Very Good	4	1	11.11
Excellent	5	6	66.67
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.44   Median:5   Std. Dev.: 0.88

7: **Availability Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	20.00
Very Good	4	3	30.00
Excellent	5	3	30.00
Not Applicable	0	2	20.00

Mean: 4.13   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 0.83

8: **Availability Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	22.22
Very Good	4	1	11.11
Excellent	5	6	66.67
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.44   Median:5   Std. Dev.: 0.88

9: **Communication Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	20.00
Very Good	4	3	30.00
Excellent	5	3	30.00
Not Applicable	0	2	20.00

Mean: 4.13   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 0.83

10: **Communication Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	22.22
Very Good	4	1	11.11
Excellent	5	6	66.67
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 4.44   Median:5   Std. Dev.: 0.88

11: **Does this TA communicate effectively in english? Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Yes	1	7	70.00
Not Applicable	0	3	30.00

Mean: 1.00   Median:1   Std. Dev.: 0.00

12: **Does this TA communicate effectively in english? Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Yes	1	9	100.00

Mean: 1.00   Median:1   Std. Dev.: 0.00

Additional TA Rating

1:   **Overall Quality Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	25.00
Good	3	2	50.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	1	25.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.25   Median:3   Std. Dev.: 1.26

2:   **Overall Quality Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	14.29
Good	3	1	14.29
Very Good	4	3	42.86
Excellent	5	2	28.57
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.86   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 1.07

3:   **Overall Quality**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	8	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

4:   **Knowledgeability Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	25.00
Good	3	2	50.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00

| Excellent | 5 | 1 | 25.00 |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |

Mean: 3.25   Median:3   Std. Dev.: 1.26

5: Knowledgeability **Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	14.29
Good	3	1	14.29
Very Good	4	3	42.86
Excellent	5	2	28.57
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.86   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 1.07

6: Knowledgeability

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	8	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

7: Approachability **Mohan Krishna Kolli**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	1	25.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	2	50.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	1	25.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.00   Median:3   Std. Dev.: 1.63

8: Approachability **Mashooq A. Muhaimen**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	14.29

Good	3	1	14.29
Very Good	4	3	42.86
Excellent	5	2	28.57
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.86   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 1.07

9: Approachability

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	8	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

10: Availability Mohan Krishna Kolli

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	25.00
Good	3	2	50.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	1	25.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.25   Median:3   Std. Dev.: 1.26

11: Availability Mashooq A. Muhaimen

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	14.29
Good	3	1	14.29
Very Good	4	3	42.86
Excellent	5	2	28.57
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.86   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 1.07

12: Availability

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	8	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

13: Communication Mohan Krishna Kolli

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	25.00
Good	3	2	50.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	1	25.00
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.25   Median:3   Std. Dev.: 1.26

14: Communication Mashooq A. Muhaimen

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	1	14.29
Good	3	1	14.29
Very Good	4	3	42.86
Excellent	5	2	28.57
Not Applicable	0	0	0.00

Mean: 3.86   Median:4   Std. Dev.: 1.07

15: Communication

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	8	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

16: Does this TA communicate effectively in english? Mohan Krishna

Kolli

Yes	1	3	75.00
Not Applicable	0	1	25.00

Mean: 1.00   Median:1   Std. Dev.: 0.00

17: Does this TA communicate effectively in english? Mashooq A. Muhaimen

Yes	1	4	57.14
Not Applicable	0	3	42.86

Mean: 1.00   Median:1   Std. Dev.: 0.00

18: Does this TA communicate effectively in english?

Not Applicable	0	8	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

Additional TA Rating

1: Overall Quality

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

2: Knowledgeability

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

3: Approachability

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent

Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

4: **Availability**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

5: **Communication**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

6: **Does this TA communicate effectively in english?**

Not Applicable		0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

Additional TA Rating

1: **Overall Quality**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00

Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

2:   **Knowledgeability**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

3:   **Approachability**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

4:   **Availability**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00
Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

5:   **Communication**

Response	Weight	Frequency	Percent
Poor	1	0	0.00

Fair	2	0	0.00
Good	3	0	0.00
Very Good	4	0	0.00
Excellent	5	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

6:   **Does this TA communicate effectively in english?**

Not Applicable		0	19	100.00

Mean: 0.00   Median:0   Std. Dev.: 0.00

Report: **Comments**

Course:	**PARALLEL PROGRAMMING (COMSW4130_001_2011_3)**
Instructor:	**Kim Martha Allen** **Saraswat Vijay**
Evaluation:	**F11_CS_Final**
Dates:	**December 06, 2011 - December 15, 2011**
No. of Respondents:	19
No. of Students:	36
Percent Completed:	**53%**

Enter any additional comments here

1. Homework is too difficult for me

2. I was a little irked that we never had any multi-place problems on the homework. We never really went through any good multi-place examples, either, so trying to figure it out on the project was a serious challenge. The first two homeworks were far too easy, and the last two were a bit too difficult.

3. course schedule is not rational, too much homework and quiz in the late semester, when there are many other courses' final project. why not give them out in advance.

4.

5. I felt the course was a bit unbalanced. Lectures on the finer points of the programming language were covered early on, before we had even had any programming assignments. By the time the later assignments got around to the features we had learned about early in the class, I had at least forgotten a lot from the lectures. It might be nice to have more frequent but shorter programming assignments at the start of the course to cover the basics of x10 before moving on to the applications.

6. If the Workload is more even for the whole semester, it will be better.

If so, please explain why

1. The professor is fine

2.

3. Great lecturer!

4. Very helpful and patient

5. I believe this course takes an interesting approach to parallel programming. The progression of concepts is logical and easy to follow. The coverage of the course ranges from the classical, as in the Dining Philosophers problem, to the modern, as in the CUDA programming section. More than anything, the course benefits a great deal from the cooperation with IBM. Vijay is an excellent lecturer, and the guest lecturers invited to speak have been excellent.

6. Both are great professor, but the deliver in the class is not that informative, but material is good

Comments - Mohan Krishna Kolli

Comments - Mashooq A. Muhaimen

1. The best TA I have ever seen!

Comments - Mohan Krishna Kolli

Comments - Mashooq A. Muhaimen