JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.01.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.01.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

1 - The overall quality of this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	2	12.50%
Good	(4)	5	31.25%
Excellent	(5)	9	56.25%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Means: 4.44 (Question), 4.05 (School level), 3.99 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
16/17 (94.12%)	4.44	0.73		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

2 - The instructor's teaching effectiveness is:
Yair Amir

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	1	6.67%
Satisfactory	(3)	2	13.33%
Good	(4)	7	46.67%
Excellent	(5)	5	33.33%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Means: 4.07 (Question), 4.05 (School level), 3.99 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
15/17 (88.24%)	4.07	0.88		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

3 - The intellectual challenge of this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	2	12.50%
Good	(4)	6	37.50%
Excellent	(5)	8	50.00%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Means: 4.38 (Question), 4.05 (School level), 3.99 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
16/17 (94.12%)	4.38	0.72		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.01.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.01.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

4 - The teaching assistant for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%		
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%		
Good	(4)	2	13.33%		
Excellent	(5)	13	86.67%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
15/17 (88.24%)	4.87	0.35		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

5 - Please enter the name of the TA you evaluated in question 4:

Return Rate	
	12/17 (70.59%)

 - Daniel Obenshain

- Tom Tantillo

- Alexis Cheng

- Dan Obenshain, Tom Tantillo, Alexis Cheng

- dano, tom, alexis

- Dan, Tom, Alexis

- Alexis Cheng

- Daniel Obenshain

- Tom Tantillo, Dan Obenshaine, Alexis Chang

- Daniel Obenshain

- Dano

- Tom, Dano, Alexis

6 - Feedback on my work for this course is useful:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	0	0.00%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	6.25%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	6	37.50%		
Agree strongly	(5)	9	56.25%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
16/17 (94.12%)	4.5	0.63		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.01.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.01.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

7 - Compared to other Hopkins courses at this level, the workload for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Much lighter	(1)	0	0.00%		
Somewhat lighter	(2)	0	0.00%		
Typical	(3)	3	18.75%		
Somewhat heavier	(4)	10	62.50%		
Much heavier	(5)	3	18.75%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Means: Question 4.00, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
16/17 (94.12%)	4	0.63		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

8 - What are the best aspects of this course?

Return Rate	12/17 (70.59%)

- The professor's and the three TA's willingness to help.

- The projects directly correlate to topics covered in class.

- Having lots of time for working with individual help available.

- TAs are very helpful.

- the lessons in class are always applicable to the next project

- Big aspects of C and C++ are shown to the students

- Projects really make you think but don't ask for anything that you couldn't reasonably be expected to know how to do from the examples presented in class.

Examples in lectures do a good job of highlighting important points and syntax details so that you can easily refer to the examples when working on the projects instead of looking everything up in the book.

- Some valuable aspects of programming that I did not know before were taught.

- You learn C/C++. Enough said.

- Personal attention. The instructor and TAs really care about the students and really go out of their way to make sure you become a good programmer.

- lots of help

- You learn every aspect of c languages through projects.

Course: EN.600.120.01.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.01.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

9 - What are the worst aspects of this course?	
Return Rate	**10/17 (58.82%)**

 - Heavy work out of class

- Not having enough example code for doing most of the projects. Most of the examples towards the end of the course (regarding C++ in particular) were lengthy and did not show good examples of how to code certain things such as having inheritance and sharing data between classes.

- Expectations early in the course can be unnecessarily harsh.

- sometimes moves a little quickly

- Some parts of the assignments are extremely monotonous.

- The concepts are merely presented and not necessarily thought

- Professor was, at times, hard to approach.

- Workload is quite ridiculous. Then again, it's just the nature of programming.

- tough grading

- Big projects that take good chunk of time to finish.

10 - What would most improve this class?	
Return Rate	**10/17 (58.82%)**

 - Having more code examples that closely match with the assigned projects.

- Clearer explanation of expectations on assignments; showing everyone how to use gdb and valgrind at the beginning of the course.

- spend more time in class on topics that weren't covered at all in intro cs, such as pointers

- Instead of going over programs in class to demonstrate how pieces of c/c++ worked, I would have preferred that the professor focus on the tool we were learning, describe its use, and THEN give us examples instead of making us parse out useage for ourselves.

- if the concepts were thought a bit more in depth so that they can be fully understood

- It works well as is, but would be harder to do with more students. The lab time was really useful and needs to be kept to a small number of students. Lectures could probably be done in a larger setting without losing too much, but that might make students less likely to actually go.

- More instructive projects with more detailed requirements.

- Either reduce the workload or spread the workload through out the semester.

- It would be nice to have a rubric of how the assignments will be graded, in order to avoid nasty surprises (and to know what is considered important)

- less work

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.01.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.01.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

11 - What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

Return Rate	10/17 (58.82%)

- It's really crowded.

- Work on projects in advance. You can't wait till the end of the deadline

- The course jumps quickly through basic programming, so experience in programming is definitely required.

- Your code needs to be exactly the best possible code or the points will fall off your assignments by the dozens. Unlike intermediate with Peter, no team projects.

- be solid on the java syntax from intro cs class or AP CS

- It is a difficult course.!

- It can be a pretty big time commitment, but if you do put in the time on the projects, you'll get a lot out of them.

- It's a good amount of work and the language can be frustrating at times, but it's not impossible.

- I cannot stress this enough. The workload is "too damn high".

- lots of work

---

12 - This course improved my appreciation for and/or ability to engage in life-long learning.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	1	6.25%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	3	18.75%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	2	12.50%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	7	43.75%		
Agree strongly	(5)	3	18.75%		0.00 (School level) 0.00 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
16/17 (94.12%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

---

13 - This course deepened my understanding of the social impact of computing.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	1	6.25%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	2	12.50%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	4	25.00%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	8	50.00%		
Agree strongly	(5)	1	6.25%		0.00 (School level) 0.00 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
16/17 (94.12%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Course: EN.600.120.01.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.01.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

14 - This course enhanced my ability to work effectively in a team.								
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses		Means		
Disagree strongly	(1)	2	12.50%					
Disagree somewhat	(2)	4	25.00%					
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	8	50.00%					
Agree somewhat	(4)	1	6.25%			0.00		0.00
Agree strongly	(5)	1	6.25%					
				0 25 50 75 100		School level		Department Level

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
16/17 (94.12%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.02.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.02.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

1 - The overall quality of this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	2	14.29%
Good	(4)	4	28.57%
Excellent	(5)	8	57.14%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)	4.43	0.76		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Means: Question 4.43, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

---

2 - The instructor's teaching effectiveness is:
Yair Amir

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	1	7.14%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	1	7.14%
Good	(4)	9	64.29%
Excellent	(5)	3	21.43%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)	3.93	1.00		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Means: Question 3.93, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

---

3 - The intellectual challenge of this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	1	7.14%
Good	(4)	3	21.43%
Excellent	(5)	10	71.43%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)	4.64	0.63		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Means: Question 4.64, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

Course: EN.600.120.02.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.02.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

4 - The teaching assistant for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.79 / 4.05 / 3.99
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%		
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%		
Good	(4)	3	21.43%		
Excellent	(5)	11	78.57%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		Question / School level / Department Level

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)	4.79	0.43		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

5 - Please enter the name of the TA you evaluated in question 4:

Return Rate	
14/15 (93.33%)	

- Alexis Cheng

- Daniel Oberman

- Alexis Cheng

- Tom Tantillo

- Tom Tantillo

- Tom Tantillo

- Alexis Chang, Daniel Obenshain, Tom Tantillo

- Alexis Cheng, Daniel Obenshain, Tom Tantillo

- Dano, Tom, Alexis

- Tom, Dano, Alexi

- Alexis

- Dano, Tom, Alexis

- Daniel Obenshain and Tom Tantillo

- alexis chang

6 - Feedback on my work for this course is useful:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%		4.79 / 4.05 / 3.99
Disagree somewhat	(2)	0	0.00%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0.00%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	3	21.43%		
Agree strongly	(5)	11	78.57%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		Question / School level / Department Level

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)	4.79	0.43		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Course: EN.600.120.02.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.02.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

7 - Compared to other Hopkins courses at this level, the workload for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Much lighter	(1)	0	0.00%		
Somewhat lighter	(2)	0	0.00%		4.29 / 4.05 / 3.99
Typical	(3)	2	14.29%		
Somewhat heavier	(4)	6	42.86%		
Much heavier	(5)	6	42.86%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)	4.29	0.73		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

8 - What are the best aspects of this course?

Return Rate	12/15 (80%)

- Learning how to program different data structures was very helpful at becoming acquainted with the languages. Very challenging and interesting course.

- The content is very useful, and the projects are well designed.

- The interaction between the professor and the students. The teaching staff (professor and teaching assistants) were really dedicated to the class, wanted us to succeed, and were always there for extra assistance when needed.

- Get a really good grasp of memory allocation and management

- None, not the course for me!

- The class is highly challenging and really pushes me to rethink how I code. I honestly became a much much better coder because of this class.

- The best aspect of this course was probably all of the help that was available to me. I am sure that the professor and TA's were working insanely hard to give great feedback and help confused students with their code. I would literally have not even passed the class if it wasn't for their hard work. I also loved how much I actually learned from this class. The class was very difficult, but I did learn a lot.

- The projects and the TAs.

- Feedback, unbelievable TA help.

- TA's and professor are very helpful and willing to help whenever you need it

- Pretty much everything. Really good course.

- You will learn programming. The instructor and TAs are extremely helpful and you can e-mail them at any time.

Course: EN.600.120.02.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.02.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

9 - What are the worst aspects of this course?	
Return Rate	9/15 (60%)

- Some of the projects take too long to complete because it requires an understanding of the complex data structure, and many haven't taken Data Structures.

- lectures are a little dry simply going over pre-written programs

- Terribly large workload

- The pace seems awkward at times. There are times when the class loads too much work, and other times when there's no work. It may be better to try to spread out the workload.

- Probably how difficult it was. I don't think that anyone I spoke to anticipated an intermediate programming course to be this difficult. We learned a lot about data structures and this is great... If I was in a data structures class. The class took A LOT of time to work on. To give you an example, I literally was working at least 3-5 hours everyday for about 2-3 weeks on my final project.

- Sometimes, lecture materials are not explained too thoroughly.

- Assignments were very demanding and long

- Projects can take a long time. If you are prone to procrastinating, assignments can get bad.

- Too much work, I believe. I strongly disagree with huge assignments that are assigned in a date range where you are forced to work on it over thanksgiving break. Thanksgiving break, not thanksgiving work on programming period.

10 - What would most improve this class?	
Return Rate	9/15 (60%)

- More projects instead of exams

- Make Data Structures a pre-requisite, or lower the emphasis on learning new data structures.
It can be distracting to have to figure out how the data structure works, since your code might work perfectly, but your understanding of the structure is flawed.

- N/A

- By forcing students to go over the example code for closely. I feel like there's not enough attention to make us do this. An easy way to do this is implement a small quiz.

- Probably nothing, other than grading. I will probably be getting a slightly lower grade than I deserve at the end of this semester.

- Hard to improve upon.

- More time for the assignments or shorter assignments

- A good work ethic.

- not much

Course: EN.600.120.02.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.02.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

11 - What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)	
Return Rate	11/15 (73.33%)

 - You should be familiar with at least one high-level programming language.

- Take Data Structures before this course.
Don't start your project the night or two nights before it is due.
The midterm is a time crunch if this is your first time working with pointers.

- Don't work on projects last minute - start working on them when they are first assigned, and ask the TAs for help along the way.

- Good course, time consuming because c++ compiler is cryptic

- Much harder than it seems! AP computer science credit will not help you much.

- Great course! Really teach you how to program well, but it takes a large amount of your time.

- It is a LOT of work. Please do not take if you don't have some experience in programming and a lot of TIME TO DEDICATE to it.

- You should at least know Java well if you dont already know C.

- Very demanding and time consuming class. Be prepared to spend lots of time with it

- Not that much work, until the projects start. First three projects are pretty easy, just take a long time. Project 4 and the Final Project are pretty serious and actually difficult.

- be ready to work.

---

12 - This course improved my appreciation for and/or ability to engage in life-long learning.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	1	7.14%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	0	0.00%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	7.14%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	7	50.00%		
Agree strongly	(5)	5	35.71%		0.00 0.00
				0 25 50 75 100	School level Department Level

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

---

13 - This course deepened my understanding of the social impact of computing.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	2	14.29%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	3	21.43%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	7	50.00%		
Agree strongly	(5)	2	14.29%		0.00 0.00
				0 25 50 75 100	School level Department Level

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Course: EN.600.120.02.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.02.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

14 - This course enhanced my ability to work effectively in a team.					
Response Option	**Weight**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**	**Percent Responses**	**Means**
Disagree strongly	(1)	6	42.86%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	3	21.43%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	4	28.57%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	0	0.00%		
Agree strongly	(5)	1	7.14%		

	0	25	50	75	100		School level	Department Level
							0.00	0.00

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
14/15 (93.33%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.03.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.03.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

1 - The overall quality of this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	1	10.00%
Good	(4)	1	10.00%
Excellent	(5)	8	80.00%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Percent Responses chart / **Means** chart: Question 4.70, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
10/10 (100%)	4.7	0.67		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

2 - The instructor's teaching effectiveness is:
Yair Amir

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	1	10.00%
Good	(4)	5	50.00%
Excellent	(5)	4	40.00%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Percent Responses chart / **Means** chart: Question 4.30, School level 4.01, Department Level 3.84

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
10/10 (100%)	4.3	0.67		7,893	4.01	1.03	843	3.84	1.11

3 - The intellectual challenge of this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%
Good	(4)	4	40.00%
Excellent	(5)	6	60.00%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Percent Responses chart / **Means** chart: Question 4.60, School level 4.08, Department Level 4.13

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
10/10 (100%)	4.6	0.52		7,437	4.08	0.90	838	4.13	0.91

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.03.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.03.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

4 - The teaching assistant for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%
Good	(4)	3	30.00%
Excellent	(5)	7	70.00%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Percent Responses chart / Means chart: 4.70 (Question), 4.06 (School level), 4.17 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
10/10 (100%)	4.7	0.48		7,433	4.06	1.01	834	4.17	0.99

---

5 - Please enter the name of the TA you evaluated in question 4:

Return Rate	
8/10 (80%)	

- Dan O.

- Alexis Cheng

- Alexis Cheng, Daniel Obenshain, Tom Tantillo,

- Alexis Cheng

- Alexis Cheng, Tom Tantillo, Daniel Obenshain

- All of them- Dano, Tom, and Alexis

- ALEXIS

- Alexis Cheng, Daniel Obenshain, Tom Tantillo

---

6 - Feedback on my work for this course is useful:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%
Disagree somewhat	(2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0.00%
Agree somewhat	(4)	3	30.00%
Agree strongly	(5)	7	70.00%
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%

Percent Responses chart / Means chart: 4.70 (Question), 3.80 (School level), 3.77 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
10/10 (100%)	4.7	0.48		7,433	3.80	1.07	832	3.77	1.12

Course: EN.600.120.03.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.03.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

7 - Compared to other Hopkins courses at this level, the workload for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Much lighter	(1)	0	0.00%		
Somewhat lighter	(2)	0	0.00%		
Typical	(3)	0	0.00%		
Somewhat heavier	(4)	7	70.00%		
Much heavier	(5)	3	30.00%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
10/10 (100%)	4.3	0.48		7,454	3.32	0.99	837	3.41	1.11

8 - What are the best aspects of this course?

Return Rate	8/10 (80%)

- The class environment is conducive to learning.

- Professor Amir and all of the TA's are very approachable and willing to help.

- The stuff was really interesting and cool to learn.

- Questions were responded to very quickly via email. Prof/TA/Grad Students put significant time into helping students.

- It is an excellent course: challenging, but fun, with a lot of interaction with the professor and the TAs.

- The in class demonstrations of how programs work

- This was an incredible course and I came out of it a much better programmer than when I went in

- The programming assignments were designed extremely well. Completing the assignments ensures mastery of all concepts covered in lectures.

9 - What are the worst aspects of this course?

Return Rate	6/10 (60%)

- Work comes in waves. There are periods of lots of work and then periods of little to no work.

- It was really hard to keep up and there was an extraordinary amount of work.

- Workload is rather heavy.

- The pace was too fast.

- The work is really hard and unevenly distributed

- N/A

Course: EN.600.120.03.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.03.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

10 - What would most improve this class?

Return Rate	7/10 (70%)

- Having all of the the tutorial sections after the lectures.

- I would have enjoyed a lot more lectures and less projects.

- A rubric for how grading of each project will be done would be helpful.
More time spent on learning using the unix command line and VIM.

- It's a really great class.

- Maybe if some of the smaller programs were written in class and not just presented,as that would help the students understand everything better step-to-step and see first hand how an experienced programmer thinks while writing a program.

- Probably another lab period or something

- N/A

---

11 - What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

Return Rate	5/10 (50%)

- Feel comfortable programming. Have a solid background knowledge of programming beforehand.

- You should expect to be frustrated a lot when your program doesn't work. If it doesn't work, expect to work a lot. You should know Java and data structures helps alot (wish I knew that...)

- The workload is very hard but the course is extremely rigorous.

- The workload is very heavy and the material pretty challenging if you do not have a lot of prior experience with programming.

- It's very important to budget enough time for each programming assignment.

---

12 - This course improved my appreciation for and/or ability to engage in life-long learning.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	0	0.00%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	11.11%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	4	44.44%		
Agree strongly	(5)	4	44.44%		
				0 25 50 75 100	

Return Rate	Mean	STD	
9/10 (90%)			

---

13 - This course deepened my understanding of the social impact of computing.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	1	11.11%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	3	33.33%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	3	33.33%		
Agree strongly	(5)	3	33.33%		
				0 25 50 75 100	

Return Rate	Mean	STD	
9/10 (90%)			

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.03.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.03.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

14 - This course enhanced my ability to work effectively in a team.					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	1	11.11%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	2	22.22%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	5	55.56%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	0	0.00%		
Agree strongly	(5)	1	11.11%		
				0 25 50 75 100	
Return Rate	Mean	STD			
9/10 (90%)					

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2011.Fall

Course: EN.600.120.04.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.04.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

1 - The overall quality of this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%		
Satisfactory	(3)	1	9.09%		
Good	(4)	1	9.09%		
Excellent	(5)	9	81.82%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
11/11 (100%)	4.73	0.65		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Means: Question 4.73, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

---

2 - The instructor's teaching effectiveness is:
Yair Amir

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
Weak	(2)	1	9.09%		
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%		
Good	(4)	6	54.55%		
Excellent	(5)	4	36.36%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
11/11 (100%)	4.18	0.87		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Means: Question 4.18, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

---

3 - The intellectual challenge of this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	1	9.09%		
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%		
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%		
Good	(4)	1	9.09%		
Excellent	(5)	9	81.82%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
11/11 (100%)	4.55	1.21		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Means: Question 4.55, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

Course: EN.600.120.04.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.04.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

4 - The teaching assistant for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Poor	(1)	1	9.09%		
Weak	(2)	1	9.09%		
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%		
Good	(4)	2	18.18%		
Excellent	(5)	7	63.64%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Means: Question 4.18, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
11/11 (100%)	4.18	1.40		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

5 - Please enter the name of the TA you evaluated in question 4:

Return Rate	
9/11 (81.82%)	

 - Alexis Cheng, Daniel Obenshain, Tom Tantillo

- Alexis Cheng

- Tom Tantillo

- Alexis something-or-other

- Multiple TA's

- Alexis Cheng was the official TA but Daniel Obenshain and Tom Tantillo were extremely helpful unofficial TAs

- Alexis Cheng

- Alexis

- Alexys

6 - Feedback on my work for this course is useful:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	1	9.09%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	1	9.09%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	9.09%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	3	27.27%		
Agree strongly	(5)	5	45.45%		
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%		

Means: Question 3.91, School level 4.05, Department Level 3.99

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
11/11 (100%)	3.91	1.38		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Course: EN.600.120.04.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.04.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

7 - Compared to other Hopkins courses at this level, the workload for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Much lighter	(1)	1	10.00%		
Somewhat lighter	(2)	0	0.00%		
Typical	(3)	2	20.00%		
Somewhat heavier	(4)	6	60.00%		
Much heavier	(5)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	1	10.00%		

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
10/11 (90.91%)	3.44	1.01		7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

8 - What are the best aspects of this course?

Return Rate	10/11 (90.91%)

- Teaching assistants are very helpful. Teaching assistants and Instructor are available throughout the week and answer emails very quickly. Example programs are helpful.

Practice Midterm before actual midterm.

- Getting a good grasp of the fundamentals of C and C++, as well as not being required to take a final.

- Learn Programming languages with challenging programs. Get to program for yourself. TAs and Professor are extremely helpful and available when needed.

- Fun, demanding projects. Good instruction. Truly teaches how to code in C and C++.

- Teacher is very dedicated to his work (it shows), and is approachable.

- Rate of class

- The projects were challenging and enjoyable to work on.

- I love programming, and the assignments are pretty creative and fun to do. The projects are very effective at teaching the relevant topics.

- Even though it was sort of a big class, the teacher and TAs were very accessible

- Lots of work-time for students to program and ask questions.

9 - What are the worst aspects of this course?

Return Rate	7/11 (63.64%)

- Programs are not always the easiest to follow, but do reflect upcoming projects to be completed.

- The teacher is difficult to understand and covers concepts too quickly. He doesn't seem to like answering questions. Projects are given out without a explanation of what we're supposed to do in them, especially the first project. The teacher doesn't make himself available in office hours and instead relies on the TA to help us.

- Demanding projects and hard time schedules to keep.

- The TA knocks points off for things that were not indicated anywhere along the line (in one instance, he removed points for my use of 'vector'. The professor had actually come by, seen my work, and said, 'OK, you're using vector. Good.')

- The goal of the projects were too similar

- Sometimes it was difficult to pay attention to the lectures explaining how the language worked. I mostly learned the features of C and C++ on my own and from previous programming experience.

- The pace is fairly quick, so if you get behind I imagine it's very difficult to catch back up and do well on the projects.

Course: EN.600.120.04.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.04.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

---

10 - What would most improve this class?

Return Rate	6/11 (54.55%)

- -

- I feel that the concepts should be covered in a different manner. Instead of handing us packets of programs, reviewing them and then expecting us to complete complex problems on our own, it would be better to have more hands-on experience doing simple projects and then complex ones.

- More seats

- For me, the course was good and I can't think of anything specific I would do to improve it.

- Emphasize using the debugger more. It's very useful.

- More in-class assignments, less listening in class. I never listened in class and learned everything simply by reading the hand-outs.

---

11 - What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

Return Rate	7/11 (63.64%)

 - Grading is based on a midterm, attendance, four projects, one final project, and one final exam. Instructor gives many example programs to help and show different aspects of C++ and C.

- They should know that they will not get much time to be introduced to C before having a large number of concepts thrown at them at once. The class has no homework besides the projects, but they should be prepared to spend time going over what is taught in class on their own.

- The course is somewhat demanding, especially if you are not well versed in computer programing and algorithms. The course teaches C and C++ well, but be warned that you will have to work for this course.

- Very, very boring if students already know C/C++.

- Know how linked lists work, study how memory managment works

- They should know that the programming assignments are challenging but doable. I found it very helpful to go to a white board with a friend and draw out the data structures for the assignments by hand before coding them. I came into the course with a decent amount of programming experience so it was not that difficult for me, but I don't know how the course would be if I had only previously taken intro programming.

- Make sure you plan your projects before you start them. Otherwise you might dig yourself into a hole. Also attendance is 10% of your grade. Just a useful thing to know.

---

12 - This course improved my appreciation for and/or ability to engage in life-long learning.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	2	18.18%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	2	18.18%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	5	45.45%		
Agree strongly	(5)	2	18.18%		

| | | | | 0   25   50   75   100 | School level 0.00   Department Level 0.00 |

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
11/11 (100%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

Course: EN.600.120.04.FA11 : Intermediate Programming : EN.600.120.04.FA11

Instructor: Yair Amir *

13 - This course deepened my understanding of the social impact of computing.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	2	18.18%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	3	27.27%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	2	18.18%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	3	27.27%		
Agree strongly	(5)	1	9.09%		0.00 (School level) 0.00 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
11/11 (100%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05

14 - This course enhanced my ability to work effectively in a team.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percentage	Percent Responses	Means
Disagree strongly	(1)	3	27.27%		
Disagree somewhat	(2)	4	36.36%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	3	27.27%		
Agree somewhat	(4)	0	0.00%		
Agree strongly	(5)	1	9.09%		0.00 (School level) 0.00 (Department Level)

Return Rate	Mean	STD		School level	Mean	STD	Department Level	Mean	STD
11/11 (100%)				7,473	4.05	0.94	840	3.99	1.05