Course Evaluation Summary

Quarter: Fall 2003
Department: CSE
Instructor: Andrew Black

Please evaluate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses:

Good domain knowledge and communication skills.

The instructor does a good job asking thought-provoking questions and bringing up key concepts in the class discussion.

CSE 526 was a welcome change from the typical lecture/homework/test class format. It introduced us to current research papers, and forced us to think deeply about what we read. Topics were always relevant and rarely repetitive. Unlike some classes that leave me thinking “I could have just read the book and saved the money”, the in-class discussions with Dr. Black made this course well worth the time and cost. Simply reading the papers wouldn't have given us an equivalent education.

What changes would you suggest to improve this course?

The selection of the papers could use some adjustment; we spent too much time on kernel/userspace protection and separation issues this year.

What aspects of this course do you think should stay the same?

I enjoyed the informal discussions in the course, based on paper reading assignments, this should not be changed.

While the material held my interest, the class format seemed a bit monotonous at times. Read, summarize, discuss. Consider mixing things up a bit. How about reading some code once in a while, instead of a paper? Could we write a reaction instead of a summary? Analyze a particular claim in detail? Do a bit of our own research? It was also not entirely clear how we were being evaluated. Dr. Black rarely commented on our summaries. Were they good enough? Did he even read them? Having them posted in a web forum was nice though—I learned from my classmates' writings.

My other concern is the emphasis placed on oral interaction. In-class discussions were nearly half our grade and I felt disadvantaged because I lose most of my ability to concentrate when placed in social situations. Also, I was often frustrated when others made the observations I had been mulling, and I felt compelled to blurt out something, even if it was stupid or not well-thought-through. But there's no question the discussion aspect of the class was a good experience, painful though it may have been.

How did you hear about this particular course?

A friend.

SPC seminar.

Catalog
Other comments:

I would definitely recommend CSE 526 to other students, and hope that it is still offered despite low enrollment this quarter.

Did your company reimburse you for the course? Yes—2
| Question                                                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | Overall Average |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|                 |
| AVG                      | 4.0| 4.3| 2.5| 4.7| 4.0| 4.3| 3.7| 5.0| 5.0| 5.0| 3.0| 4.0| 4.7| 4.3| 4.3| 4.5| 4.7| 4.3| 4.7| N/A| 4.3              |
| 1                         | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | N/A | 4.2              |
| 2                         | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | N/A | 4.8              |
| 3                         | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | N/A | 4.1              |
| N/A                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
| N/A                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
| N/A                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
| N/A                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
| N/A                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
| N/A                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
| Ave                       | 4.0| 4.3| 2.5| 4.7| 4.0| 4.3| 3.7| 5.0| 5.0| 5.0| 3.0| 4.0| 4.7| 4.3| 4.3| 4.5| 4.7| 4.3| 4.7| N/A | 4.3              |
Course Evaluation Summary

Quarter: Winter 2004
Department: CSE
Instructor: Black
Course: CSE 515/615: Distributed Computing Systems

Please evaluate the instructor’s strengths and weaknesses:

Andrew explains the material very clearly and completely.

Strengths: Experience, knowledge, interest.
Weaknesses: Organization. Some of the projects that students are graded on were not as well prepared and communicated as one would like. This led to some confusion on what needed to be done.

Enjoyed Dr. Black a great deal.

He explains the materials (that are confusing) in a very precise manner.

Good speaker, good at presenting small questions with small answers and building knowledge.

Strengths: knowledge, experience
Weaknesses: Occasionally came across as arbitrary/demanding.

The instructor was very good, but I have only one complaint; the lecture used to be 80 minutes, but he goes at least 90 minutes.

Prof. Black is an excellent lecturer. I found all his classes to be interesting, and he was able to keep everyone’s attention well.

Very knowledgeable in 00 and dist. 00
Not so good in pure dist paradigm. This class felt like N/W + mobile 0 class, rather than dist. class.

Please prepare lecture note and make them available BEFORE class.

What changes would you suggest to improve this course?

I would inform the students of the plans for the final project way ahead of time, perhaps at the beginning of the course. There were many surprises.

More lead time on the final project. Address secrecy (sp?) by covering it or dropping it explicitly.
Less snow days! 😊

Textbook was awful! I'm going to sell mine. Supplemental reading choices were excellent.

Supposedly grading is 20% class participation. This hard number scares the crap out of me (clearly I don't talk much). I think it would be fairer if it was a smaller number, or a 'fudge factor' when scores were on a fence.

*Have three homeworks.
*Have one project.
*Remove writing course summaries, especially if they don't really matter (why is 20% of the grade assigned to them?!) 
*Drop fault tolerance. Change or don't use a textbook.
More thought on project. More concise lectures. More time.

Better organization of the final project.

Final project needs work. Either give groups more leeway (hotter learning, higher chance of failure) or more direction. *Homework 5 more of a GUI exercise than dist. Prog. They should have done similar to just like homework 3 (RMI). Give basic framework, which does GUI and let us focus on dist. Algo. Aspect.

*Summary writing was overkill
*lots of load, and demanding: summary, projects, exam, readings....

Each group should implement their own project designs. Interop was a waste of everyone's time.

The textbook was poorly written. Too many grammatical errors.

While I in general appreciated the format of the read-first, lecture-later, the textbook and readings were inaccessible. The textbook was greatly redundant and poorly edited as well. Some of the readings were good, but others were too dense for the time period given for comprehension.

What aspects of this course do you think should stay the same?

Good mix of theoretical vs. applied material.

Pretty much all of it was a good structure.

The general spirit is good.

Case studies are very valuable—more would be better.

All projects are very appropriate.

Summaries, homeworks, project (should stay the same).

I liked the final homework.
It could have been better organized.

This presenter in particular was an excellent lecturer and discussion leader.

How did you hear about this particular course?

Online (OGI/CSE website) x 4
OGI catalog/schedule x 3

Other comments:

Did your company reimburse you for the course? Yes--1
| Question                                                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | Avg |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|    |
| 1. The instructor was knowledgeable in the course material.             | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5  | 4  | 4  | 5  | 5  | 2  | 5  | 3  | 3  | 1  | 5  | 4  | 4  | 3  | 4.1|
| 2. The lectures were well-prepared and organized.                      | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4.0|
| 3. The instructor's slides were clear and easy to follow.               | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2  | 4  | 3  | 5  | 5  | 1  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3.8|
| 4. The instructor's use of examples and personal experiences helped     | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4.0|
| 5. The pace of the course was appropriate.                              | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3  | 5  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 5  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4.1|
| 6. The instructor related the course concepts in a systematic manner.   | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 4.8|
| 7. The course material challenged me intellectually.                    | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 4  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 3.2|
| 8. The instructor graded and returned tests/homework in a timely manner. | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 4.9|
| 9. The textbook and supplementary materials were valuable.               | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 4.1|
| 10. The course was a valuable part of my curriculum.                   | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3  | 4  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 4.0|
| 11. The course was a valuable part of my curriculum.                   | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5.0|
| 12. Homework assignments contributed to my understanding of the course  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5.0|
| 13. The lecture topics were appropriate for the course.                 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5.0|
| 14. Taking this class increased my interest in the course material.     | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5.0|
| 15. Taking this class increased my interest in the subject area.         | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5.0|
| 16. The instructor was effective at teaching this course.               | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5.0|
| 17. The instructor was effective at teaching this course.               | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5.0|
| 18. Overall, the instructor was effective at teaching the class.       | N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A| N/A|    |    |
| Overall Average.... NOTE: SCALE IS NOW FROM 1 - 5.                     | 4.9| 4.3| 4.1| 4.8| 4.6| 4.0| 4.3| 4.6| 4.2| 4.4| 3.9| 3.8| 4.3| 4.3| 4.3| 4.3| 2.4| 4.4| 4.4| 4.3| 4.4| 4.0| 4.2|
Quarter: Spring 2004  
Department: CSE  
Instructor: Andrew Black  
Course: CSE 529-0 - Object-Oriented Programming

Please evaluate the instructor’s strengths and weaknesses:

Dr. Black is in the top three instructors at this school. I would be glad to take a class from him no matter what it was!

He’s good at on-the-fly thinking. Better examples might be nice (?)

Very knowledgeable. He presented personal views and experience during lectures.

Strengths: Good lecturer and knowledgeable. Weaknesses: He gave us no idea how we were doing in the course. The TA graded all our work, so the teacher just lectured, and the TA graded differently than the teacher would have.

Andrew is a great presenter. He certainly has a lot of experience in this area, and is very effective at conveying the concepts in a way that is interesting and informative.

Great communication skills, enthusiasm and knowledge.

What changes would you suggest to improve this course?

The course was so basic, I was expecting more advanced topics. There is a lot of overlap between this course and CSE 519 (Object Oriented Design).

If you intend for refactoring to be an important part of the class, more of the projects should use the same code to increase the benefits for refactoring or give an existing working program and have people refactor it.

Not to focus on learning semantics of SmallTalk or Java. Felt like I didn’t learn as much about OO concepts as I was frustrated with SmallTalk libraries. Homework took too long to finish.

Get rid of SmallTalk. Use ruby or python. I find it hard to believe that squeak is great when the image crashes every 5 minutes.

I didn’t like how we got basically no feedback on the programming assignments. Since this is a programming class, it would have been useful to get at least some hint as to what we were doing right or wrong instead of just hearing that “it crashed on some test case … 45/50.”

For the last project, we were given a program that was severely lacking in Object-Oriented design when given to us. It would have been nice to have a very good project given to us, and we add new features, etc.

Drop Smalltalk. Use Java or C++. Hire a real TA that is responsive and available.

More guidance on how to apply class lecture topics to assignments. There’s a signicicant gap between theory in class and practical application in assignment. Felt like I was too much on my
What aspects of this course do you think should stay the same?
We should merge it with CSE519, and have a more advanced class if there is something advanced in OO. (Handwriting was very hard to read. I guessed at the above comment. LG)

Pace of lectures and assignments.

An assignment each week of manageable size.

Good teacher: he’s a keeper!

Twice a week is good.

The Java programming and the patterns are useful.

Andrew Black should definitely remain the instructor; he makes the lectures enjoyable.

Breadth of material and topics were good.

How did you hear about this particular course?

It was recommended by Dr. Fairley.

Web x 3

Degree requirements on website.

Catalog

Other comments:

TA was knowledgeable and helpful.

Nope.

Did your company reimburse you for the course?

No x 3

Yes x 5
Course: CSE 529-0 - Object-Oriented Programming