

*** PROVISIONAL REPORT ***

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
Downing, Glenn P C S371G 86970
E100 EXPANDED

COURSE-INSTRUCTOR SURVEY
GENERIC PROGRAMMING & THE STL

Summer 2017 DEPARTMENT COPY
Enrollment = 17
Surveys Returned = 15

	NUMBER CHOOSING EACH RESPONSE						NO. REPLIES THIS ITEM	AVG.
	Str	Disag	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree		
1 COURSE OBJECTIVES DEFINED-EXPLAINED	0		1	0	0	14	15	4.8
2 INSTRUCTOR PREPARED	0		0	0	1	14	15	4.9
3 COMMUNICATED INFORMATION EFFECTIVELY	0		0	0	0	15	15	5.0
4 STUDENTS ENCOURAGED-ACTIVE ROLE	0		0	0	2	13	15	4.9
5 INSTRUCTOR AVAILABILITY	0		0	1	1	13	15	4.8
6 COURSE WELL-ORGANIZED	0		0	0	1	14	15	4.9
7 STUDENT FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION	0		0	1	0	14	15	4.9
8 CLASS PARTICIPATION ENCOURAGED	0		0	0	1	14	15	4.9
9 ENGAGING INSTRUCTION	0		0	0	3	12	15	4.8
10 INST. HAD THOROUGH KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT	0		0	0	2	13	15	4.9
11 INSTRUCTOR EXPLANATIONS CLEAR	0		0	0	2	13	15	4.9
12 GENUINELY INTERESTED IN TEACHING COURSE	0		0	0	0	15	15	5.0
13 HELPFUL COURSE MATERIALS	0		0	3	5	7	15	4.3
14 ADEQUATE INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSIGNMENTS	0		1	0	2	12	15	4.7
15 ASSIGNMENTS AND TESTS RETURNED PROMPTLY	0		0	0	4	11	15	4.7
16 ASSIGNMENTS USUALLY WORTHWHILE	0		0	1	1	13	15	4.8
17 STUDENT PERFORMANCE EVALUATED FAIRLY	0		0	0	2	13	15	4.9
18 STUDENT PERCEPTION OF AMOUNT LEARNED	0		0	0	1	14	15	4.9
	Vry	Unsat	Unsat	Satisfact	Very Good	Excellent		
19 OVERALL INSTRUCTOR RATING	0		0	0	0	15	15	5.0
20 OVERALL COURSE RATING	0		0	0	0	14	14	5.0
	Excessive	High	Right	Light	Insuff			
21 STUDENT RATING OF COURSE WORKLOAD	0		3	12	0	0	15	
	Less 2.00	2.00-2.49	2.50-2.99	3.00-3.49	3.50-4.00			
22 OVERALL UT GRADE POINT AVERAGE	0		1	2	7	5	15	
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>F</u>			
23 PROBABLE COURSE GRADE	12		3	0	0	0	15	

For the computation of averages, values were assigned on a 5-point scale so that the most favorable response was assigned a value of 5 and the least favorable response was assigned a value of 1.

COMMENTS:

Total Number of Comments: 9

-
1. The Netflix project is kinda boring, the most challenging part of it is obtaining the cache data perhaps this is the point? . However figuring out how to use a serialization library is not very difficult so even if this is somewhat the purpose of the assignment I feel that It could easily be swapped out for something more interesting. The Graph project is fairly boring as well, primarily because of the few operations needing to be supported. Perhaps require the ability to remove edges and vertices. It might be nice to require us to have to use or graph is some sort of graph algorithm A shortest path search perhaps? . The Integer and Deque assignments were both great. Perhaps swap Netflix with another data structure implementation.
-
2. I can safely say I know way more about Cpp than I did going into the class. I can also say that I've become a better programmer and learned many software tools that are used in professional environments. I loved the conversational tone that classes had. I liked the examples of real STL implementations. I liked the articles and design advice for coding and testing practices. The deque project, in my opinion, was the hardest thing in the class. It seemed like we went over the trivial case of vector but then were thrown into a way harder class to implement. It was way harder than the others but made me better. I think learning the different constructors earlier would have been good. Drilling those like the iterators would've helped.
-
3. two thumbs up
-
4. Overall, the class was excellent. I enjoyed Prof. Downing's teaching style, and I learned a lot from him. There are 5 projects. Deque was the hardest one, and Integer was the second. The rest projects were pretty easy. I benefited from Deque and Integer projects, but seldom from the rest three. The only benefit from Netflix project was the usage of boost serialization. And the graph project was unexpected easy when comparing to Deque. Quiz questions were sometimes ambiguous, but they are great in total. The only downside was that we cannot go back after clicking next. And the test was fair enough, except we were tested on minor details in the papers.
-
5. Great class!
-
6. This has been my second time taking Downing and I can only say that the experience was as fantastic as the last. I could not recommend taking his courses more.
-
7. I really enjoyed this class. As far as tools go, Docker was definitely the most interesting to me, and I was surprised that I hadn't heard about it before. Deque was definitely the hardest project, but still doable provided you start early.
-
8. Professor Downing is a great teacher. His lectures are engaging and his projects are extremely useful learning experiences. This being my first upper division CS elective, I have found that the way he encourages you to examine code has made me a far better programmer and really prepared me for the remainder of my coursework. I do wish that the tests were more reliant on code, since some of the more complex multiple choice questions became confusing. I also found the final three projects to be fairly repetitive and it would be nice if one of those were based on a more interesting problem, rather than replicating STL structures. I personally found graph to be the least beneficial of the three. Overall, though, it is an excellent class.
-
9. While I understand the intent behind them, the results or uses of clang-check, Valgrind, doxygen, and clang-format were not meaningful or noticeable to me. I didn't really use Boost or Docker. I both appreciated and understood the uses of Google Test, Travis CI, gcov, and git GitHub. Learning about and using those particular tools was pragmatic and interesting. I will likely use them in the future well, until Travis stops being free, at least . The blog was awkward and tedious. Perhaps having the questions be "suggested topics" and removing the minimum word count could go a long way to improve the experience. Daily quizzes and HackerRank were what I loved the most, despite doing rather poorly on both. I got stuck on compiler errors.
-