

*** PROVISIONAL REPORT ***

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
Downing, Glenn P C S371P 52970
E100 EXPANDED

COURSE-INSTRUCTOR SURVEY
OBJECT-ORIENTED PROGRAMMING

Fall 2021 DEPARTMENT COPY
Grade-eligible enrollment = 57
Surveys Returned = 54

	NUMBER CHOOSING EACH RESPONSE					NO. REPLIES THIS ITEM	AVG.
	Str Disag	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree		
1 COURSE OBJECTIVES DEFINED-EXPLAINED	0	0	2	20	31	53	4.5
2 INSTRUCTOR PREPARED	0	0	1	11	42	54	4.8
3 COMMUNICATED INFORMATION EFFECTIVELY	0	0	4	21	29	54	4.5
4 STUDENTS ENCOURAGED-ACTIVE ROLE	0	1	4	12	37	54	4.6
5 INSTRUCTOR AVAILABILITY	0	2	9	13	30	54	4.3
6 COURSE WELL-ORGANIZED	0	4	4	19	27	54	4.3
7 STUDENT FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION	0	2	4	17	31	54	4.4
8 CLASS PARTICIPATION ENCOURAGED	0	0	1	12	40	53	4.7
9 ENGAGING INSTRUCTION	0	3	6	21	24	54	4.2
10 INST. HAD THOROUGH KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT	0	0	1	11	42	54	4.8
11 INSTRUCTOR EXPLANATIONS CLEAR	0	0	3	16	35	54	4.6
12 GENUINELY INTERESTED IN TEACHING COURSE	0	0	1	16	37	54	4.7
13 HELPFUL COURSE MATERIALS	1	2	12	15	24	54	4.1
14 ADEQUATE INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSIGNMENTS	0	5	5	22	21	53	4.1
15 ASSIGNMENTS AND TESTS RETURNED PROMPTLY	6	7	12	16	13	54	3.4
16 ASSIGNMENTS USUALLY WORTHWHILE	1	4	4	21	24	54	4.2
17 STUDENT PERFORMANCE EVALUATED FAIRLY	0	5	15	16	18	54	3.9
18 STUDENT PERCEPTION OF AMOUNT LEARNED	0	3	6	18	27	54	4.3
	Vry Unsat	Unsat	Satisfact	Very Good	Excellent		
19 OVERALL INSTRUCTOR RATING	0	3	7	19	25	54	4.2
20 OVERALL COURSE RATING	1	4	11	20	18	54	3.9
	Excessive	High	Right	Light	Insuff		
21 STUDENT RATING OF COURSE WORKLOAD	1	20	29	2	2	54	
	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	0	3	11	40	54	
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>F</u>		
23 PROBABLE COURSE GRADE	33	15	5	1	0	54	

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.

1. RESPONSE: Although I did come to find myself appreciating the grading system of this course, I was not a fan of how it was sometimes applied on the grading of projects. Even if we were passing test cases and had all the right code, we could still potentially fail the project if we happened to miss a small detail on the Workflow. I'm not a fan of how such small mistakes can ultimately drop you a full letter grade, as all projects are basically worth 1 bump in your letter grade. I just don't feel that such small mistakes are proportional to being worth a deduction of a full letter grade. Other than this though, I felt the grading system worked fairly well for all other forms of assignments. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-4, Q3-4, Q4-4, Q5-4, Q6-4, Q7-4, Q8-4, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-4, Q12-4, Q13-4, Q14-4, Q15-3, Q16-4, Q17-4, Q18-4, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

2. RESPONSE: I have only one minor complaint, and it is about the website. I think there should be a tab on the top with "Home", "Calendar", "Evaluations", etc. that says something like "Projects" that links to the current project that we're working on. I say this because on the Collatz project it took me a solid thirty minutes to find the project spec. Intuitively, I would try to look for some sort of project/assignment page on the website. I also recommend putting a link to the spec on the Canvas assignment page because I'm sure many people actually went to look at that the first time. Lastly, you have a slight tendency to cut off a student while they're speaking to answer a question. Considering there is a cold calling it kind of lowers the morale of the student who was just called to speak up in front of the entire class. This goes especially so for people who really don't want to be cold-called. Other than that I found the class to be really fun and interesting, and I'm sure if I ever land a job that needs me to work in C++ (or any other OOP usable language) I'll look back to my notes from this class. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-3, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-3, Q14-4, Q15-3, Q16-4, Q17-5, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-5, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-2,

3. RESPONSE: My one complaint is that the grading system is a bit stressful. It makes each category worth the same amount, when certain types of assignments require way more preparation and time than others. Also, it feels very unforgiving. It would be a lot easier to manage in my opinion if there was a normal grading system. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-4, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-5, Q15-4, Q16-4, Q17-4, Q18-4, Q19-3, Q20-3, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-2,

4. RESPONSE: I liked the content of the course, but really didn't like the grading scale. I don't think it's a good reflection of the work put into this class especially the autograded Perusall papers which I read through and annotated, but still got a 1 on. I feel like this scale is very demotivating- once you know you're going to get a B in a category it doesn't feel worth it to put effort in the other ones to get an A in them. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-4, Q4-5, Q5-3, Q6-4, Q7-4, Q8-5, Q9-3, Q10-4, Q11-4, Q12-4, Q13-3, Q14-2, Q15-3, Q16-4, Q17-2, Q18-4, Q19-3, Q20-3, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-2,

5. RESPONSE: The grading structure of this course is not adequate for our university. The average student in this course finds themselves worrying more about quiz grades than any other assignment in the class. These quizzes, which are daily, allow for no more than one question to be missed (on the average 3 question quiz), and a poor set of quiz grades leaves no ability for recovery through other assignments. This led to a much more stressful semester than necessary. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-4, Q3-4, Q4-3, Q5-4, Q6-4, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-2, Q10-4, Q11-4, Q12-4, Q13-3, Q14-4, Q15-4, Q16-2, Q17-2, Q18-2, Q19-3, Q20-2, Q21-4, Q22-5, Q23-1,

6. RESPONSE: I would have preferred a more typical grading system, similar to the one that we had in SWE in Spring 2021. I understand the ideas behind this grading system; it prevents people from slacking off in some of the "less important" categories, such as quizzes, since they are a smaller percentage of the grade. On the other hand, someone who doesn't learn the material super well the first time might struggle on these daily quizzes, but they could still do very well in every other category. With the typical grading system, this student would be able to get an A since their performance on these quizzes won't hurt their grade enough. With this grading system, however, this student could end up with an A-, or even a B-, depending on how many quizzes they don't end up grasping right away. This also takes into account the virtual token boost you can receive at the end of the course. This is all a hypothetical scenario, of course, and I think the system does still work well overall. It does a great job of discouraging people from missing the lectures. On that note, I also did enjoy your lectures a lot. I've done a bit of complaining here, but overall I think the class was extremely enjoyable and helpful, and you've done a great job with the course! /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-5, Q15-5, Q16-5, Q17-5, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-5, Q21-4, Q22-5, Q23-1,

7. RESPONSE: I thoroughly enjoyed the structure of the course along with the material covered in the course. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-5, Q15-5, Q16-5, Q17-5, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-5, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-1,

8. RESPONSE: I dislike the new grading scheme - it feels like I'm counting how many assignments until I've met the requirement, and after that I don't feel like putting effort, as I've already gotten the grade I want. With a numerical grading scale, a lot of time I would be trying until the end to get good grades on every assignment. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-4, Q14-4, Q15-5, Q16-5, Q17-5, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-5, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

9. RESPONSE: Enjoyed the class but the grading scheme was convoluted and made the class confusing. It felt like I was playing a game to see whether to redeem virtual tokens or not. Moreover, it was hard to keep track of when I had used a virtual token. The projects were penalized quite harshly under the grading system, for example, when smaller issues like asserts were forgotten the entire project was downgraded and the chance of getting an A in the class was slashed. Enjoyed the class but ditch confusing grading system. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-4, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-3, Q14-5, Q15-4, Q16-5, Q17-5, Q18-5, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

10. RESPONSE: The EMRN grading scale wasn't the best for me, but I do understand its appeal and potential to be beneficial for other students. I think the online format worked well for this course. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-5, Q15-5, Q16-4, Q17-5, Q18-4, Q19-5, Q20-3, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-3,

11. RESPONSE: Personally, I detested this grading style. This all of nothing grading style made me feel constantly stressed and diminished my work. If a project was done correctly for most of the criteria but fell short when it came to one or two things, it was practically the same as not doing the project at all when it came to the grade. This felt unbelievably terrible. Furthermore, the projects, class activities, and virtual tokens were graded/updated incredibly slowly which made it hard for me to tell how good I was doing in the class. Also, the whole system of virtual tokens just seemed to be haphazardly put in at the last minute. To this day, I don't think I know how the virtual tokens really work with group projects. I suppose I could have asked, but I feel as if this is something which should be explained without having to ask. Similarly, I feel as if there was considerable confusion when it came to using the virtual tokens. The class website specifically said to email/message TA's on canvas but then it turns out we need to use a google poll or something along those lines. Also, the specifications for the output for projects and sample tests were handled pretty bad. I feel as if there could be more specificity when it comes to that. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question

Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-4, Q3-4, Q4-4, Q5-5, Q6-4, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-4, Q12-5, Q13-4, Q14-3, Q15-2, Q16-2, Q17-2, Q18-3, Q19-2, Q20-2, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-1,

12. RESPONSE: My issue may just be that I am a bad student, but I found the grading scheme to be somewhat frustrating and worrisome in my opinion. I'm used to being able to see what my grade is in the class and expect to be able to make up for my mistakes whenever I mess up. In this class, I did not feel like I was able to do that. Maybe I had a problem understanding the grading criteria. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-4, Q3-4, Q4-4, Q5-3, Q6-4, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-4, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-3, Q14-3, Q15-2, Q16-3, Q17-2, Q18-4, Q19-3, Q20-3, Q21-2, Q22-3, Q23-3,

13. RESPONSE: I think the engagement in this class would feel natural in a classroom setting, occasionally dealing with zoom and being on the spot for zoom can be a bit more stressful than in person. Besides that, clearly, a well organized and put together class and the TA's were also very competent. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-4, Q4-4, Q5-4, Q6-5, Q7-4, Q8-5, Q9-4, Q10-4, Q11-4, Q12-4, Q13-4, Q14-4, Q15-4, Q16-4, Q17-3, Q18-5, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-4, Q23-2,

14. RESPONSE: I'm not completely sold on the new grading system, but I didn't mind it overall. I think that there are a few small things to work out with it, but I'm not sure exactly what the pain points for me were. Maybe making it a little more forgiving with virtual tokens and smaller assignments or changing how many E/M's needed for some categories would make me like it a bit more, but overall I didn't mind the new grading system too much. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-5, Q15-4, Q16-5, Q17-3, Q18-4, Q19-5, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

15. RESPONSE: It took me a while to adjust to the new EMRN grading scale, but after a while it started to make sense to me. I had some trouble keeping up with the lectures, as it was hard for me to find a good way to take notes. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-4, Q3-4, Q4-4, Q5-4, Q6-4, Q7-4, Q8-4, Q9-4, Q10-4, Q11-4, Q12-4, Q13-4, Q14-4, Q15-4, Q16-4, Q17-4, Q18-4, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-2,

16. RESPONSE: I have taken SWE with Professor Downing before and the course flow was largely the same. That is to say that Professor Downing does an excellent job at communicating the course material. He keeps us engaged by implementing cold calling. He clearly has in depth knowledge of the topics he's teaching. The assignments, quizzes, and exercises were fair given what was taught. The grading system was a little confusing at the beginning and for me personally I didn't see much difference between the newsystem and a normal percentage system. The new grading system did not change the way I worked or the quality of work I produced. Professor Downing is an excellent professor and I feel I have learned a lot from this course. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-4, Q8-5, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-4, Q13-5, Q14-4, Q15-4, Q16-5, Q17-5, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

17. RESPONSE: I found the that the grading system did the opposite of what it was set out to do. Professor Downing explained that the EMRN grading system encouraged students to do well on all aspects of the course, and avoid situations where a student could avoid doing all the quizzes, for example, but still get a good grade if they did well on the tests or projects. In my case, I didn't do too well on the quizzes, to the point where I knew it'd be impossible for me to get an A. At that point, it made no sense for me to do the last 2 projects. Even if I got perfect E's on them, I would still receive a C or a B because of my quizzes. I don't mind getting a lower grade, but I could see how this could cause frustration for a student trying to get an A. It also seems weird that you could put yourself in a situation where doing a project will not help your grade whatsoever. I do think the virtual token system is nice, especially the bump to the next grade with a minus. Professor Downing was also great in lectures, wish we could've done some classes in person. I'd recommend this course to friends, I'd just warn them to stay on top of all the assignments! /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-4, Q4-5, Q5-4, Q6-4, Q7-4, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-4, Q14-3, Q15-4, Q16-4, Q17-3, Q18-4, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-4, Q23-2,

18. RESPONSE: Overall, I enjoyed learning C++ and the basics of OOP design from doing the projects and in-class exercises. However, I felt like the lectures were too concentrated on the C++ languages and not much on Object-oriented design. I felt like the projects tested our ability to apply OOP design but we didn't really spend much time in-class lectures doing examples. Most projects were also not graded and returned on time to use the virtual tokens if mistakes were made. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-4, Q3-4, Q4-4, Q5-4, Q6-3, Q7-4, Q8-4, Q9-4, Q10-4, Q11-3, Q12-4, Q13-4, Q14-4, Q15-2, Q16-5, Q17-3, Q18-4, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

19. RESPONSE: I think there should be reminders after each project is graded that we can use a virtual token on it to fix changes. This is a system I have never had and therefore I was unaware that a token could be used to bump the grade up. In addition to this, there was a project where our team missed assert statements and we were penalized a whole point on the grading system. It took the assignment from an M to an R and I do not think it is indicative of the work we had put into the assignment. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-5, Q15-3, Q16-5, Q17-3, Q18-4, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-2,

20. RESPONSE: Super great professor, specifications grading can suck a bit but other than that he's awesome! /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-5, Q15-5, Q16-5, Q17-4, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-5, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

21. RESPONSE: This class did a great job of teaching me C++, but I wish we covered more about Object-Oriented Programming practices. We learned about them a little bit in the papers, but they were never discussed in class, and we were never shown how to actually apply what was discussed in the papers. I have mixed feelings about the grading system. I think the number of Ms on papers required to get an A should be lower; it's difficult to predict what score the Perusall AI will give you. I'd rather there be reading quizzes once a week than being graded on Perusall; asking questions via annotations is a largely waste of time since only other students answer, so the annotations just become busy work to earn Perusall's approval. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-4, Q8-5, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-4, Q13-4, Q14-5, Q15-4, Q16-4, Q17-4, Q18-3, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

22. RESPONSE: I think I learned a lot in this course. The grading system really affected my grade, I felt I had acceptable grades on exercises, quizzes, and projects, but the papers that were graded by Perusall, gave me some trouble. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-4, Q5-3, Q6-3, Q7-4, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-0, Q15-4, Q16-4, Q17-3, Q18-4, Q19-4, Q20-4, Q21-2, Q22-4, Q23-4,

23. RESPONSE: 1. Course load about appropriate for upper div CS class. 2. Dislike implementation of grading scheme -- arbitrary E granting incentivizes the bare minimum from students. 3. Exercises don't allow adequate time for completion -- don't think it's a fair assessment of what students can complete. Especially when there's a difference between starter code shown in class vs. starter on exercises. 4. I'm convinced cold calling structure isn't just per rotation, as I was easily called 2-3x more than friends in class. I've paid attention, turned on camera, answered questions well, etc. Convinced prof just wasn't marking my name off. To clarify, I don't really care that I was called on more, just annoyed it's inconsistent with what I was told. 5. Projects could use more planning beforehand -- surprised smth like rubric on p5 was still edited a week after original post, even though it seems these projects are recycled over semesters. 6. Current TA's do what they can, but course needs 1-2+ other graders. Ensure M/E well defined for new TA's re: feels arbitrary. 7. Response time awful via Canvas. 8. Difficult to agree with clear explanations if I wasn't v engaged with material. Thank you for bearing with students who clearly weren't paying attention.

Overall feel like course would be better irl. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-3, Q4-5, Q5-2, Q6-2, Q7-4, Q8-5, Q9-2, Q10-4, Q11-4, Q12-5, Q13-3, Q14-4, Q15-1, Q16-2, Q17-4, Q18-2, Q19-2, Q20-2, Q21-3, Q22-4, Q23-1,

24. RESPONSE: The course was organized for the most part, but I feel like instructions should be more clear. Project 5 for example, in lecture we only really went over Conway cells when there were 2 more cells to implement. Of course, the spec is there to provide the information, but discussing it in class is more clear. I don't like the grading system since there's no partial credit. One small mess up was the difference for me getting credit and not getting credit (usually acceptance tests). It was also hard this semester to make the deadlines to redo part of the assignment to get and M. I'd check for the grades every other day for a week or two, and the moment I stop checking is when the grades are released. It'd be nice to have more concrete deadlines, but I understand the TA's have a lot to do (maybe have some more TAs?). Other than that, Professor Downing knew the material, explained it well, and really seemed to care about his students. The structure of the class was the main problem for me since cold calling is nerve-racking and the grading very rigid. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-4, Q4-4, Q5-4, Q6-5, Q7-2, Q8-4, Q9-3, Q10-5, Q11-4, Q12-5, Q13-3, Q14-2, Q15-1, Q16-4, Q17-2, Q18-4, Q19-4, Q20-3, Q21-2, Q22-4, Q23-3,

25. RESPONSE: I had some trouble starting the projects early, and I am not sure how that could be motivated, but that would be a big help as the project deadline and the few days before would be very stressful. The lack of leeway with things like missing daily quizzes or the paper or blog assignments that comes with specifications is partly counterbalanced with the virtual tokens, but I think that system could use some work I think. Only being able to use one for papers and two for quizzes (plus the two previously earned E's) seemed a little bit on the low side. The grade cutoffs also seemed like they could use some adjustment, specifically the fact that only two papers can be missed, when there is only 14, and since it is an autograder. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-0, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-4, Q6-5, Q7-4, Q8-4, Q9-3, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-3, Q14-4, Q15-2, Q16-4, Q17-4, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-4, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,

26. RESPONSE: Prof. Downing has implemented a new grading system that I fundamentally believe is both confusing to the student and frankly doesn't achieve the goals set out by the creator of said system. In addition, the projects for the course (a large portion of the grade for the class) were graded extremely slowly. The materials taught during class were also far from what the class is advertised as teaching; when signing up for the class, I was under the assumption that I would be learning Object-Oriented Principles simply using C++. Instead, the lectures were almost entirely about the C++ API, with all of the OOP content taught through simple articles provided by Downing. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-3, Q4-3, Q5-2, Q6-2, Q7-4, Q8-5, Q9-2, Q10-5, Q11-3, Q12-4, Q13-2, Q14-2, Q15-1, Q16-1, Q17-3, Q18-2, Q19-2, Q20-1, Q21-1, Q22-5, Q23-1,

27. RESPONSE: My one complaint is that it did not feel like the class focused enough on principles of OOP, and instead felt like a breakdown of the C++ language and its features. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-4, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-4, Q15-3, Q16-5, Q17-4, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-4, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-1,

28. RESPONSE: I really enjoyed the course and thought that the lectures were rather engaging. I personally liked the projects and the exercises given. I didn't really have that big of an issue with the grading system but think that the system could use small tweaks like any new system. I do think that giving the students a bit more time for the exercises would be beneficial because it did feel like sometimes we were rushing through those. Overall great course, would recommend it to any CS student. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-5, Q15-3, Q16-5, Q17-4, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-5, Q21-2, Q22-4, Q23-2,

29. RESPONSE: I feel that what could have been an excellent course became plagued by structural issues. I do think specifications grading can work as I am in Competitive Programming which also uses this grading scheme and I think specifications grading worked well in that course due to its regular work schedule and simple nature of all of its assignments. For this class, however, I think specifications grading needs more tweaking for it to be fair and enjoyable from the student's end. I brought about this extensively in a blog post, but I think the issues of this class's structures can be summarized in 3 main points: slow grade returns, project grading transparency, and lowering the exercise count across all letter grades. The first of these issues is the issue that I think does the most harm in the experience of the class. It can be very frustrating to think you are on track to a certain letter grade only for the next wave of grades to show that you are actually near failing in a single category which will overshadow your a's in the other categories. For a system that encourages its students to resubmit assignments for a better grade, those grades should be returned in a timely fashion. A general recommendation of the course not related to the grading system is using gradescope for submissions /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-4, Q2-5, Q3-4, Q4-4, Q5-3, Q6-2, Q7-3, Q8-4, Q9-4, Q10-5, Q11-4, Q12-4, Q13-3, Q14-4, Q15-1, Q16-4, Q17-3, Q18-4, Q19-3, Q20-3, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-2,

30. RESPONSE: The grading system feels very unwieldy in its current state. E's should automatically be applied to repair N/Rs (it is always optimal for a student to immediately do so when possible) without an upgrade request. Even after that, there are still too many limits to keep track of: one blog resubmission, one virtual token exercise resubmission, one paper resubmission, two project extensions, two project resubmissions, two quiz resubmissions. Each upgrade has a different deadline to make a request. Since it takes time to get our grades back and for upgrade requests to go through (sometimes up to a month), it's hard to gauge our status with virtual tokens and limits to decide which requests to make, especially with the 6-token bump in consideration. I imagine it's a nightmare for the TAs to manage as well. I think removing the virtual tokens, lowering the letter grade thresholds to compensate, and having a standard slip day system would make more sense. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-4, Q15-1, Q16-5, Q17-3, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-4, Q21-2, Q22-5, Q23-1,

31. RESPONSE: I became comfortable with specifications grading, but I don't feel like we were able to take advantage of it because of the delay in receiving our grades and in seeing changes occur whenever we redeemed a virtual token or a previously earned E. I know we were told to keep track of virtual tokens on our end, however, it was hard to do so because I was never sure if my request was accepted. In addition, it was hard to be strategic with requests given the ambiguity behind the number of tokens and the time it took before we got our grades back. /// SURVEY SUMMARY (Question Number-Scale Position) /// Q1-5, Q2-5, Q3-5, Q4-5, Q5-5, Q6-5, Q7-5, Q8-5, Q9-5, Q10-5, Q11-5, Q12-5, Q13-5, Q14-4, Q15-3, Q16-5, Q17-4, Q18-5, Q19-5, Q20-5, Q21-3, Q22-5, Q23-1,