# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**1 - Course: Amount Learned**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 0.67% | | 4.51 |
| Fair | (2) | 4 | 2.67% | | |
| Good | (3) | 13 | 8.67% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 32 | 21.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 100 | 66.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 150/251 (59.76%) | 4.51 | 0.82 | 5.00 |

**2 - Course: Appropriateness of Workload**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 18 | 12.00% | | 3.54 |
| Fair | (2) | 25 | 16.67% | | |
| Good | (3) | 18 | 12.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 36 | 24.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 53 | 35.33% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 150/251 (59.76%) | 3.54 | 1.42 | 4.00 |

**3 - Course: Fairness of Grading Process**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 12 | 8.00% | | 3.67 |
| Fair | (2) | 22 | 14.67% | | |
| Good | (3) | 25 | 16.67% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 36 | 24.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 55 | 36.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 150/251 (59.76%) | 3.67 | 1.32 | 4.00 |

**4 - Course: Overall Quality**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 7 | 4.67% | | 4.14 |
| Fair | (2) | 6 | 4.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 22 | 14.67% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 39 | 26.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 76 | 50.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 150/251 (59.76%) | 4.14 | 1.11 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**5 - Enter any additional comments here**

| Response Rate | 39/251 (15.54%) |
|---|---|

• Jae makes this into more of a lifestyle than a course, which I do not appreciate. You will get emails on most weekend nights, holidays, etc. It is an incredible amount of work but you learn a lot.

• Among the best classes I have taken at Columbia. Despite AP being challenging and very time-consuming, Jae's expectations are made extremely clear from the beginning of the course and there is an abundance of resources available to ensure that with enough effort, it is possible for anyone to succeed. I have learned very much this semester. In addition, the entire team of TA's was excellent.

• This has been my favorite class at Columbia - albeit the most difficult course I have taken as well.

• Tests should be more focused on material and course knowledge rather than taking off points for silly mistakes.

• TAs really made this class bearable. Unfairness of grading process was beyond extreme. Too much weight on testing and not enough on homework.

• One of the best classes I've ever taken. Tbh there was not as much work as I expected. Jae keeps saying at least 2 hours a day to keep up with this class, but that doesn't make sense if there's only one lab every other week or so.

• Honestly, AP has maybe been the course I've enjoyed the most at Columbia (and I'm not even that good at it!). I found the labs to be challenging but doable, the lectures engaging and I learned a lot throughout the semester. The class is not easy, but if you study and work hard you can do well. There a lot of resources provided (constant TA office hours, practice exams, lecture notes, videos etc.), so although it can be intimidating at times you are set up to succeed. I can tell Jae puts quite a bit of thought into designing his lectures and I really appreciate that. My only complaint is the size of the class is really large but I understand there is not much one can do about that.

• I consider AP to be the paradigm of CS classes. I cannot stress enough how satisfying it is to finally have a class that is structured and executed in such a flawless manner. There was not a single moment that I ever experienced any sort of ambiguity or confusion in terms of the class' procedures, deadlines, and operation. In every possible way that I can conceive of, Jae and his team of TAs, are committed to and have delivered a learning experiences that minimizes the ambiguity, confusion, inequity, insufficient communication, and other obstacles that plague too many of the other classes I have taken. The above comments don't even directly address the curriculum itself, whose purpose, at almost(!) every turn, is evident from Jae's lectures. Nearly every lecture felt important and the structure and progression of the labs was excellent. Thanks Jae. (y)

• I think that the grading process was almost always fair, but in some instances, I found lab descriptions to be inadequate. This is totally understandable, but this class has also been taught for over 10 years with no large changes to labs. I think it would be reasonable to add notes to each lab explaining commonly misinterpreted pieces of information. Otherwise, you are forced to engage with the email system. I also just want to make one comment about the email listserv. This may be a controversial opinion, but I actually think that there are much better systems than the listserv. I totally understand why Piazza is awful, but the problem with the listserv is two fold. First, many people do not properly follow proper formatting in their subject, making important information impossible to find. And second, there is no distinction between important information and unimportant information. There have been many labs where I thought I was finished, until I decided to just read through the emails. In fact, as an example of both the email frustration and the lab instruction frustration, for lab7, I did not know that we needed to ensure the server did not crash even if the backend database server did in the middle of the server's runtime. I did not find this information communicated in the lab, and so I did not do it and believed I was finished. After browsing emails randomly for 30 minutes, I found one TA response which clarified that we do have to manage that situation. It would have been nice to have information like that in the lab, or some way to have that information given more relative importance than the other emails. Otherwise, this class was excellent! I am being a little nitpicky but I think it is worth communicating these things!

• This is probably the most difficult class I'll take at Columbia, but I've learned more than I ever thought I would. The community of TAs and Jae is fantastic, and I've definitely felt a certain bond with my classmates unlike any other 300+ person course I've taken before. Surprisingly, this class made me like CS even more than I already did.

• I love this class! People complain about it because it's a lot of work, but if you pay attention and stay on top of it, you get so much out of the class. The labs are all so important for understanding the lecture material.

• By far the most challenging class I've taken up at Columbia. A significant amount of time was dedicated to the course, yet I don't feel that was in vain. I truly feel like I've learned a lot.

• Excellent course! Challenging and tough, but you learn an incredible amount in a small amount of time. I am happy this is part of the CS core, and I'd definitely recommend others to take it.

• Really love this course. It is extremely well organized as everything in the course builds upon itself.

• I was nice experience taking the class taught by Prof. Lee. He is a good instructor and knows how to teach the materials that may be difficult to understand.

• A lot of work, but I walked out of every class feeling like I learned something worthwhile / interesting (it was so awesome to understand how things work in lower levels). Grading was super fair - whenever I got a lab back, I knew exactly why I had lost points.

• harsh grading

• The course load is very heavy, but you do learn a lot of material. However, the material in general is not the most interesting. I enjoyed learning C, but many of the later labs were very time-consuming, but not in a way that felt like I was learning a lot in the process of doing the labs. It feels like many aspects of the course were made more difficult than necessary, though I did not go to some extra resources like review sessions and stuff. But I don't think the course should be intentionally designed to require a lot of going above and beyond the standard lectures, readings, and assignments. As an example, I spent most of my time on one lab figuring out how to link libraries in a Makefile, and I ended up messing it up in the end anyway. It would have been a lot less painful and time consuming if an example of such a Makefile were provided, and I feel like I would have learned the exact same thing. I later found such an example on the recitations GitHub, which I guess I should have just checked before, but it feels like the course asks students to go out of their way to figure things out themselves even when this isn't necessary. Maybe this is intentional as part of the value of the course is learning to read (often unclear) documentation, but often it seems like it's more frustrating than useful. Also, the exams are not a good experience. Every question feels like a trick question, and it makes the exams very unenjoyable. Also, grading is pretty harsh and there are only a few problems on each exam. If the exams were 4-5 questions instead of 2-3 and were slightly more straightforward, they would be much better.

• Midterm 2 grading rubric was not representative of my mastery of the content.

• Super helpful course

• Meh. Good overall/content not mentioned should be assumed to be good. I had problems with three things. For context I was far above median on both tests. I say this so my feedback is hopefully not taken as a rant. 1) This is small but linking lab assignments/course notes on the webpage seems like it would make everyone's life easier. Generally I think there are many better forum platforms than gmail but I assume you have reasons/have thought this through. 2) For someone who struggled through each assignment honestly, the justification for why cheating is made extremely easy seems pretty weak. If a police officer said they were not going to prosecute stealing because the justice department has done the best they can to create good laws for a functioning society I'd be a bit perplexed. The bottom line is no matter how hard you plead, some people will cheat (based on the numbers you gave in the beginning I wouldn't be surprised if that was close to 20-30%). These people raise the curve for honest students, and make it harder for them to get into graduate/professional school. Having no control over this kinda sucks. If you genuinely feel you cannot change the labs, potentially you could employ multiple grading schemes (ex labs worth 30% in one and maybe 10% in another) so students who worked hard to learn material wouldn't be dragged down by cheaters. I have not thought this though to the extent where I fully understand the consequences but know many other professors do this. 3) From my perspective there was an over prioritization on "googleable" knowledge. For example I would much rather spend time learning various examples/ get more practice with fork/exec than memorizing their man pages. I am not convinced this memorization will provide me value (I can google/man what the functions do) in the future and am fairly certain I will forget it in a few months. Overall though I do not want this to take away from a good course. I'm convinced you care a great deal about teaching, and I respect you a lot for it.

• Most stressful class I've ever taken. Gave me so much anxiety and stress, despite constantly studying in the library and doing all the labs on time. Very brutal grading process. Destroyed my mental health. Students dropped out of being a CS major because of this class. Class was also unfair because there was a Section 2 which allowed other students to get an advantage in the class for others who were not in it.

• Learned so much!

• I love the way this class is structured so that everything you learn builds off of what you learned previously. The progression is understandable and makes the class less daunting. I do not like the usage of the listserv nor the competitive/comparative nature of the class, but can appreciate the things I've learned. I did not appreciate the time Jae said he would kill himself if we did not get an answer correct in lecture. I feel that he should be more careful of saying things like this, especially considering the school he works for and the course he teaches.

• This is likely the best class I have taken at Columbia. It was the right amount of hard, I learned a huge amount, and I had all the resources I needed. Jae and all the teaching staff are fantastic. The class got me excited about what I was studying in a way that no other Columbia class has. I really wish this class just continued.

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

• I don't know why people are so scared of this course. It's a lot of work, sure, but the support systems are there, the programming assignments are manageable, and if you keep up with the material you'll know what you need to know. I learned so much in this course. It's true what they say—data structures helps you get the job, AP helps you keep the job. I'm exiting this course feeling for the first time like a self-sufficient and capable programmer. I understand that managing grading for such an enormous course can be challenging, but there were times when I had to request points back for pretty severe and ridiculous reductions. Those requests were generally ultimately granted, but I would have preferred not to have had to do that at all.

• I feel that some of the labs were graded over harshly, with no credit being given in the student made a silly mistake. This is disheartening when we spend so much time on them.

• Jae was an excellent lecturer and I feel that I learned a lot both in class and through completing his assignments. I enjoyed the labs (homework assignments). My main critique would be the grading of code on the midterm exam. I felt that mistakes that were due to oversight and not lack of understanding were attributed to a lack of conceptual understanding and considered 'major mistakes.' It was incredibly discouraging to fully understand the exam and how the functions worked and still receive so many points off for this. Additionally, I felt that I learned the most from completing the labs and if possible, I think that these should be worth more in the future, as they take a great deal of time and can demonstrate a greater understanding of material than data taken from 1-2 hours of stressful test environments.

• One of the best computer science courses I have ever taken. It is true that when you take this class, care about it, and finish all the work, you become a better programmer than before. You learn all sorts of interesting topics like lower level understanding of computer memory and how to write code which manages it effectively, and the reasoning behind the way computers and protocols are structured.

• I spent more time on this course than 3 other courses combined, the material is difficult and asking students to do this much homework and covering so many subjects on exams is unfair to students with large courseloads, which many have to do in order to graduate on time

• The work load was very heavy and one assignment was dated for during reading week.

• Jae is incredible! I've learned a ton of material thanks to him, and am incredibly grateful for the amount of preparation he puts into his lectures and labs. I never thought that I'd be a fan of low-level programming, but his labs taught me otherwise. He and the TAs work so hard to ensure that the course material is taught as effectively as possible, and I really appreciate the amount that he does to help students understand advanced computer science concepts in a way that's as accessible as possible.

• How has no one stopped him yet?

• I learned a lot, but this course took up so much time. I could have taken no other classes except this one and it would still be challenging.

• I thought that the HW assignments were the best HW's I have received in any class I have ever taken because of how well it prepares you for the test and the knowledge you gain from doing the HW. By doing all the HW, you basically understand all there is to know about the topic we are learning about the I feel like are perfectly structured assignments.

• Great class, but worst grading system I have ever encountered. Grades are a poor reflection of the amount learned in this course. Morale was low after receiving my first midterm grade back, and I struggled for the rest of the course knowing that no matter how well I did I would still receive a poor grade.

• Overwhelmingly stressful for no reason, it is just another cs class, but Jae definitely makes it seem like its more important than it is.

• I have very mixed feelings about this class. I definitely learned SO much in this class, but at what cost? Sometimes labs were sent out before the previous lab was even due, which allowed for zero time to process everything that I had just done, instead just needed to race off to the next assignment. I have worked really hard for this class and genuinely feel that I have learned more than in any of my other classes so far at my time here, but I feel like that will not come across in my final grade. The exam gets graded to the smallest dot, which I understand it is important to really comprehend all of the concepts, but in any job I will have in the future I will be coding on a computer and will usually be able to detect those issues which I lost points for on an exam. I know the grade isn't what matters, it matters that I learned, but at the end of the day we do go to Columbia where grades mean a lot and it kind of brings you down to see that you've worked so hard and don't get the A you think you deserve. I think maybe the labs should count for more of your grade considering how time consuming they are and that's really where I learned the most. I appreciate the effort to make this class effective and I appreciate what I've been able to learn, but this class has brought me more stress and unnecessary pain than I think a college class should bring upon someone. (I was talking to a friend who is going to take the class next semester and had tears in my eyes because I thought about having to take this class all over again.) Also want to mention how incredible the TAs for this class are!!!!!!! All of the TAs for this class are the most helpful supportive people ever!! They were always there to answer questions on the listserv and in office hours and truly know what they are talking about. Couldn't have completed this course without them! :)

• Course is extremely stressful.

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**6 - Instructor: Organization and Preparation**

**Jae Lee**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 2 | 1.33% | | 4.54 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 0.67% | | |
| Good | (3) | 14 | 9.33% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 30 | 20.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 103 | 68.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Instructor |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 150/251 (59.76%) | 4.54 | 0.80 | 5.00 |

**7 - Instructor: Classroom Delivery**

**Jae Lee**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 0.67% | | 4.48 |
| Fair | (2) | 4 | 2.67% | | |
| Good | (3) | 15 | 10.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 32 | 21.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 98 | 65.33% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Instructor |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 150/251 (59.76%) | 4.48 | 0.83 | 5.00 |

**8 - Instructor: Approachability**

**Jae Lee**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 14 | 9.33% | | 3.63 |
| Fair | (2) | 22 | 14.67% | | |
| Good | (3) | 25 | 16.67% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 34 | 22.67% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 55 | 36.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Instructor |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 150/251 (59.76%) | 3.63 | 1.35 | 4.00 |

**9 - Instructor: Overall Quality**

**Jae Lee**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 3 | 2.00% | | 4.27 |
| Fair | (2) | 10 | 6.67% | | |
| Good | (3) | 18 | 12.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 32 | 21.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 87 | 58.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Instructor |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 150/251 (59.76%) | 4.27 | 1.04 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**10 - Would you nominate this professor for the SEAS Distinguished Faculty Award?**

**Jae Lee**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 89 | 65.93% | | 1.34 |
| No | (2) | 46 | 34.07% | | |

0 25 50 100 — Instructor

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 135/251 (53.78%) | 1.34 | 0.48 | 1.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**11 - If so, please explain why**

**Jae Lee**

| Response Rate | 66/251 (26.29%) |
|---|---|

• This course is difficult but rewarding. Jae has clearly put much thought and effort into developing and refining AP into the class it is today, and he deserves to be commended for it.

• He is always willing to stay after class to explain complicated topics. He is truly comitted to the student's learning process.

• Jae is an amazing professor!

• Jae is easily one of the coolest professors I have had at Columbia so far. He stresses the importance of truly understanding what you are learning, and does an excellent job pushing us just enough to test our understanding.

• A great professor who leads a great TA team. Why not?

• He is just perfect.

• His lectures are very interesting and rewarding. I also think the labs are well-designed. They form a natural progression from C, to writing a web server, to C++.

• Passionate speaker. Dedicated instructor.

• Amazing lecturer. I feel like I walk away from each lecture with a lot of new knowledge, and I feel like the labs are very well designed and promote learning

• Jae is a gifted teacher. His explanations for complicated concepts were always clear and made the content accessible. The AP curriculum he designed is very well-planned and builds nicely upon itself throughout the semester.

• Jae has clearly put a lot of thought and effort into this course. AP has been incredibly challenging (and defeating at times), but I'm sad that the class is ending soon. I appreciate how enthusiastic and knowledgeable Jae is about C/C++. He helps students critically think and evaluate problems in a different light than how we're taught to solve problems in traditional undergrad CS courses.

• This is truly a very well designed class, Jae has put a lot of thought into how this class is constructed and run, and it shows.

• jae is asian and not enough asian people here get reward and he has taught for a long time. Do not be racist Columbia.

• Most unapproachable professor I have ever had. Does not value student's time.

• Great at explaining concepts in a way that could be understood by anyone.

• Clear lecturer and very honest with his students. Genuinely appears that he cares about student education.

• Jae teaches so much in so little time and doesn't let anything up to guessing. He knows the subject extremely well and has made a class taht is both fun, educational, and comprehensive.

• He obviously cares about the material and is intentional in the way that it is taught.

• Jae has clearly spent a lot of time polishing his lectures and highlighting common misconceptions that students have either about C, or about the implementation of the labs. I also really enjoyed the midterms, I thought they did a really good job of highlighting conceptual misunderstandings that I had that I was unaware of.

• Jae has put a lot of thought into designing the course and the lectures. As a student I was constantly being challenged and learning something new, but I felt like Jae set me up for success. He has an in depth understanding of the concepts but presents them in an understandable manner. The labs are designed to be rigorous but doable.

• Jae might be one of the most effective professors I have ever had the privilege to learn from. He teaches with absolute clarity and a subdued passion that manifests itself in the form of depth of knowledge and weathered experience. This man knows what he's doing, and should be recognized.

• Best Computer science teacher I've had in 3 semesters at Columbia

• Jae is an excellent lecturer. I certainly understand CS better now than I ever have and I have never learned so much in a single semester. Anyone who doesn't understand why we learn C and C++ in this class do not understand the point of it. Jae does an amazing job communicating the concepts and really pushes the students.

• An excellent instructor who can explain materials very clearly. He is also very experienced in organizing the course and have made policies and grading processes crystal clear so that there is no ambiguity.

• he is god i think

• he teaches one of the hardest cs classes with ridiculous amount of workload, but remains one of the favorite professors for the students.

• He has created a culture of independent learning. You don't go to Jae to have your hand held, but he sets up his course with such precision you are certain that all you need is in front of you. This class has given me an incredible amount of confidence to learn other programming material INDEPENDENTLY. This is what it means to be a programmer in the 21st century. He embodies this principle in the course and this has spilt over in the culture of the class. This is something very few professors can do, and AP is a class that a generation of CS majors from Columbia will remember.

• The only negative aspect of the course was just how the semester was scheduled, yet that was out of Jae's hands really. Other than that, I have nothing negative to say about the course. I attended every lecture, yet he made those available online as well - making it so that we could have that extra resource in the event that we missed something. The way each lab builds on top of each other really lets me see what I'm building, and made me feel more confident with the code I was writing. The amount of time I dedicated to the course seemed entirely appropriate for the level of proficiency in coding Jae has instilled in us. I don't really write much course reviews, but having gone through this course and seeing how Jae teachers, it just felt necessary to write one.

• He is a fantastic instructor who can be funny and is very approachable. He really cares about what his students learn, as well as how well they learn it. He makes the class hard enough to where we push ourselves, but not hard enough to where the material is impossible, which I greatly appreciate. He is one of my favorite teachers that I have had so far, if not my favorite.

• Jae plans his course very well and he's very good at explaining confusing topics. He really puts a lot of effort in teaching and has passion in seeing his students doing well.

• In spite of all those "boring" jokes, Jae's lecture does not contain single waste word. EVERY SINGLE WORD Jae said during lecture counts. I think most classmates do not even realize this (because in order to realize this, we need to first read a lot and then either pay 100% attention during lecture or review video lectures over and over again). Jae's lecture has extracted the most valuable/important things from various sources (during which those confusing materials have been omitted). Only true educator can achieve the level Jae has achieved (because only true educator will be willing to do this -- at the end of the day, it is all about willingness and attitude). Unfortunately we do not have a lot of Jae in colleges now a days. However, this is also why he is distinguished. He should earn this Award by all means.

• His course is extremely well crafted, and it is clear that he really cares about his students. He takes the time to make sure that every student is learning as much as possible upon leaving the course.

• Good at teaching

• He is a good instructor.

• Best and the hardest class for my first semester at Columbia university!

• A genuinely nice person who wants his students to actually learn the material and get something out of the course. The class is well-organized and a staple in the Columbia CS curriculum.

• It was the most rewarding class I've taken at Columbia.

• Amazing amazing prof

• Perfect material

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

• I did not find him to be an approachable professor.

• Before I took this class I was really worried about it since I head alot of bad rumors about Jae and how hard and grueling his assignments were and how harsh his grading policy was. When I took the class for myself, Jae was very clear with the expectations he had from the class and the workload and encouraged people to either not take the class if they felt like they weren't ready or didn't have the time to dedicate. He is a very good lecturer, and he explains things very clearly and simply and takes his time to explain things. He doesn't make the course hard, its just that the nature of the material is difficult to learn. His assignments were grueling just like any other SEAS class but unlike most SEAS classes the assignments we were doing actually relate to real world industry expectations. The assignments were a display of actual skills we needed to learn for our future jobs and not some random niche thing that he assigned just because he felt like it. I feel like I became a better software engineer after taking AP

• great explanation of concepts well-organized course structures

• The course design was excellent in that each class and assignment built on previously gained knowledge. Lectures were engaging and extremely helpful. Professor Lee is excellent at explaining things in a clear way.

• Very well prepared and every word he says is intentional and important

• Class material is super structured; Assignments are great; Labs are closely related to lectures; Super great learning environment and TAs

• Jae is one of the best teachers I have ever had. He is immaculately prepared, willing and able to answer any and every question. Cares deeply about students learning, the fairness of the process, and the ways in which students may struggle and succeed. He has a grand vision of this course and its place in students' educational careers that makes the course feel important (as it is). He is able to present huge quantities of information in a learnable, interesting, challenging (but not impossible) way that very few teachers can. Jae is truly what I would hope for in any teacher for any subject. I hope dearly I will have him again.

• What an absolute legend. I don't know what this course would be without Jae. I don't know if I've ever encountered a professor who so completely knows his course material. His (frankly ridiculous) attention to detail serves this course so well, and his candor and sense of humor make lecture enjoyable.

• Professor Jae Lee is an amazing lecturer who is realistic about the necessary amount of work that you need to put into a course like this in order to truly understand all of the concepts thoroughly. All lectures were very well-prepared and effective, and most importantly, Jae radiates a love for logical thinking and puzzle/problem solving that was wonderful and inspiring to see in a computer science professor.

• Jae's explanation of the material was always clear and easy to understand. He drew many helpful diagrams on the board so as to ensure our understanding without looking at code, and this really worked well. His assignments were interesting and relevant, and the way each of the labs led into each other was a great way to keep students motivated and to correct their mistakes along the way. Jae is a great guy and his course was a fantastic experience. I am genuinely sad that it is over, and it's rare that I feel that way for any class.

• Jae is extremely organized. He explains materials clearly in lectures. He provides us a lot of resources to study. He is approachable. Jae cares about the students. Besides doing an excellent job on in-classroom teaching of the materials, a lot of times Jae would mention things from a career perspective, bringing the bigger picture to us. For example, he once said in class that "I want you to know that everything is not so complicated - they might look so but they are all built from this, very simple building block." I believe I was not the only one who had that kind of enlightening moment. To students like us who are just entering this huge field of Computer Science and learning the building blocks, this serves as an inspiration, a confidence booster, and more over, a reminder that would have a positive lasting impacts in our further studies and careers.

• I appreciate the videos of lectures!

• Jae Lee is an incredible teacher clear in his delivery as well as in his passion. He knows what he is talking about well beyond the course's necessity which allows him to explain everything with great clarity.

• Jae is one of the best lecturers I've had at Columbia. His lectures are clear, precises, and structured in a way that keeps the larger context in mind. I've learned more about programming than any other class I've taken.

• I don't think Jae's curriculum design in this course is perfect, but he gave a lot of thought to it for a class that might otherwise have been low priority for the school. Frankly, he's doing god's work by teaching what is essentially an intro systems programming course. Having a design philosophy for this course and administrating it well really is one of the most thankless jobs in a CS department and Jae handles it with so much grace all things considered.

• Jae pushes students beyond their limits in the best manner possible. I came into Columbia with no programming experience, and was afraid that I would be struggling with the course given my lack of expertise in computer science. However, the class was incredibly rewarding--the me from one year ago who struggled to write a Poker Game in Java would never imagine that I'd be able to build a web server from scratch using C! Jae genuinely cares about his students, and always comes well-prepared to lectures. He's incredibly detail-oriented, and while the class is tough, I can tell that he wants his students to get the most out of it. I love how he experimented with new teaching techniques this year by posting video recordings of lectures and holding a smaller section of students to help those who need extra assistance.

• The fact that the first thing that Jae tells us to read is his paper on why exactly the course is designed the way it is, shows how much effort he has put in into making this course such a foundation for a CS undergrad. Every lecture, Jae's knowledge on the intricacies of C show through and the reasons and applications behind what we do are demonstrated well.

• I feel like more of the core CS classes should follow the level of academic rigor set in AP. The course is organized, well structured, and Jae is a very good lecturer.

• Here's the thing about Jae. He's not a nice guy, BUT you need to pretend like he is. His entire class is just a mind game. But, to be fair, you do learn a lot (both about yourself and about C) along the way. You need to take the class pretending that he is there to help you, that every word he says is very important in the grand scheme of your career as a C programmer, and that he is a fair instructor who is doing his best to help you grasp the concepts of the course. In reality, that's not true. You really just need to listen to what he says in lecture because he's gonna try to trick you on the exam and then be like "Oh well technically I said that one time". When you take a test, it's not really testing your understanding of C, it's testing your understanding of what Jae wants you to understand about C; some of this stuff is very niche and not important, and other stuff is very important. Regardless, you have to know it. The TAs on the other hand, are super helpful and nice, and will do everything they can to help you pass the class. So yeah, pretend like Jae is a really nice guy and look up and adore him for the whole semester. After the semester is over you can tell everyone else what you really think about him, and admire what you learned throughout the semester.

• He's great at teaching.

• Jae explains things so clearly. I do not think people can survive in AP without coming to his class. His lecture really represents the pinnacle of Columbia quality course. His teaching style is pleasant. Students would love to come to his course.

• Jae was an amazing lecturer and articulated his points very well.

• His lectures are crafted amazingly well. I can see that year after year he studies what students have understood from lecture and what might need more explanation.

• He was a good lecturer and he clearly cared about his students, fostering a community for the class

• jae is a great lecturer and he makes a lot of sense when he is talking in class. However, every other aspect of the class distracts from this. Compassion is not a bad thing and I wish that Jae was a little more understanding. It is ok to not know things, it is ok to be confused, it is okay to make mistakes. While for the entire semester of this course I have gotten tens of emails, at least, each night from our listserv, we had an assignment due yesterday at midnight (the night of Tessa Majors' death) and I have not received any kind of email at all from Jae or any other TA while I have received emails from all other teachers. The hard deadline for this is tomorrow and even though I feel directly impacted by this untimely tragedy and overwhelmed on many fronts I don't feel comfortable enough to send an email to Jae to ask for an extension as I am afraid that won't matter to him. While some say his callousness, lack of compassion, and inflated sense of self importance is meant to be a lesson in itself (saying "well he won't hold your hand"), that's not the lesson people need. He shouldn't let people walk all over him of course, but I think what would be more radical than that is showing understanding, kindness, and compassion especially if you call this class "the make or break class for computer science students". Just because a class is academically challenging doesn't mean it has to take a toll on your mental health or wellbeing.

• He's challenging but fair and we've learned a lot

• Great professor

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Amanda Liu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.59 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 4 | 11.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 6 | 17.65% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 24 | 70.59% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 34/251 (13.55%) | 4.59 | 0.70 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Benjamin Most**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.46 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 7.69% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 7.69% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 15.38% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 9 | 69.23% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13/251 (5.18%) | 4.46 | 0.97 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Bill Chen**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.61 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 4.35% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 4.35% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 4 | 17.39% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 17 | 73.91% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23/251 (9.16%) | 4.61 | 0.78 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Brennan McManus**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.79 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 7.14% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 7.14% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 12 | 85.71% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14/251 (5.58%) | 4.79 | 0.58 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Catherine Chu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 3.85% | | 4.50 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 7.69% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 19.23% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 18 | 69.23% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 26/251 (10.36%) | 4.50 | 0.95 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Gustaf Ahdritz**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.57 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 4.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 7 | 33.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 13 | 61.90% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21/251 (8.37%) | 4.57 | 0.60 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Hans Montero**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.62 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 4.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 15 | 30.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 33 | 66.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 50/251 (19.92%) | 4.62 | 0.57 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Hollis Lehv**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.29 |
| Fair | (2) | 2 | 11.76% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 11.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 11.76% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 64.71% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17/251 (6.77%) | 4.29 | 1.10 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**12 - Overall Quality**

**James Yang**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.80 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 3.33% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 4 | 13.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 25 | 83.33% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 30/251 (11.95%) | 4.80 | 0.48 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Julia Guo**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.50 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 4 | 22.22% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 5.56% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 13 | 72.22% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 18/251 (7.17%) | 4.50 | 0.86 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Kent Hall**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.62 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 3.85% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 8 | 30.77% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 17 | 65.38% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 26/251 (10.36%) | 4.62 | 0.57 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Lauren Ogden**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.53 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 6.67% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 33.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 9 | 60.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 4.53 | 0.64 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Lucie Le Blanc**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.75 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 2.27% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 2.27% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 6 | 13.64% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 36 | 81.82% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 44/251 (17.53%) | 4.75 | 0.61 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Maria Kogan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.78 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 5.56% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 11.11% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 15 | 83.33% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 18/251 (7.17%) | 4.78 | 0.55 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Matthew Broughton**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.42 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 3 | 25.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 8.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 8 | 66.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/251 (4.78%) | 4.42 | 0.90 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Michael Jan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.58 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 3.03% | | |
| Good | (3) | 3 | 9.09% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 15.15% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 24 | 72.73% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 33/251 (13.15%) | 4.58 | 0.79 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.58 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 8.33% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 25.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 8 | 66.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/251 (4.78%) | 4.58 | 0.67 | 5.00 |

**12 - Overall Quality**

**Amanda Liu, Benjamin Most, Bill Chen, Brennan McManus, Catherine Chu, Gustaf Ahdritz, Hans Montero, Hollis Lehv, James Yang, Julia Guo, Kent Hall, Lauren Ogden, Lucie Le Blanc, Maria Kogan, Matthew Broughton, Michael Jan, Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 0.25% | | 4.61 |
| Fair | (2) | 6 | 1.48% | | |
| Good | (3) | 30 | 7.39% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 77 | 18.97% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 292 | 71.92% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 4.61 | 0.71 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Amanda Liu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.67 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 3 | 9.09% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 15.15% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 25 | 75.76% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 33/251 (13.15%) | 4.67 | 0.65 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Benjamin Most**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.58 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 16.67% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 8.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 9 | 75.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/251 (4.78%) | 4.58 | 0.79 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Bill Chen**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.73 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 4.55% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 4.55% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 4.55% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 19 | 86.36% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 22/251 (8.76%) | 4.73 | 0.77 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Brennan McManus**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.77 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 7.69% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 7.69% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 84.62% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13/251 (5.18%) | 4.77 | 0.60 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Catherine Chu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 3.85% | | 4.58 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 3.85% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 19.23% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 19 | 73.08% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 26/251 (10.36%) | 4.58 | 0.90 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Gustaf Ahdritz**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.70 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 5.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 4 | 20.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 15 | 75.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20/251 (7.97%) | 4.70 | 0.57 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Hans Montero**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.65 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 3 | 6.12% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 11 | 22.45% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 35 | 71.43% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 49/251 (19.52%) | 4.65 | 0.60 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Hollis Lehv**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.53 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 6.67% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 6.67% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 13.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 73.33% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 4.53 | 0.92 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**James Yang**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.86 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 4 | 14.29% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 24 | 85.71% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 28/251 (11.16%) | 4.86 | 0.36 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Julia Guo**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.41 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 5.88% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 11.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 17.65% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 64.71% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17/251 (6.77%) | 4.41 | 0.94 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Kent Hall**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.64 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 8.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 20.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 18 | 72.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 25/251 (9.96%) | 4.64 | 0.64 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Lauren Ogden**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.57 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 14.29% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 14.29% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 10 | 71.43% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14/251 (5.58%) | 4.57 | 0.76 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Lucie Le Blanc**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.74 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 2.38% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 4.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 4 | 9.52% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 35 | 83.33% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 42/251 (16.73%) | 4.74 | 0.66 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Maria Kogan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.76 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 5.88% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 11.76% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 14 | 82.35% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17/251 (6.77%) | 4.76 | 0.56 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Matthew Broughton**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.27 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 9.09% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 9.09% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 27.27% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 6 | 54.55% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11/251 (4.38%) | 4.27 | 1.01 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Michael Jan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.63 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 3.13% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 6.25% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 15.63% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 24 | 75.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 32/251 (12.75%) | 4.63 | 0.75 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.73 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 9.09% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 9.09% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 9 | 81.82% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11/251 (4.38%) | 4.73 | 0.65 | 5.00 |

**13 - Knowledgeability**

**Amanda Liu, Benjamin Most, Bill Chen, Brennan McManus, Catherine Chu, Gustaf Ahdritz, Hans Montero, Hollis Lehv, James Yang, Julia Guo, Kent Hall, Lauren Ogden, Lucie Le Blanc, Maria Kogan, Matthew Broughton, Michael Jan, Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 0.26% | | 4.66 |
| Fair | (2) | 6 | 1.55% | | |
| Good | (3) | 26 | 6.72% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 59 | 15.25% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 295 | 76.23% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 4.66 | 0.70 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**14 - Approachability**

**Amanda Liu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.59 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 3.13% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 6.25% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 6 | 18.75% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 23 | 71.88% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 32/251 (12.75%) | 4.59 | 0.76 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Benjamin Most**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.45 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 18.18% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 18.18% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 7 | 63.64% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11/251 (4.38%) | 4.45 | 0.82 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Bill Chen**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 4.76% | | 4.62 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 4.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 9.52% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 17 | 80.95% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21/251 (8.37%) | 4.62 | 0.97 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Brennan McManus**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.83 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 8.33% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 91.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/251 (4.78%) | 4.83 | 0.58 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**14 - Approachability**

**Catherine Chu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.44 |
| Fair | (2) | 2 | 8.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 4.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 6 | 24.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 16 | 64.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 25/251 (9.96%) | 4.44 | 0.92 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Gustaf Ahdritz**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.63 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 5.26% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 26.32% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 13 | 68.42% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 19/251 (7.57%) | 4.63 | 0.60 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Hans Montero**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.58 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 3 | 6.25% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 14 | 29.17% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 31 | 64.58% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 48/251 (19.12%) | 4.58 | 0.61 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Hollis Lehv**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.40 |
| Fair | (2) | 2 | 13.33% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 6.67% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 6.67% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 73.33% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 4.40 | 1.12 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**14 - Approachability**

**James Yang**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.82 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 3.57% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 10.71% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 24 | 85.71% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 28/251 (11.16%) | 4.82 | 0.48 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Julia Guo**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.63 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 12.50% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 12.50% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 12 | 75.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16/251 (6.37%) | 4.63 | 0.72 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Kent Hall**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.50 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 8.33% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 8 | 33.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 14 | 58.33% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24/251 (9.56%) | 4.50 | 0.66 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Lauren Ogden**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.62 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 7.69% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 23.08% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 9 | 69.23% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13/251 (5.18%) | 4.62 | 0.65 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**14 - Approachability**

**Lucie Le Blanc**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.71 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 2.38% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 4.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 11.90% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 34 | 80.95% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 42/251 (16.73%) | 4.71 | 0.67 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Maria Kogan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.81 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 6.25% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 6.25% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 14 | 87.50% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16/251 (6.37%) | 4.81 | 0.54 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Matthew Broughton**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.60 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 10.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 20.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 7 | 70.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10/251 (3.98%) | 4.60 | 0.70 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Michael Jan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 3.23% | | 4.61 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 6.45% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 4 | 12.90% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 24 | 77.42% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 31/251 (12.35%) | 4.61 | 0.88 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**14 - Approachability**

**Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.70 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 10.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 10.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 8 | 80.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10/251 (3.98%) | 4.70 | 0.67 | 5.00 |

**14 - Approachability**

**Amanda Liu, Benjamin Most, Bill Chen, Brennan McManus, Catherine Chu, Gustaf Ahdritz, Hans Montero, Hollis Lehv, James Yang, Julia Guo, Kent Hall, Lauren Ogden, Lucie Le Blanc, Maria Kogan, Matthew Broughton, Michael Jan, Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 2 | 0.54% | | 4.62 |
| Fair | (2) | 6 | 1.61% | | |
| Good | (3) | 25 | 6.70% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 65 | 17.43% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 275 | 73.73% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 4.62 | 0.73 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Amanda Liu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.59 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 3.13% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 6.25% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 6 | 18.75% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 23 | 71.88% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 32/251 (12.75%) | 4.59 | 0.76 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Benjamin Most**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.80 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 20.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 8 | 80.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10/251 (3.98%) | 4.80 | 0.42 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**15 - Availability**

**Bill Chen**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.62 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 4.76% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 4.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 14.29% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 16 | 76.19% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21/251 (8.37%) | 4.62 | 0.80 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Brennan McManus**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.83 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 8.33% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 91.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/251 (4.78%) | 4.83 | 0.58 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Catherine Chu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.48 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 4.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 8.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 6 | 24.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 16 | 64.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 25/251 (9.96%) | 4.48 | 0.82 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Gustaf Ahdritz**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.72 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 27.78% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 13 | 72.22% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 18/251 (7.17%) | 4.72 | 0.46 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**15 - Availability**

**Hans Montero**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.57 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 2.13% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 4.26% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 13 | 27.66% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 31 | 65.96% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 47/251 (18.73%) | 4.57 | 0.68 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Hollis Lehv**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.54 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 7.69% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 7.69% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 7.69% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 10 | 76.92% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13/251 (5.18%) | 4.54 | 0.97 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**James Yang**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.74 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 7.41% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 11.11% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 22 | 81.48% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 27/251 (10.76%) | 4.74 | 0.59 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Julia Guo**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.67 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 13.33% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 6.67% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 12 | 80.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 4.67 | 0.72 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**15 - Availability**

**Kent Hall**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.52 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 8.70% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 7 | 30.43% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 14 | 60.87% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23/251 (9.16%) | 4.52 | 0.67 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Lauren Ogden**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.75 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 25.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 9 | 75.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/251 (4.78%) | 4.75 | 0.45 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Lucie Le Blanc**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.62 |
| Fair | (2) | 2 | 4.76% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 4.76% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 6 | 14.29% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 32 | 76.19% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 42/251 (16.73%) | 4.62 | 0.79 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Maria Kogan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.87 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 13.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 13 | 86.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 4.87 | 0.35 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**15 - Availability**

**Matthew Broughton**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.50 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 20.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 10.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 7 | 70.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10/251 (3.98%) | 4.50 | 0.85 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Michael Jan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.53 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 3.33% | | |
| Good | (3) | 3 | 10.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 16.67% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 21 | 70.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 30/251 (11.95%) | 4.53 | 0.82 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.78 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 22.22% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 7 | 77.78% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9/251 (3.59%) | 4.78 | 0.44 | 5.00 |

**15 - Availability**

**Amanda Liu, Benjamin Most, Bill Chen, Brennan McManus, Catherine Chu, Gustaf Ahdritz, Hans Montero, Hollis Lehv, James Yang, Julia Guo, Kent Hall, Lauren Ogden, Lucie Le Blanc, Maria Kogan, Matthew Broughton, Michael Jan, Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.63 |
| Fair | (2) | 8 | 2.22% | | |
| Good | (3) | 22 | 6.09% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 66 | 18.28% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 265 | 73.41% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 4.63 | 0.70 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**16 - Communication**

**Amanda Liu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.65 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 3 | 9.68% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 16.13% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 23 | 74.19% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 31/251 (12.35%) | 4.65 | 0.66 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Benjamin Most**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.33 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 11.11% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 11.11% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 11.11% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 6 | 66.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9/251 (3.59%) | 4.33 | 1.12 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Bill Chen**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.63 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 5.26% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 4 | 21.05% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 14 | 73.68% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 19/251 (7.57%) | 4.63 | 0.76 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Brennan McManus**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 5.00 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 100.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11/251 (4.38%) | 5.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**16 - Communication**

**Catherine Chu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 4.17% | | 4.54 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 4.17% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 20.83% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 17 | 70.83% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24/251 (9.56%) | 4.54 | 0.93 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Gustaf Ahdritz**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.65 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 5.88% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 17.65% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 13 | 76.47% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17/251 (6.77%) | 4.65 | 0.79 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Hans Montero**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.68 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 4.26% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 11 | 23.40% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 34 | 72.34% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 47/251 (18.73%) | 4.68 | 0.56 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Hollis Lehv**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.64 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 7.14% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 14.29% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 11 | 78.57% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14/251 (5.58%) | 4.64 | 0.84 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**16 - Communication**

**James Yang**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.78 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 7.41% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 7.41% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 23 | 85.19% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 27/251 (10.76%) | 4.78 | 0.58 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Julia Guo**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.67 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 13.33% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 6.67% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 12 | 80.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 4.67 | 0.72 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Kent Hall**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.67 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 4.17% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 6 | 25.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 17 | 70.83% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24/251 (9.56%) | 4.67 | 0.56 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Lauren Ogden**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.67 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 4 | 33.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 8 | 66.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/251 (4.78%) | 4.67 | 0.49 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**16 - Communication**

**Lucie Le Blanc**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.75 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 2.50% | | |
| Good | (3) | 1 | 2.50% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 5 | 12.50% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 33 | 82.50% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 40/251 (15.94%) | 4.75 | 0.63 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Maria Kogan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.87 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 2 | 13.33% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 13 | 86.67% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 4.87 | 0.35 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Matthew Broughton**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.56 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 2 | 22.22% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 7 | 77.78% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9/251 (3.59%) | 4.56 | 0.88 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Michael Jan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.59 |
| Fair | (2) | 1 | 3.45% | | |
| Good | (3) | 3 | 10.34% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 3 | 10.34% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 22 | 75.86% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 29/251 (11.55%) | 4.59 | 0.82 | 5.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**16 - Communication**

**Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.88 |
| Fair | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Good | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 1 | 12.50% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 7 | 87.50% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8/251 (3.19%) | 4.88 | 0.35 | 5.00 |

**16 - Communication**

**Amanda Liu, Benjamin Most, Bill Chen, Brennan McManus, Catherine Chu, Gustaf Ahdritz, Hans Montero, Hollis Lehv, James Yang, Julia Guo, Kent Hall, Lauren Ogden, Lucie Le Blanc, Maria Kogan, Matthew Broughton, Michael Jan, Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | (1) | 1 | 0.28% | | 4.68 |
| Fair | (2) | 6 | 1.71% | | |
| Good | (3) | 18 | 5.13% | | |
| Very Good | (4) | 55 | 15.67% | | |
| Excellent | (5) | 271 | 77.21% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 4.68 | 0.68 | 5.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Amanda Liu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 31 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 31/251 (12.35%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Benjamin Most**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 10 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10/251 (3.98%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Bill Chen**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 20 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20/251 (7.97%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Brennan McManus**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 11 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11/251 (4.38%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Catherine Chu**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 24 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24/251 (9.56%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Gustaf Ahdritz**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 15 | 93.75% | | |
| No | (2) | 1 | 6.25% | | 1.06 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16/251 (6.37%) | 1.06 | 0.25 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Hans Montero**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 44 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 44/251 (17.53%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Hollis Lehv**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 14 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |

0 25 50 100 TA

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14/251 (5.58%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**James Yang**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 27 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |

0 25 50 100 TA

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 27/251 (10.76%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Julia Guo**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 15 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |

0 25 50 100 TA

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Kent Hall**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 24 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |

0 25 50 100 TA

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24/251 (9.56%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Lauren Ogden**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 12 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |

0 25 50 100 TA

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/251 (4.78%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Lucie Le Blanc**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 39 | 95.12% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.10 |
| N/A | (3) | 2 | 4.88% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 41/251 (16.33%) | 1.10 | 0.44 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Maria Kogan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 15 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15/251 (5.98%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Matthew Broughton**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 9 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9/251 (3.59%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Michael Jan**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 31 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 31/251 (12.35%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 8 | 100.00% | | |
| No | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 1.00 |
| N/A | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8/251 (3.19%) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?**

**Amanda Liu, Benjamin Most, Bill Chen, Brennan McManus, Catherine Chu, Gustaf Ahdritz, Hans Montero, Hollis Lehv, James Yang, Julia Guo, Kent Hall, Lauren Ogden, Lucie Le Blanc, Maria Kogan, Matthew Broughton, Michael Jan, Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | (1) | 349 | 99.15% | | |
| No | (2) | 1 | 0.28% | | 1.01 |
| N/A | (3) | 2 | 0.57% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | TA |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1.01 | 0.16 | 1.00 |

**18 - Comments**

**Amanda Liu**

| Response Rate | 6/251 (2.39%) |
|---|---|

• Amanda is one of the best TAs I have ever had and has made AP so much more doable.

• Did a great job!

• Amanda is amazing at explaining the material of this course and her review sessions early on in the semester were super duper helpful for my beginning understanding of C. She's so kind and knowledgable and never failed to help me out whenever I needed it!

• *note: I would generally give all the TAs high marks. I singled out these two because they're the ones I had the most interaction with.* Knowledgeable, helpful, and thorough! The TAs really are lifelines in this course. I'm very grateful that they're very good at their jobs.

• Amanda was always helpful in helping me work through the conceptual errors that I was having with an assignment or topic. She was enthusiastic and always seemed to have a very positive attitude in office hours, even after helping many people for extended periods of time. I appreciated how clearly she explained concepts and her willingness to answer follow-up questions.

• Amanda's incredibly knowledgeable and is always willing to clarify any confusing concepts to students during her office hours.

**18 - Comments**

**Benjamin Most**

| Response Rate | 2/251 (0.8%) |
|---|---|

• Ben communicates effectively, not only in English but in C, his native tongue. MOST qualified TA by far, other TA's can Fork Bomb themselves.

• Benjamin is amazing at providing hints for students without giving away too much. He asks great questions to the student to help them engage with something they're struggle to get, rather than simply providing the answer. He really believes in the student and helps them bring out their true capabilities. Even when I felt unconfident about a certain approach, he always motivated me by indicating that I was on the right track, and then pointed out areas in which I could improve my methods.

**18 - Comments**

**Bill Chen**

| Response Rate | 2/251 (0.8%) |
|---|---|

• Really appreciated Bill for all his efforts to help students in the class!! I know he has a heavy workload himself but he still pulls through and does the utmost!

• Bill always knows how to point students towards the right direction when it comes to labs. He's incredibly patient and will take the time to run through your approach to a problem together in order to figure out the source of the issue.

**18 - Comments**

**Brennan McManus**

| Response Rate | 3/251 (1.2%) |
|---|---|

• Brennan is such a kind person who also happens to love compsci. I only talked to him a few times but he was a great help and gently pushed me in the right direction.

• It was nice talking to you when I needed a help with fork()

• Great TA! Extremely helpful, he takes time to draw diagrams to get students to understand the problem rather than just pointing out solution.

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**18 - Comments**

**Catherine Chu**

| Response Rate | 5/251 (1.99%) |
|---|---|

• Catherine was so knowledgable and helpful in office hours.

• Cat is a really great TA. She always tried her best to help during office hours, even staying late to work through problems with us. I know it was super appreciated especially when TAs are so busy as well.

• Catherine is soooooososososo intelligent and capable and was an amazing TA! She could teach pointers to an art history major with no experience in programming with her explanations. She was exceptionally good at reassuring any understanding you already had and building upon it for more understanding.

• Catherine's diagrams were incredibly helpful for the first midterm! Her explanation of pointers and memory allocation really helped prepare me for the exams, and I appreciate the amount of time she took to clarify concepts, even when I asked repeated versions of the same question.

• Catherine is a great TA!! But really all of the TAs for this class are the most helpful supportive people ever!! They were always there to answer questions on the listserv and in office hours and truly know what they are talking about. Couldn't have completed this course without them!

**18 - Comments**

**Gustaf Ahdritz**

| Response Rate | 5/251 (1.99%) |
|---|---|

• Solid chap!

• I went to Gustaf's SmartPtr review session near the end of the semester and found it really helpful. The information was presented clearly and with examples. Additionally, he was very helpful with questions about lab 10, which I struggled with in the beginning. He was kind and did not make me feel dumb for making obvious mistakes, which I greatly appreciated.

• I'm sure he personally knows the material but his explanations are made for people who already understand the material. His explanations are thus insensitive to those who are learning the topics for the first time and/or have a desire to learn the material. During review sessions, as he explained topics I already understood, I was amazed at how jumbled some explanations were (as such, after his explanations I was not surprised to see confused faces from those asking questions).

• Was very helpful during office hours. Made sure he didn't just help debug code, but also so you understood what was wrong.

• Knows his stuff

**18 - Comments**

**Hans Montero**

| Response Rate | 6/251 (2.39%) |
|---|---|

• unbelievable and communicative

• Hans is a magnificent TA! You can tell how much he loves to teach and spread his love for AP :) He describes everything in just enough detail, but is always willing to share fun facts and little intricacies that make learning C fun :) His review sessions are bomb and goofy (but informative!) and he is very generous with his time in OH, too. And his listserv responses? Timely and informative. 10/10 would review again

• Great TA! He is extremely helpful and approachable. He is always knowledgable of problems.

• Hans is great at explaining material in the way that a professor would during a lecture. You can tell that he always knows what he's doing, and even when he does make mistakes, he'll take the time to follow-up with the student to correct his initial statement. He was always very responsive on the listserv, and I appreciated how he gave specific examples during recitation to help students gain an in-depth understanding of the material (ex. Explaining fork() and execl() using diagrams and foreshadowing its use cases in OS). He's willing to answer questions no matter how much a student struggles with grappling a certain concept, and is also super approachable during his office hours.

• Hans was one of the most engaging and energetic TAs during review and especially paired with James Yang were a great review session duo efficiently answering questions fielded to them and also providing good code analysis.

• Really helpful. During a review session, I asked for something to be repeated/reexplained, and the TA lecturing didn't hear me, and he spoke up to slow it down a little and I really appreciated that. His emails to the list serve were also very clear and helpful.

**18 - Comments**

**Hollis Lehv**

| Response Rate | 1/251 (0.4%) |
|---|---|

• Hhollis is good TA. Hollis hollis hollis the hhollis. Also Rating Eli who is not here, but abstractly present, he is a chill guy.

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**18 - Comments**

**James Yang**

| Response Rate | 8/251 (3.19%) |
|---|---|

• Never interacted with in person, but his listserv answers were very comprehensive and detailed. Way better than I expected.

• Great TA!! Would love to have him in any subject.

• This guy can work as full time instructor already.

• James is THE C++ KING!!!! His review session for C++ was mad helpful and his handle on C is really impressive. He could debug my code without even looking at it sometimes and was always able to teach me how to handle my many valgrind errors. His listserv responses are top-notch, too, and I found myself frequently starring his for reference.

• Knowledgeable, helpful, and thorough! The TAs really are lifelines in this course. I'm very grateful that they're very good at their jobs.

• I attended James's office hours and C++ review sessions on multiple occasions and always found them helpful. When I went to his office hours, he spent time helping me work through an issue in my code (Lab 7) rather than just offering a piece of advice and moving on. I really appreciated the time he took to help me fix my code and fully understand what was causing the issue so that this did not happen again. His C++ review sessions were fun because of the enthusiasm that he brought to each one, even on Friday or Sunday night.

• James is so, so responsive on the listserv, especially when it came to C++. I appreciated how he ran through actual test files during recitations to demonstrate a certain concept. He also has incredibly sharp eyes, and is quick to identify sources of errors in a certain piece of code. He's willing to walk students through their struggles no matter what it takes, and was also instrumental in helping me understand sources of confusion in past exams/assignments.

• James was quite invaluable for the later labs (9 and 10) as he seemed to answer pretty much every listserv question. He was good at analysing the differences between C/C++ and exactly what the new C++ constructs did. He was also able to use his own personal experience as an undergraduate to engage students and show where AP and its concepts lie in the broader scheme of things.

**18 - Comments**

**Julia Guo**

| Response Rate | 0/251 (0%) |
|---|---|

**18 - Comments**

**Kent Hall**

| Response Rate | 4/251 (1.59%) |
|---|---|

• unbelievable and communicative

• I always saw Kent active in the listserv, answering student questions around the clock to the point his name stuck in my head. His responses were always clear and thorough, ensuring help was given and clarity was reached.

• Kent is suppppeeerr knowledgable and has some great listserv responses. Extremely helpful and we are very lucky :)

• Thanks for being so responsive on the listserv! Kent was always incredibly quick to respond to emails, which was really helpful when it came to close deadlines for a lab or exam. His detailed explanations also helped clarify confusing concepts, especially when it came to the unit on sockets and networks.

**18 - Comments**

**Lauren Ogden**

| Response Rate | 3/251 (1.2%) |
|---|---|

• Very helpful especially during super office hours!

• Lauren is super reliable and always explained things to me in ways that were easy to digest and comprehend. She was super helpful in the super OH as well :)

• Lauren really took the time to explain general concepts in a way that prepared me to tackle the labs. She does a great job of directing students towards the right direction without giving away too many details.

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**18 - Comments**

**Lucie Le Blanc**

| Response Rate | 11/251 (4.38%) |
|---|---|

• Lucie is incredibly knowledgable and explains difficult concepts so clearly.

• Lucie is the most helpful, knowledgeable, and kind TA that I have ever had. She makes me feel more confident to enter the tech world.

• she is my favorite ta!

• Lucie is the best! She explains everything so clearly and she is such an amazing person! I feel so lucky to have her as our TA.

• Lucie is an AMAZING TA. She always provided the best diagrams that I drew on all of my exams and for all of my labs. As a visual learner, I appreciated the effort she put into conveying the material as pictures instead of text. She is kind and generous and often sacrificed her own time for the students with no complaints or drop in energy. She is truly a gift and I know many students that have expressed how much she personally has helped them learn. Truly a top tier TA.

• I really appreciated having Lucie as a TA this semester. Her review sessions were very well organized and she presented the information very clearly and I really liked her use of metaphors. She was very kind and I got the sense that she really wanted students to understand everything and she always answered every question and went over material for a second time if necessary.

• She is the first Comp Sci TA I have felt comfortable with. Most are just trying to get through you to get to the next person, but Lucie cares that you understand and succeed.

• Lucie is honestly one of the best TAs I've ever had. She always presented the material at a great pace during recitations, and never spoke too quickly so that the student wouldn't get lost. During her office hours, she took the time to draw diagrams for the entire group present, so that every student could collectively understand what was going on and have each other's questions answered during the process. I always felt as if I could understand what she was saying and walked away with a clearer understanding of the concepts that I was initially confused about. Hearing her personal reflections on the course when she took it also significantly helped my journey through AP, since it enabled me to learn what worked and what didn't from the experiences of past TAs. I really appreciate her detailed explanations since day one, and can genuinely state that she led me to love AP despite its reputation for being an intimidating class.

• Lucie provided very clear explanations and diagrams for all concepts she took in review sessions and I would often go to her reviews over others because I found it was where I learned best/the most.

• Lucie is a great TA. She once helped me the day before a midterm wayy longer than she had to - she probably stayed until like midnight just to help explain to me and a group of students a really important concept. She's super friendly and explains concepts clearly and concisely.

• Was super knowledgeable and helpful! Really glad to have her as a TA. She clearly really cared a lot and was there to help for Lab 7 even though it wasn't her night to TA

**18 - Comments**

**Maria Kogan**

| Response Rate | 4/251 (1.59%) |
|---|---|

• Maria always knows how to encourage and make students feel like they are in the right place. She helped me when I felt the least confident in myself.

• Maria is a super kind person who is also really smart. She is perfect as a TA because she is gentle and wants to help you succeed.

• Maria was always so caring and helpful in OH! She always answered my questions so thoroughly even when I needed her to re-explain. Maria is a stellar TA and really helped me understand things when I got stuck.

• Maria's always so welcoming and is one of the most approachable TAs I've ever met. She helped draw diagrams for concepts that were difficult to understand, and also took the time to walk through confusing areas in a way that made the assignment less intimidating.

**18 - Comments**

**Matthew Broughton**

| Response Rate | 1/251 (0.4%) |
|---|---|

• Matthew was very approachable and helpful during office hours. I felt comfortable asking questions even if they felt like *stupid* questions, which I really appreciated.

**18 - Comments**

**Michael Jan**

| Response Rate | 6/251 (2.39%) |
|---|---|

• A splendid TA, always available and willing help, constantly improving his own knowledge in order to better aid students in their own learning.

• Michael is a CS legend

• Great guy

• Very patient and will go through everything with you step by step! Couldn't have asked for a better TA.

• Never interacted with in person, but his listserv answers were very comprehensive and detailed. Way better than I expected.

• Always willing to help understand the big-picture idea before jumping to code, and provides explanations in a very accessible manner. Thanks Michael!

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**18 - Comments**

**Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Rate | 2/251 (0.8%) |
|---|---|

• Best TA!

• Stanley is super patient during his office hours and often stayed past the amount of time that was listed on the calendar. Sometimes it seemed as though he didn't go through the lab manual before his office hours, which would've been helpful in saving time explaining the requirements of the assignment. However, he's very knowledgeable and willing to answer every question that the student has.

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**18 - Comments**

**Amanda Liu, Benjamin Most, Bill Chen, Brennan McManus, Catherine Chu, Gustaf Ahdritz, Hans Montero, Hollis Lehv, James Yang, Julia Guo, Kent Hall, Lauren Ogden, Lucie Le Blanc, Maria Kogan, Matthew Broughton, Michael Jan, Yuanhe Ye**

| Response Rate | |
|---|---|

• A splendid TA, always available and willing help, constantly improving his own knowledge in order to better aid students in their own learning.

• Michael is a CS legend

• Great guy

• Ben communicates effectively, not only in English but in C, his native tongue. MOST qualified TA by far, other TA's can Fork Bomb themselves.

• Hhollis is good TA. Hollis hollis hollis the hhollis. Also Rating Eli who is not here, but abstractly present, he is a chill guy.

• Very patient and will go through everything with you step by step! Couldn't have asked for a better TA.

• Really appreciated Bill for all his efforts to help students in the class!! I know he has a heavy workload himself but he still pulls through and does the utmost!

• Very helpful especially during super office hours!

• Amanda is one of the best TAs I have ever had and has made AP so much more doable.

• Catherine was so knowledgable and helpful in office hours.

• Lucie is incredibly knowledgable and explains difficult concepts so clearly.

• Lucie is the most helpful, knowledgeable, and kind TA that I have ever had. She makes me feel more confident to enter the tech world.

• Maria always knows how to encourage and make students feel like they are in the right place. She helped me when I felt the least confident in myself.

• Never interacted with in person, but his listserv answers were very comprehensive and detailed. Way better than I expected.

• Never interacted with in person, but his listserv answers were very comprehensive and detailed. Way better than I expected.

• Did a great job!

• Great TA!! Would love to have him in any subject.

• unbelievable and communicative

• unbelievable and communicative

• Brennan is such a kind person who also happens to love compsci. I only talked to him a few times but he was a great help and gently pushed me in the right direction.

• Cat is a really great TA. She always tried her best to help during office hours, even staying late to work through problems with us. I know it was super appreciated especially when TAs are so busy as well.

• Maria is a super kind person who is also really smart. She is perfect as a TA because she is gentle and wants to help you succeed.

• Solid chap!

• I always saw Kent active in the listserv, answering student questions around the clock to the point his name stuck in my head. His responses were always clear and thorough, ensuring help was given and clarity was reached.

• This guy can work as full time instructor already.

• she is my favorite ta!

• It was nice talking to you when I needed a help with fork()

• Lucie is the best! She explains everything so clearly and she is such an amazing person! I feel so lucky to have her as our TA.

• Best TA!

• Amanda is amazing at explaining the material of this course and her review sessions early on in the semester were super duper helpful for my beginning understanding of C. She's so kind and knowledgable and never failed to help me out whenever I needed it!

• Catherine is soooooososososo intelligent and capable and was an amazing TA! She could teach pointers to an art history major with no experience in programming with her explanations. She was exceptionally good at reassuring any understanding you already had and building upon it for more understanding.

• Lucie is an AMAZING TA. She always provided the best diagrams that I drew on all of my exams and for all of my labs. As a visual learner, I appreciated the effort she put into conveying the material as pictures instead of text. She is kind and generous and often sacrificed her own time for the students with no complaints or drop in energy. She is truly a gift and I know many students that have expressed how much she personally has helped them learn. Truly a top tier TA.

• Kent is suppppeeerr knowledgable and has some great listserv responses. Extremely helpful and we are very lucky :)

• Lauren is super reliable and always explained things to me in ways that were easy to digest and comprehend. She was super helpful in the super OH as well :)

• Hans is a magnificent TA! You can tell how much he loves to teach and spread his love for AP :) He describes everything in just enough detail, but is always willing to share fun facts and little intricacies that make learning C fun :) His review sessions are bomb and goofy (but informative!) and he is very generous with his time in OH, too. And his listserv responses? Timely and informative. 10/10 would review again

• Maria was always so caring and helpful in OH! She always answered my questions so thoroughly even when I needed her to re-explain. Maria is a stellar TA and really helped me understand things when I got stuck.

• James is THE C++ KING!!!! His review session for C++ was mad helpful and his handle on C is really impressive. He could debug my code without even looking at it sometimes and was always able to teach me how to handle my many valgrind errors. His listserv responses are top-notch, too, and I found myself frequently starring his for reference.

• *note: I would generally give all the TAs high marks. I singled out these two because they're the ones I had the most interaction with.* Knowledgeable, helpful, and thorough! The TAs really are lifelines in this course. I'm very grateful that they're very good at their jobs.

• Knowledgeable, helpful, and thorough! The TAs really are lifelines in this course. I'm very grateful that they're very good at their jobs.

• Great TA! Extremely helpful, he takes time to draw diagrams to get students to understand the problem rather than just pointing out solution.

• Great TA! He is extremely helpful and approachable. He is always knowledgable of problems.

• Amanda was always helpful in helping me work through the conceptual errors that I was having with an assignment or topic. She was enthusiastic and always seemed to have a very positive attitude in office hours, even after helping many people for extended periods of time. I appreciated how clearly she explained concepts and her willingness to answer follow-up questions.

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

• Matthew was very approachable and helpful during office hours. I felt comfortable asking questions even if they felt like *stupid* questions, which I really appreciated.

• I really appreciated having Lucie as a TA this semester. Her review sessions were very well organized and she presented the information very clearly and I really liked her use of metaphors. She was very kind and I got the sense that she really wanted students to understand everything and she always answered every question and went over material for a second time if necessary.

• I went to Gustaf's SmartPtr review session near the end of the semester and found it really helpful. The information was presented clearly and with examples. Additionally, he was very helpful with questions about lab 10, which I struggled with in the beginning. He was kind and did not make me feel dumb for making obvious mistakes, which I greatly appreciated.

• I attended James's office hours and C++ review sessions on multiple occasions and always found them helpful. When I went to his office hours, he spent time helping me work through an issue in my code (Lab 7) rather than just offering a piece of advice and moving on. I really appreciated the time he took to help me fix my code and fully understand what was causing the issue so that this did not happen again. His C++ review sessions were fun because of the enthusiasm that he brought to each one, even on Friday or Sunday night.

• She is the first Comp Sci TA I have felt comfortable with. Most are just trying to get through you to get to the next person, but Lucie cares that you understand and succeed.

• Always willing to help understand the big-picture idea before jumping to code, and provides explanations in a very accessible manner. Thanks Michael!

• Amanda's incredibly knowledgeable and is always willing to clarify any confusing concepts to students during her office hours.

• Bill always knows how to point students towards the right direction when it comes to labs. He's incredibly patient and will take the time to run through your approach to a problem together in order to figure out the source of the issue.

• Catherine's diagrams were incredibly helpful for the first midterm! Her explanation of pointers and memory allocation really helped prepare me for the exams, and I appreciate the amount of time she took to clarify concepts, even when I asked repeated versions of the same question.

• Lucie is honestly one of the best TAs I've ever had. She always presented the material at a great pace during recitations, and never spoke too quickly so that the student wouldn't get lost. During her office hours, she took the time to draw diagrams for the entire group present, so that every student could collectively understand what was going on and have each other's questions answered during the process. I always felt as if I could understand what she was saying and walked away with a clearer understanding of the concepts that I was initially confused about. Hearing her personal reflections on the course when she took it also significantly helped my journey through AP, since it enabled me to learn what worked and what didn't from the experiences of past TAs. I really appreciate her detailed explanations since day one, and can genuinely state that she led me to love AP despite its reputation for being an intimidating class.

• Stanley is super patient during his office hours and often stayed past the amount of time that was listed on the calendar. Sometimes it seemed as though he didn't go through the lab manual before his office hours, which would've been helpful in saving time explaining the requirements of the assignment. However, he's very knowledgeable and willing to answer every question that the student has.

• Thanks for being so responsive on the listserv! Kent was always incredibly quick to respond to emails, which was really helpful when it came to close deadlines for a lab or exam. His detailed explanations also helped clarify confusing concepts, especially when it came to the unit on sockets and networks.

• Lauren really took the time to explain general concepts in a way that prepared me to tackle the labs. She does a great job of directing students towards the right direction without giving away too many details.

• Hans is great at explaining material in the way that a professor would during a lecture. You can tell that he always knows what he's doing, and even when he does make mistakes, he'll take the time to follow-up with the student to correct his initial statement. He was always very responsive on the listserv, and I appreciated how he gave specific examples during recitation to help students gain an in-depth understanding of the material (ex. Explaining fork() and execl() using diagrams and foreshadowing its use cases in OS). He's willing to answer questions no matter how much a student struggles with grappling a certain concept, and is also super approachable during his office hours.

• Maria's always so welcoming and is one of the most approachable TAs I've ever met. She helped draw diagrams for concepts that were difficult to understand, and also took the time to walk through confusing areas in a way that made the assignment less intimidating.

• Benjamin is amazing at providing hints for students without giving away too much. He asks great questions to the student to help them engage with something they're struggle to get, rather than simply providing the answer. He really believes in the student and helps them bring out their true capabilities. Even when I felt unconfident about a certain approach, he always motivated me by indicating that I was on the right track, and then pointed out areas in which I could improve my methods.

• James is so, so responsive on the listserv, especially when it came to C++. I appreciated how he ran through actual test files during recitations to demonstrate a certain concept. He also has incredibly sharp eyes, and is quick to identify sources of errors in a certain piece of code. He's willing to walk students through their struggles no matter what it takes, and was also instrumental in helping me understand sources of confusion in past exams/assignments.

• Lucie provided very clear explanations and diagrams for all concepts she took in review sessions and I would often go to her reviews over others because I found it was where I learned best/the most.

• Hans was one of the most engaging and energetic TAs during review and especially paired with James Yang were a great review session duo efficiently answering questions fielded to them and also providing good code analysis.

• James was quite invaluable for the later labs (9 and 10) as he seemed to answer pretty much every listserv question. He was good at analysing the differences between C/C++ and exactly what the new C++ constructs did. He was also able to use his own personal experience as an undergraduate to engage students and show where AP and its concepts lie in the broader scheme of things.

• Lucie is a great TA. She once helped me the day before a midterm wayy longer than she had to - she probably stayed until like midnight just to help explain to me and a group of students a really important concept. She's super friendly and explains concepts clearly and concisely.

• I'm sure he personally knows the material but his explanations are made for people who already understand the material. His explanations are thus insensitive to those who are learning the topics for the first time and/or have a desire to learn the material. During review sessions, as he explained topics I already understood, I was amazed at how jumbled some explanations were (as such, after his explanations I was not surprised to see confused faces from those asking questions).

• Was super knowledgeable and helpful! Really glad to have her as a TA. She clearly really cared a lot and was there to help for Lab 7 even though it wasn't her night to TA

• Really helpful. During a review session, I asked for something to be repeated/reexplained, and the TA lecturing didn't hear me, and he spoke up to slow it down a little and I really appreciated that. His emails to the list serve were also very clear and helpful.

• Was very helpful during office hours. Made sure he didn't just help debug code, but also so you understood what was wrong.

• Catherine is a great TA!! But really all of the TAs for this class are the most helpful supportive people ever!! They were always there to answer questions on the listserv and in office hours and truly know what they are talking about. Couldn't have completed this course without them!

• Knows his stuff

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**19 - This semester we offered several resources for students to study and interact with the course. Please rate each item.**

**Sample exam review (super office hours)**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Get rid of it | (1) | 1 | 0.70% | | |
| Meh | (2) | 3 | 2.10% | | 4.10 |
| Somewhat useful | (3) | 15 | 10.49% | | |
| Very useful | (4) | 51 | 35.66% | | |
| Indispensable | (5) | 34 | 23.78% | | |
| I did not use this resource | (0) | 39 | 27.27% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 143/251 (56.97%) | 4.10 | 0.82 | 4.00 |

**19 - This semester we offered several resources for students to study and interact with the course. Please rate each item.**

**Mock exam**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Get rid of it | (1) | 1 | 0.70% | | |
| Meh | (2) | 1 | 0.70% | | 4.25 |
| Somewhat useful | (3) | 10 | 6.99% | | |
| Very useful | (4) | 42 | 29.37% | | |
| Indispensable | (5) | 38 | 26.57% | | |
| I did not use this resource | (0) | 51 | 35.66% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 143/251 (56.97%) | 4.25 | 0.78 | 4.00 |

**19 - This semester we offered several resources for students to study and interact with the course. Please rate each item.**

**Course listserv**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Get rid of it | (1) | 9 | 6.29% | | |
| Meh | (2) | 8 | 5.59% | | 3.90 |
| Somewhat useful | (3) | 20 | 13.99% | | |
| Very useful | (4) | 56 | 39.16% | | |
| Indispensable | (5) | 49 | 34.27% | | |
| I did not use this resource | (0) | 1 | 0.70% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 143/251 (56.97%) | 3.90 | 1.13 | 4.00 |

**19 - This semester we offered several resources for students to study and interact with the course. Please rate each item.**

**Weekly review sessions**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Get rid of it | (1) | 1 | 0.70% | | |
| Meh | (2) | 5 | 3.50% | | 3.70 |
| Somewhat useful | (3) | 35 | 24.48% | | |
| Very useful | (4) | 37 | 25.87% | | |
| Indispensable | (5) | 19 | 13.29% | | |
| I did not use this resource | (0) | 46 | 32.17% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 143/251 (56.97%) | 3.70 | 0.88 | 4.00 |

# Columbia University: School of Engineering
# Fall 2019 SEAS Final Evaluation

**Course:** COMSW3157_001_2019_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

**Instructor:** Jae Lee *

Gustaf Ahdritz,Matthew Broughton,Bill Chen,Catherine Chu,Julia Guo,Kent Hall,Michael Jan,Maria Kogan,Lucie Le Blanc,Hollis Lehv,Amanda Liu,Brennan McManus,Hans Montero,Benjamin Most,Lauren Ogden,James Yang,Yuanhe Ye

**Response Rate:** 150/251 (59.76 %)

**19 - This semester we offered several resources for students to study and interact with the course. Please rate each item.**

**Review videos on YouTube (see https://bit.ly/3157TV)**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Get rid of it | (1) | 2 | 1.40% | | |
| Meh | (2) | 4 | 2.80% | | |
| Somewhat useful | (3) | 25 | 17.48% | | |
| Very useful | (4) | 47 | 32.87% | | |
| Indispensable | (5) | 33 | 23.08% | | |
| I did not use this resource | (0) | 32 | 22.38% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |


| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 143/251 (56.97%) | 3.95 | 0.91 | 4.00 |

**19 - This semester we offered several resources for students to study and interact with the course. Please rate each item.**

**Review session notes on GitHub**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Get rid of it | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Meh | (2) | 3 | 2.10% | | |
| Somewhat useful | (3) | 23 | 16.08% | | |
| Very useful | (4) | 39 | 27.27% | | |
| Indispensable | (5) | 36 | 25.17% | | |
| I did not use this resource | (0) | 42 | 29.37% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |


| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 143/251 (56.97%) | 4.07 | 0.84 | 4.00 |

**19 - This semester we offered several resources for students to study and interact with the course. Please rate each item.**

**Section 2 exercises**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Get rid of it | (1) | 4 | 2.80% | | |
| Meh | (2) | 11 | 7.69% | | |
| Somewhat useful | (3) | 25 | 17.48% | | |
| Very useful | (4) | 13 | 9.09% | | |
| Indispensable | (5) | 7 | 4.90% | | |
| I did not use this resource | (0) | 83 | 58.04% | | |
| | | | | 0 25 50 100 | Question |


| Response Rate | Mean | STD | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| 143/251 (56.97%) | 3.13 | 1.07 | 3.00 |