### Course: COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

#### Instructor:

# Jae Lee \*

1 - Course: Amount Learned												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses	Means				
Poor	(1)	1	0.88%	1				4.21				
Fair	(2)	12	10.62%									
Good	(3)	10	8.85%									
Very Good	(4)	29	25.66%									
Excellent	(5)	61	53.98%									
			-	0	25	50	100	Question	1			
Response Rate						Mean		STD			Median	
113/244 (46.31%)				4.21				1.05			5.00	

2 - Course: Appropriateness of Workload	I								
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Poor	(1)	14	12.39%						
Fair	(2)	20	17.70%		3.24				
Good	(3)	28	24.78%						
Very Good	(4)	27	23.89%						
Excellent	(5)	24	21.24%						
				0 25 50 100	Question				
Response	Rate			Mean	STD	Median			
113/244 (46.	31%)			3.24	1.31	3.00			

3 - Course: Fairness of Grading Process												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respor	nses	Means				
Poor	(1)	11	9.73%									
Fair	(2)	22	19.47%					3.43				
Good	(3)	21	18.58%									
Very Good	(4)	25	22.12%									
Excellent	(5)	34	30.09%									
				0	25	50	100	Question				
Response Rate						Mean			STD	Me	edian	
113/244 (46.31%)						3.43			1.36	4	4.00	

4 - Course: Overall Quality													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses	Means					
Poor	(1)	6	5.31%					3.87					
Fair	(2)	11	9.73%					5.07					
Good	(3)	24	21.24%										
Very Good	(4)	23	20.35%										
Excellent	(5)	49	43.36%										
				0	25	50	100	Question					
Response Rate						Mean		STD			Median		
113/244 (46.31%)						3.87		1.23				4.00	

#### Course: COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

### Jae Lee \*

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

#### 5 - Enter any additional comments here

#### Response Rate 29/244 (11.89%)

• the worst class I've ever taken and professors I've had. I don't think the material is particularly difficult but through Jae's convoluted explanations and continuous instance that "this is very hard" "this is so confusing" he manages to make the class absolutely terrible.

· - horrible course, would never take again, but definitely learned a lot and it made me a good programmer. - overall love hate relationship with a strong veer towards hate

· Literally the most interesting course I've taken at Columbia.

• this course definitely requires a lot of time dedication, but as long as you put in the work in the right way, it is doable to do well

• Some lab due dates were too close to exam dates.

• Best course I've ever taken.

• i was scared as FUCK for ap bruh but not gonna lie it was alright

• The grading is stringent and poorly explained. Workload was often such that large exams and large lab assignments coincided so that one had little time to work meaningfully on either of them.

• The class is too big for its difficulty. I feel like I would have grasped more from a smaller class. On top of that, it is a very rushed class. Almost every week there is a lab. For example, if there is an exam on Thrusday, it would helpful to not have a lab due Saturday.

• I believe Jae runs an extremely fair and well organized class that has plenty of resources for people to succeed in, such as exam prep, detailed lecture notes and recordings, fast grading, and many accessible and knowledgeable TA's. I am very appreciative of how fast he grades exams and homeworks, and I believe that this class is set up so students will succeed if and only if they put in the time and effort (which is the way classes should be). I also think Jae's lectures are engaging and that he delivers information in a better way than most Columbia professors. However, I found the material itself to be almost irrelevant and somewhat useless to me, as a CS/Math major. Having this as a required class does weed out a lot of prospective CS majors and minors, but the content itself did not help me understand Computer Science or programming better than I did before. It was a niche subject that I doubt I will ever touch again.

• grading is pretty harsh from my experience, and TAs are not super quick on responding to questions on the listserv, which can result in late days being used while waiting for help

· Love this class, learned a lot, somewhat tough grading with basically no partial credit, but overall a good experience.

• Midterm 3 (which is effectively a cumulative final) should not be on the last day of lecture before reading week. Every big class (AP, Fundies etc.) thinks they can do this and students end up with 3 big finals on the last Thursday of the semester which is ridiculous. Reading week is meant to give students time to revise. If there is no time to schedule after reading week, then don't make your final midterm cumulative and finals-like. Keep the midterm as a midterm. Apart from this, the course is excellent, engaging and highly recommended.

• the midterms are very punishing for making small mistakes which mean you can understand the material

· Excellent Course. Very heavy workload but completely reasonable for the course and its requirements.

· AP Is epic

• Hands down the most organized and well taught class I've taken at Columbia. C isn't supposed to be easy, so obviously not everyone loves AP. However, if show up to every lecture and do the labs yourself, you'll do great!

• I think there should be more room for partial credit on exams, especially for questions that you have to write code for, because many times small errors resulted in 0 points, even if the logic or the rest of the code line was correct.

• Jae makes clear from day 1 that he is all about fairness. As such, he does not tolerate any cheating (good!) and he grades everyone on the same scale, with little question answering on tests and with static grading. While Jae believes these types of test procedures ensure fairness, I would beg to differ. I think that being fair means awarding partial credit and recognizing people's efforts. It's not "fair" to have a test average constantly be below 50% when students put in so much time and effort into succeeding. It is not "fair" not to answer student's questions in asking for. There are ways in which he could alter his tests and give his TAs guidelines to answer questions that don't make the tests all or nothing games.

• Amazing class, amazing professor. Please switch from using email for discussion to somethnig like Edstem for future semesters please (announcements should still be sent by email, but email is just not it for discussions, especially with such a big class)

• Great course learned a lot. Grading process not the fairest -- exams have many involved questions where the process matters a lot, but you are only graded on your final answer (not multiple choice). Felt like even though I understood the material, I would make small mistakes on the exams which caused my grade to not at all be reflective of my understanding of the course content

· Absolutely no partial credit on exams. When you miss an \* you get it incorrect, which is so silly

• Hardest class I've ever taken. I tried and studied very hard and still did not get it. Completely useless material for most of the CS industry anyway, as said by Jae himself. The homeworks basically take over your life. Easily 10+ hours a week, most weeks more than 15 hours. I would start the labs very early (within 48 hours of it being assigned) and still find myself very stressed out. The amount I stressed over a class that probably doesn't even matter in the long run was definitely very unhealthy. It got to the point where my parents became very worried about me. Jae is objectively an okay lecturer, but not anything outstanding. He didn't make me feel passionate about the course material and often times the instructions and hints for homeworks were extremely vague or just flat out wrong. Sometimes I genuinely worder if he derives pleasure from watching us suffer. The additional weight put on Lab 7 and crazy formula for dropping a lab essentially forces us to do it on top of all our studying for other classes during an already stressful reading week makes me wonder if he likes students at all. And no, it's not exactly easy to finish that lab before the reading week because with the timing that it's released, you need to first dedicate all your time to studying for the final exam. I really don't understand why he can't weight all the labs the same and just drop one of them normally (so you...it's still possible to get 100 average for your labs...), or maybe, I don't know...just don't assign a lab that overlaps with reading week altogether??? I cannot wait to voluntarily banish all this material out of my mind. I hated every second of it. Not a good class at all. Probably took years off my life. Please avoid it if you can. I will say that Jake Torres is an extremely kind and excellent TA. If he's not graduating early I would encourage Jae to continue hiring him.

. There was a lot to learn, but if you time it out well, you'll do fine

• I really learned a lot in this course, the curriculum was well organized, classroom delivery was excellent, and the assignments enhanced the material learned in lecture. If the content learned was all I was evaluating, I would give this course top marks. What significantly diminishes the quality and enjoyability of the course is a series of administrative decisions that have led to significantly lower of subox, it is still more difficult than it needs to be to find responses, and many students do not respect the listerv guidelines, making the experience worse for everyone. The listerv could be easily replaced with an Ed discussion board to make it easier to navigate it and silo it from the rest of one's email, without any additional downside. If instructional staff is adamant on preserving the listerv format, students, thus significantly degrading his sense of approachability. Before the first midterm, several events caused me to have significantly diminished mental health, and I did not feel prepared to take the exam. I did not want to drop the class (which was Jaes's instruction if an exam needed to be missed), and felt uncomfortable expressing vulnerability to my instructor given his expressed zero tolerance for offering make-up exams. 3. Further, teaching staff's express unvillingness to answer clarifying questions during exams projects a sense of apathy towards students from clarification about a test question and while it rarely ended up being necessary, the perception that teaching staff was not there to support me created the impression in my head that Advanced Programming was more of an enemy to be conquered than an opportunity to learn in a supportive environment. 4. Class weighting could benefit from shifting slightly towards more weight for labs. It fet unfair to spend many times more hours working on labs than studying for exams, only to have one word incorrect answer yield the same grade drop as a significant error on a lab. Advanced Programming had the potential to be one of my favorite classes

• One of the best classes I have taken here, perhaps the best. Learned a tremendous amount of computer system content but, more importantly, a style of coding that relies on conceptual understanding rather than trial-and-error. The grading system, teaching style, and assignments all encourage this form of learning.

• Exams are unnecessarily tricky and could be a hit or miss - for example, misreading / misunderstanding one line of code in the given code sample could lead to all wrong answers (based on predicted output) for the whole section that's worth maybe 30%. So the outcome is really bimodal. Workload is a lot but proportional to the amount learned.

Course:	COMSW3157_001_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING
Instructor:	Jae Lee *
	Brennan McManus,Tameem Asif,Justin Cange,Andrew Cheng,Joy He,Patrick Puma,Kevin Li,Jeremy Carin,Chloe Ho,Patrick Tong,Phoebe Lu,Helen Chu,Seyoung Ree,Benjamin Vazzana,Albert Jan,Shimon Sarkar,Shreya Somayajula,Faustina Cheng,Aidan Eichman,Dorothy Zhang,Ben Harrison,Jake Torres,Luke Xue,Avighna Suresh,Noam Zaid,Stanley Lin,Christine Li,Andrew Yang,Claudia Cortell
happen and it still v	ever struggled so much life. This class consumed my entire life. As someone who works while in school to be able to afford the city while attending, I've had to make the impossible was not enough. The exams are very unfair and cost way too much, considering the amount of time you spend on the labs. I spent most of my week coding for this class and in the because the incredibly difficult exams diminished all of my hard work in as little as one question wrong. "Some of you will not do well even if you try your hardest." I struggled so o rest a little now.

### Course: COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

### Instructor:

# Jae Lee \*

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

6 - Instructor: Organization an	d Preparation						
Jae Lee							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Mea	ans	
Poor	(1)	3	2.65%		4.27		
Fair	(2)	6	5.31%				
Good	(3)	12	10.62%				
Very Good	(4)	28	24.78%				
Excellent	(5)	64	56.64%				
				0 25 50 100	Instructor		
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median	
113/244 (46.31%)				4.27	1.03	5.00	

#### 7 - Instructor: Classroom Delivery

Jae Lee												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses						Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	3	2.65%	I				4.2	5			
Fair	(2)	6	5.31%									
Good	(3)	16	14.16%									
Very Good	(4)	23	20.35%									
Excellent	(5)	65	57.52%									
				0	25	50	100	Instru	ictor			
Response R		Mean				STD			N	edian		
113/244 (46.3				4.25				1.06		5.00		

#### 8 - Instructor: Approachability

Jae Lee									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Poor	(1)	11	9.73%						
Fair	(2)	20	17.70%		3.46				
Good	(3)	21	18.58%						
Very Good	(4)	28	24.78%						
Excellent	(5)	33	29.20%						
				0 25 50 100	Instructor				
Response Ra	ite			Mean	STD	Median			
113/244 (46.31	1%)			3.46	1.34	4.00			

9 - Instructor: Overall Quality							
Jae Lee							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	5	4.42%	I	4.04		
Fair	(2)	8	7.08%				
Good	(3)	18	15.93%				
Very Good	(4)	29	25.66%				
Excellent	(5)	53	46.90%				
				0 25 50 100	Instructor		
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median	
	113/244 (46.31%)			4.04	1.15	4.00	

Jae Lee \*

### Course: COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

### Instructor:

10 - Would you nominate this professor for	the SEA	S Distinguish	ed Faculty	Award	?						
Jae Lee											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans	
Yes	(1)	66	65.35%					1.35			
No	(2)	35	34.65%								
				0	25	50	100	Instructor			
Response Ra	te			Mean					STD	M	edian
101/244 (41.39				1.35			0.48		1.00		

#### Instructor:

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Jae Lee \*

Jae Lee	
Response Rate	36/244 (14.75%)
•	passionate about the material. his classes are never boring to attend and while AP covers a lot of material, he makes an effort to keep everything engaging a
guide us along.	
I felt that Jae presented his prepared	materials very well. There was excellent structure.
Professor Lee is extremely knowledg	eable, prepared, and passionate about his teaching.
professor Lee is exceptional	
Jae knows how to teach this class. I	ike how he structured it and did an excellent job teaching all the material via class and the (sometimes hosted) Friday recitations.
he's the best lecturer in the CS depart	tment.
made the complex content very clear	and straight-forward
content incredibly interesting and a po	bugh the content seems daunting, his organization of the class and the quality and content of his lectures prepared me for labs. Following his class, I find AF tential focus that I'd like to further study or pursue a career in. I know more about things that I typically take for granted, like web servers. I also appreciate ho than having labs due when we get back. I really enjoyed this class.
Best professor I've had at Columbia.	
• really great lecturer and makes me w	ant to push myself in CS
This is unacceptable fr students with c	class then took several minutes to set up before starting class 15-20 minutes late, then holding students for a similar amount of extra time at the end of class asses following this one who thus had to be late to another class or miss key information from this lecture.
he is good	
<ul> <li>Very nice and knoledgeble.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Great professor, taught many difficult</li> </ul>	concepts, very fair.
<ul> <li>Very well run class.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>keeps lectures engaging and is relati</li> </ul>	vely receptive to students' feedback
Jae is a great teacher and knows where	at hes talking about. The class is full of complex and difficult topics but Jae has a grasp on all of them which is not something many people can do.
Just an amazing teacher. I understar course.	nd that part of the reason he can't do partial credit is because of the size of the class, so I get it. I've learned a lot about computer science as a whole from the transmission of the size of the size of the class, so I get it. I've learned a lot about computer science as a whole from the size of the si
hes a Columbia classic	
<ul> <li>Not only is he extremely prepared w quality and wants his students to learn</li> </ul>	ith his content, but he cares about the students and topic he is teaching as well. Despite the difficulty of the class you can tell that he cares about the over .
Best class I've ever taken	
•-	
Phenomenal professor in every way.	Entertaining, Caring, and extremely knowledgeable.
<ul> <li>Jae is pretty epic</li> </ul>	
when it comes to CS and teaching rea	ass like this), communicates material very well, and teaches exactly what is necessary - not more, not less. The visibly active playfulness and enjoyment he h ches the students and makes the class atmosphere the ideal learning environment. What's even more important is that you can tell the man is an expert in wh sees this large, and I that alone is enough to to qualify Professor Jae as Distinguished.
• Jae seems like he really does care a	pout his students and he developed this course which is very cool.
I'm a second bachelor's degree stude	ent. I was moved by the precise and clear explanation that I didn't feel while getting my previous degree.
Great course and great professor	
Jae Lee is a professor. He goes to th	e classroom to teach to help students learn difficult concepts. He does not come empty handed in any way but always thoughtful and knowledgable.
Difficult class, but made it approacha	ble and fun!
Good teacher.	
Jae Lee is a fantastic professor. His Would definitely recommend him for the	course is really difficult but I really enjoyed his teaching and I got a lot out of this course. His explanations are really thorough and I liked his teaching style a I e SEAS Distinguished Faculty Award.
	mely clear and he understood what would be difficult to comprehend well, which I have not found to be common among other professors who also rea his lectures were incredibly organized and the examples solidified knowledge of all the major concepts covered in class.
• Extremely efficient and effective in te be 2-3x of other classes given the limit	aching & designing projects to help students learn the materials - very strong support from TAs. Course optimally designed and executed such that learning c of class time.
He's incredibly good at teaching. He's	s just a really harsh grader.
• I think he's a very accomplished teac	her and he does a good job teaching this course. It's a difficult subject but he makes it understandable.

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality											
Aidan Eichman											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Resp	onses			Means		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.43				
Fair	(2)	1	14.29%								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	14.29%								
Excellent	(5)	5	71.43%								
				0	25 50	100	TA				
R	Response Rate							STD		Median	
7/244 (2.87%)					4.43			1.13		5.00	

12 - Overall Quality											
Albert Jan											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses		Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.70			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
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	M	edian
	10/244 (4.10%)					4.70			0.67	Į	5.00

12 - Overall Quality						
Andrew Cheng						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	М	eans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.40	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1		
Good	(3)	2	20.00%			
Very Good	(4)	2	20.00%			
Excellent	(5)	6	60.00%			
			•	0 25 50 100	TA	
Respons	e Rate			Mean	STD	Median
10/244 (4	.10%)			4.40	0.84	5.00

12 - Overall Quality									
Andrew Yang									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4	.20			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%						
Good	(3)	2	40.00%						
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	]					
Excellent	(5)	3	60.00%						
				0 25 50 100		ТА			
	Response Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian
	5/244 (2.05%)			4.20			1.10	5	.00

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality									
Avighna Suresh									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	nt Respo	nses		Mea	ins
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.60		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1					
Good	(3)	1	10.00%						
Very Good	(4)	2	20.00%						
Excellent	(5)	7	70.00%						
				0 25	5 50	100	TA		
Res	ponse Rate				Mean			STD	Median
10/	244 (4.10%)				4.60			0.70	5.00

12 - Overall Quality											
Ben Harrison											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Re	spons	es		Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.43			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%								
Good	(3)	2	28.57%								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	5	71.43%								
				0 2	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Me	ean			STD	Me	edian
	7/244 (2.87%)				4.	.43			0.98	Ę	5.00

12 - Overall Quality							
Benjamin Vazzana							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.33		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]			
Good	(3)	1	33.33%				
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	]			
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%				
			•	0 25 50 100	TA		
Response	Rate			Mean		STD	Median
3/244 (1.2	3%)			4.33		1.15	5.00

12 - Overall Quality										
Brennan McManus										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	nt Respon	ses		Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				4.50			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	2	20.00%							
Very Good	(4)	1	10.00%							
Excellent	(5)	7	70.00%							
				0 2	5 50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian
	10/244 (4.10%)				4.50			0.85	5	.00

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality							
Chloe Ho							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.25		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]			
Good	(3)	1	25.00%				
Very Good	(4)	1	25.00%				
Excellent	(5)	2	50.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	4/244 (1.64%)			4.25		0.96	4.50

12 - Overall Quality										
Christine Li										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	es		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				4.00			
Fair	(2)	1	20.00%							
Good	(3)	1	20.00%							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1						
Excellent	(5)	3	60.00%							
	·			0 25	50	100	TA			
Respo	nse Rate				Mean			STD	M	edian
5/244	(2.05%)				4.00			1.41	Į	5.00

12 - Overall Quality										
Claudia Cortell										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	ses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.67			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	1	11.11%							
Very Good	(4)	1	11.11%							
Excellent	(5)	7	77.78%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
R	esponse Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian
9	9/244 (3.69%)				4.67			0.71	5	.00

12 - Overall Quality							
Dorothy Zhang							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.00		
Fair	(2)	2	25.00%				
Good	(3)	1	12.50%				
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%				
Excellent	(5)	5	62.50%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	8/244 (3.28%)			4.00		1.41	5.00

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality												
Faustina Cheng												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respo	nses			Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.50				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	1	25.00%									
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			s	TD	IV	edian
	4/244 (1.64%)					4.50			1	.00		5.00

12 - Overall Quality										
Helen Chu										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	nt Respo	nses		Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				4.57			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	1	14.29%							
Very Good	(4)	1	14.29%							
Excellent	(5)	5	71.43%							
				0 2	5 50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian
	7/244 (2.87%)				4.57			0.79	5	i.00

12 - Overall Quality						
Jake Torres						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Me	ans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.60	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1		
Good	(3)	2	13.33%			
Very Good	(4)	2	13.33%			
Excellent	(5)	11	73.33%			
				0 25 50 100	ТА	
Respo	onse Rate			Mean	STD	Median
15/24	4 (6.15%)			4.60	0.74	5.00

12 - Overall Quality											
Jeremy Carin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent R	lespo	nses		l	Means	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	I				4.55			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	5	17.24%		I						
Very Good	(4)	3	10.34%								
Excellent	(5)	21	72.41%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				N	Nean			STD		Median
	29/244 (11.89%)	29/244 (11.89%)							0.78		5.00

### Course:

### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality									
Joy He									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	Means		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.67				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%						
Good	(3)	1	16.67%						
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1					
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%						
				0 25 50 100	TA				
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median		
	6/244 (2.46%)			4.67		0.82	5.00		

12 - Overall Quality										
Justin Cange										
Response Option	Weigh	t Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				4.50			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	1	25.00%							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1						
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	M	ədian
	4/244 (1.64%)				4.50			1.00		5.00

12 - Overall Quality									
Kevin Li									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Respons	es		Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			4.67			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]					
Good	(3)	1	16.67%						
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%						
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%						
				0 25 50	100	TA			
Respo	nse Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian
6/244	(2.46%)			4.67			0.82	5	.00

12 - Overall Quality							
Luke Xue							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	I	4.64		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]			
Good	(3)	1	9.09%	]			
Very Good	(4)	2	18.18%				
Excellent	(5)	8	72.73%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	11/244 (4.51%)			4.64		0.67	5.00

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality										
Noam Zaid										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percer	nt Respon	ses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.80			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1						
Very Good	(4)	1	20.00%							
Excellent	(5)	4	80.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian
	5/244 (2.05%)				4.80			0.45	5	.00

12 - Overall Quality													
Patrick Puma													
Response Option	N	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respor	ises	Меа	ans			
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					4.56				
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good		(3)	2	22.22%									
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	7	77.78%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate						Mean				STD	I	ledian
	9/244 (3.69%)						4.56				0.88		5.00

12 - Overall Quality											
Patrick Tong											
Response Option	Weig	nt Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses		Mea	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.71			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	14.29%								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%								
Excellent	(5)	6	85.71%								
		•		0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	7/244 (2.87%)					4.71			0.76		5.00

12 - Overall Quality							
Phoebe Lu							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mear	ıs
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.44		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%				
Good	(3)	1	11.11%				
Very Good	(4)	3	33.33%				
Excellent	(5)	5	55.56%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	9/244 (3.69%)			4.44		0.73	5.00

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality										
Seyoung Ree										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	es		Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.17			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]						
Good	(3)	2	33.33%							
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%							
Excellent	(5)	3	50.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Median	
	6/244 (2.46%)				4.17			0.98	4.50	

12 - Overall Quality												
Shimon Sarkar												
Response Option	Wei	ight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans	
Poor	(1	1)	0	0.00%					4.50			
Fair	(2	2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3	3)	1	16.67%								
Very Good	(4	4)	1	16.67%								
Excellent	(5	5)	4	66.67%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate						Mean			STD	M	edian
	6/244 (2.46%)						4.50			0.84		5.00

12 - Overall Quality									
Shreya Somayajula									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Response	es		Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			4.67			
Fair	(2)	1	3.03%	]					
Good	(3)	1	3.03%	]					
Very Good	(4)	6	18.18%						
Excellent	(5)	25	75.76%						
			•	0 25 50	100	TA			
Response	Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian
33/244 (13.	52%)			4.67			0.69	5	.00

12 - Overall Quality											
Stanley Lin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent F	Respon	ses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	6	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	ədian
	6/244 (2.46%)					5.00			0.00	4	5.00

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

12 - Overall Quality											
Tameem Asif											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respo	nses			Means	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.29			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	2	28.57%								
Very Good	(4)	1	14.29%								
Excellent	(5)	4	57.14%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Median
	7/244 (2.87%)					4.29			0.95		5.00

#### 12 - Overall Quality

Aidan Eichman, Albert Jan, Andrew Cheng, Andrew Yang, Avighna Suresh, Ben Harrison, Benjamin Vazzana, Brennan McManus, Chloe Ho, Christine Li, Claudia Cortell, Dorothy Zhang, Faustina Cheng, Helen Chu, Jake Torres, Jeremy Carin, Joy He, Justin Cange, Kevin Li, Luke Xue, Noam Zaid, Patrick Puma, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Seyoung Ree, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Stanley Lin, Tameem Asif

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respoi	nses		Mea	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.53			
Fair	(2)	5	1.94%	1							
Good	(3)	38	14.73%								
Very Good	(4)	30	11.63%								
Excellent	(5)	185	71.71%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	M	edian
						4.53			0.81	Į	5.00

#### 13 - Knowledgeability Aidan Eichman Percent Responses **Response Option** Weight Frequency Percent Means Poor (1) 0 0.00% Fair (2) 0 0.00% 0 (3) 0.00% Good Very Good (4) 1 16.67% Excellent (5) 5 83.33% 0 25 50 100 TA Response Rate STD Median Mean 6/244 (2.46%) 4.83 0.41 5.00

13 - Knowledgeability	13 - Knowledgeability												
Albert Jan													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses		м	eans		
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.75				
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good		(3)	1	12.50%									
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	7	87.50%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	N	edian	
	8/244 (3.28%	)					4.75			0.71		5.00	

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability										
Andrew Cheng										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	es		Mea	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.25			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]						
Good	(3)	2	25.00%							
Very Good	(4)	2	25.00%							
Excellent	(5)	4	50.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian
	8/244 (3.28%)				4.25			0.89	4	.50

13 - Knowledgeability									
Andrew Yang									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	ses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.50		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1					
Good	(3)	1	25.00%						
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1					
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%						
				0 25	50	100	TA		
Respon	se Rate				Mean			STD	Median
4/244 (	1.64%)				4.50			1.00	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability									
Avighna Suresh									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Respons	es		Меа	ins	
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			
Respons	e Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian
8/244 (3	3.28%)			4.88			0.35	5	.00

13 - Knowledgeability									
Ben Harrison									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Re	esponses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			4.75			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1					
Very Good	(4)	1	25.00%						
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%						
				0 25	50 100	TA			
	Response Rate			Me	ean		STD	Median	
	4/244 (1.64%)			4.	.75		0.50	5.00	

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability										
Benjamin Vazzana										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	es		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1			4.00			
Good	(3)	1	50.00%							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1						
Excellent	(5)	1	50.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	edian
	2/244 (0.82%)				4.00			1.41	4	1.00

13 - Knowledgeability								
Brennan McManus								
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Response	s		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			4.44		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]				
Good	(3)	2	22.22%					
Very Good	(4)	1	11.11%					
Excellent	(5)	6	66.67%					
				0 25 50 1	00	TA		
Re	sponse Rate			Mean			STD	Median
9/	244 (3.69%)			4.44			0.88	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability							
Chloe Ho							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.00		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]	4.00		
Good	(3)	1	33.33%				
Very Good	(4)	1	33.33%				
Excellent	(5)	1	33.33%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
Respo	nse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
3/244	(1.23%)			4.00		1.00	4.00

13 - Knowledgeability										
Christine Li										
Response Option	Weigh	t Frequency	Percent	Percent	Response	es		Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.00			
Fair	(2)	1	33.33%				4.00			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1						
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%							
		•	•	0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	edian
	3/244 (1.23%)				4.00			1.73	5	5.00

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability											
Claudia Cortell											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respor	nses		М	eans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.86			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	14.29%								
Excellent	(5)	6	85.71%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	7/244 (2.87%)					4.86			0.38		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Dorothy Zhang												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respo	nses			Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	1	16.67%					4.00	,			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	1	16.67%									
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	4	66.67%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
Response F	Rate					Mean				STD	Median	
6/244 (2.46	%)					4.00				1.67	5.00	

13 - Knowledgeability						
Faustina Cheng						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	м	eans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.33	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1		
Good	(3)	1	33.33%			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%			
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%			
				0 25 50 100	TA	
Respo	onse Rate			Mean	STD	Median
3/244	(1.23%)			4.33	1.15	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability											
Helen Chu											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent Re	espons	ses		Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.60			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	20.00%								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	4	80.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				М	ean			STD	Me	dian
	5/244 (2.05%)				4	.60			0.89	5	5.00

### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability											
Jake Torres											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respo	nses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.64			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	9.09%								
Very Good	(4)	2	18.18%								
Excellent	(5)	8	72.73%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	11/244 (4.51%)					4.64			0.67		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability											
Jeremy Carin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respo	nses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.64			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	2	7.14%								
Very Good	(4)	6	21.43%								
Excellent	(5)	20	71.43%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
2	28/244 (11.48%)					4.64			0.62	4	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Joy He												
Response Option	w	leight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent F	Respor	ises		Mea	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					5.00			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent		(5)	5	100.00%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate						Mean			STD	M	edian
	5/244 (2.05%)						5.00			0.00		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability									
Justin Cange									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	t Respon	ises		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.33		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]					
Good	(3)	1	33.33%						
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1					
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%						
				0 25	50	100	TA		
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Median
	3/244 (1.23%)				4.33			1.15	5.00

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability											
Kevin Li											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.60			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	20.00%								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	4	80.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	5/244 (2.05%)					4.60			0.89		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability											
Luke Xue											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Respo	onses			Means		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				4.75				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	2	25.00%								
Excellent	(5)	6	75.00%								
				0 2	25 50	100	TA				
F	Response Rate				Mean			STD		Me	dian
	8/244 (3.28%)				4.75			0.46		5	.00

13 - Knowledgeability											
Noam Zaid											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respor	ises		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%								
	·			0	25	50	100	TA			
Response	Rate					Mean			STD	n	ledian
3/244 (1.:	23%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability											
Patrick Puma											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent R	lespor	nses		Mea	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	ļ				4.63			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	12.50%								
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%								
Excellent	(5)	6	75.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				N	lean			STD	M	ədian
	8/244 (3.28%)					4.63			0.74		5.00

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability													
Patrick Tong													
Response Option	۱	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent I	Respor	nses			Mea	ns	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.00				
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	5	100.00%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate						Mean			STD		M	edian
	5/244 (2.05%)						5.00			0.00			5.00

13 - Knowledgeabil	ity
--------------------	-----

Phoebe Lu											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respo	nses		M	eans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.43			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	14.29%								
Very Good	(4)	2	28.57%								
Excellent	(5)	4	57.14%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	7/244 (2.87%)					4.43			0.79		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability										
Seyoung Ree										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percer	nt Respon	ses		Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			0.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1			3.80			
Good	(3)	3	60.00%							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1						
Excellent	(5)	2	40.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Med	lian
	5/244 (2.05%)							1.10	3.	00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Shimon Sarkar												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent I	Respor	nses			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.60				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	1	20.00%									
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	4	80.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			S	STD	M	edian
	5/244 (2.05%)								(	).89		5.00

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

13 - Knowledgeability												
Shreya Somayajula												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respor	nses		Ме	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.69			
Fair		(2)	1	3.13%								
Good		(3)	1	3.13%								
Very Good		(4)	5	15.63%								
Excellent		(5)	25	78.13%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate	Э					Mean			STD	M	ədian
	32/244 (13.11%	)			4.69				0.69		5.00	

13 - Knowledgeability											
Stanley Lin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respor	nses		Mea	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.75			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	25.00%								
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Respons	e Rate					Mean			STD	N	edian
4/244 (1	64%)					4.75			0.50		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability											
Tameem Asif											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respo	nses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.50			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	16.67%								
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%								
Excellent	(5)	4	66.67%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response R	ate					Mean			STD	M	edian
6/244 (2.46	%)					4.50			0.84		5.00

#### 13 - Knowledgeability

Aidan Eichman, Albert Jan, Andrew Cheng, Andrew Yang, Avighna Suresh, Ben Harrison, Benjamin Vazzana, Brennan McManus, Chloe Ho, Christine Li, Claudia Cortell, Dorothy Zhang, Faustina Cheng, Helen Chu, Jake Torres, Jeremy Carin, Joy He, Justin Cange, Kevin Li, Luke Xue, Noam Zaid, Patrick Puma, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Seyoung Ree, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Stanley Lin, Tameem Asif

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respo	nses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	1	0.47%					4.59			
Fair	(2)	2	0.95%	1							
Good	(3)	24	11.37%								
Very Good	(4)	28	13.27%								
Excellent	(5)	156	73.93%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	M	edian
						4.59			0.77	4	5.00

### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

14 - Approachability										
Aidan Eichman										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respon	ses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1						
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1						
Excellent	(5)	5	100.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Median	
5/244 (2.05%)					5.00			0.00 5.00		

14 - Approachability												
Albert Jan												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses			М	eans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.0	00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	7	100.00%									
		•		0	25	50	100	Т	A			
	Response Rate					Mean				STD		Median
	7/244 (2.87%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

### 14 - Approachability

Andrew Cheng												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent R	espor	nses			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.57				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	3	42.86%									
Excellent	(5)	4	57.14%									
	•			0	25	50	100	TA				
Respon	ise Rate				M	lean			STD		Me	dian
7/244 (	2.87%)				4	1.57			0.53		5	.00

14 - Approachability								
Andrew Yang								
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.50	)		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%					
Good	(3)	1	25.00%					
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%					
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%					
				0 25 50 100	TA			
	Response Rate			Mean		STD		Median
	4/244 (1.64%)			4.50		1.00		5.00

### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability												
Avighna Suresh												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respoi	ises			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.00				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	8	100.00%									
		•		0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Me	dian
	8/244 (3.28%)					5.00			0.00		5	.00

14 - Approachability													
Ben Harrison													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respor	nses			Mea	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					5.00	)			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	4	100.00%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate	e					Mean				STD		Median
	4/244 (1.64%)						5.00				0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability												
Benjamin Vazzana												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	ercent	Respo	nses			Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.00				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	1	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			5	STD	M	edian
	1/244 (0.41%)								(	0.00	4	5.00

14 - Approachability												
Brennan McManus												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent R	espor	nses			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.63				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	1	12.50%									
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%									
Excellent	(5)	6	75.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate				N	lean			STD		Me	dian
	8/244 (3.28%)					4.63			0.74		5	5.00

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability										
Chloe Ho										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Respon	ses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.50			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1						
Very Good	(4)	1	50.00%							
Excellent	(5)	1	50.00%							
				0	25 50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	edian
	2/244 (0.82%)				4.50			0.71	4	1.50

14 - Approachability												
Christine Li												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent I	Respo	nses		Me	ans		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.00				
Fair	(2)	1	33.33%									
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Median	
	3/244 (1.23%)					4.00			1.73		5.00	

14 - Approachability							
Claudia Cortell							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mear	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	5.00		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%				
Excellent	(5)	7	100.00%				
	÷			0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	7/244 (2.87%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

14 - Approachability							
Dorothy Zhang							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mear	าร
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.67		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%				
Good	(3)	1	16.67%				
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%				
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	6/244 (2.46%)		4.67		0.82	5.00	

### Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability							
Faustina Cheng							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ins
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	5.00		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	]			
Excellent	(5)	2	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	2/244 (0.82%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

14 - Approachability												
Helen Chu												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent I	Respor	nses			Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.0	0			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	Т	٩			
	Response Rate					Mean				STD		Median
	3/244 (1.23%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability						
Jake Torres						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	N	leans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.91	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1		
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1		
Very Good	(4)	1	9.09%			
Excellent	(5)	10	90.91%			
		•	•	0 25 50 100	TA	
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
	11/244 (4.51%)			4.91	0.30	5.00

14 - Approachability											
Jeremy Carin											
Response Option	v	Neight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	t Respo	nses		м	eans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%				4.31			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good		(3)	6	23.08%							
Very Good		(4)	6	23.08%							
Excellent		(5)	14	53.85%							
					0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	Me	edian
	26/244 (10.66%)					4.31			0.84	5	5.00

### Course:

### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability							
Joy He							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ins
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)	4	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	4/244 (1.64%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

14 - Approachability												
Justin Cange												
Response Option	Weigh	t Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respon	ises		Ν	leans	;	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	2	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Me	dian
	2/244 (0.82%)					5.00			0.00		5	.00

14 - Approachability							
Kevin Li							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	5.00		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%				
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	]			
Excellent	(5)	4	100.00%				
	·		•	0 25 50 100	TA		
Response	Rate			Mean		STD	Median
4/244 (1.	64%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

14 - Approachability							
Luke Xue							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	ļ	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		
Res	ponse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
8/2	44 (3.28%)			4.88		0.35	5.00

Jae Lee \*

# Course:

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

14 - Approachability											
Noam Zaid											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respor	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	N	ledian
	3/244 (1.23%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability											
Patrick Puma											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	ises		Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.86			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	14.29%								
Excellent	(5)	6	85.71%								
		·		0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	N	ledian
	7/244 (2.87%)					4.86			0.38		5.00

14 - Approachability									
Patrick Tong									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Mear	าร	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.80	)			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]					
Very Good	(4)	1	20.00%						
Excellent	(5)	4	80.00%						
			•	0 25 50 100	TA	<b>\</b>			
	Response Rate			Mean		STD		Me	dian
	5/244 (2.05%)			4.80		0.45		5	.00

14 - Approachability									
Phoebe Lu									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	t Respor	ises		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.17		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]					
Good	(3)	1	16.67%						
Very Good	(4)	3	50.00%						
Excellent	(5)	2	33.33%						
				0 25	50	100	TA		
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Median
	6/244 (2.46%)				4.17			0.75	4.00

Jae Lee \*

# Course:

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

14 - Approachability												
Seyoung Ree												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent I	Respo	nses			Mean	s	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.50				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	1	25.00%									
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Me	edian
	4/244 (1.64%)					4.50			1.00		Ę	5.00

14 - Approachability												
Shimon Sarkar												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respon	ises		Меа	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					5.00			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent		(5)	4	100.00%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate	•					Mean			STD	N	ledian
	4/244 (1.64%)						5.00			0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability								
Shreya Somayajula								
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.74			
Fair	(2)	1	3.23%	]				
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	ון				
Very Good	(4)	5	16.13%					
Excellent	(5)	25	80.65%					
				0 25 50 100	TA			
Response R	ate			Mean		STD	Me	dian
31/244 (12.7	0%)			4.74		0.63	5	.00

14 - Approachability											
Stanley Lin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	ercent F	Respon	ses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	4	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	ədian
	4/244 (1.64%)					5.00			0.00	4	5.00

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

14 - Approachability											
Tameem Asif											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent l	Respor	nses		Ν	leans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.80			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	20.00%								
Excellent	(5)	4	80.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	1	ledian
	5/244 (2.05%)					4.80			0.45		5.00

#### 14 - Approachability

Aidan Eichman, Albert Jan, Andrew Cheng, Andrew Yang, Avighna Suresh, Ben Harrison, Benjamin Vazzana, Brennan McManus, Chloe Ho, Christine Li, Claudia Cortell, Dorothy Zhang, Faustina Cheng, Helen Chu, Jake Torres, Jeremy Carin, Joy He, Justin Cange, Kevin Li, Luke Xue, Noam Zaid, Patrick Puma, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Seyoung Ree, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Stanley Lin, Tameem Asif

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.73			
Fair	(2)	2	1.05%								
Good	(3)	11	5.76%								
Very Good	(4)	24	12.57%								
Excellent	(5)	154	80.63%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	M	edian
						4.73			0.61	1	5.00

····,											
Aidan Eichman											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent F	Respoi	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	4	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Respo	onse Rate				I	Mean			STD	M	edian
4/244	4 (1.64%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

15 - Availability										
Albert Jan										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percer	nt Respon	ses		Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.83			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1						
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%							
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian
	6/244 (2.46%)				4.83			0.41	5	.00

Jae Lee \*

# Course:

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

15 - Availability											
Andrew Cheng											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent F	Respoi	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.17			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	2	33.33%								
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%								
Excellent	(5)	3	50.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				I	Mean			STD	M	edian
	6/244 (2.46%)					4.17			0.98		1.50

15 - Availability													
Andrew Yang													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	ent R	Respoi	nses			Me	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					4.3	3			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good		(3)	1	33.33%									
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	2	66.67%									
					0	25	50	100	Т	A			
	Response Rat	e				ľ	Mean				STD	N	edian
	3/244 (1.23%)						4.33				1.15		5.00

15 - Availability												
Avighna Suresh												
Response Option	v	Veight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respon	ses		Mea	ins	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.71			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	1	14.29%								
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent		(5)	6	85.71%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate						Mean			STD	Me	edian
	7/244 (2.87%)						4.71			0.76	5	i.00

15 - Availability												
Ben Harrison												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respor	ises			Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%									
		•		0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			\$	STD	M	edian
	3/244 (1.23%)					5.00			(	0.00		5.00

# Course:

### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability									
Benjamin Vazzana									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	nt Respo	nses		Меа	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1					
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1					
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1					
Excellent	(5)	0	0.00%	1			0.00		
				0 2	5 50	100	TA		
Respo	nse Rate				Mean			STD	Median
0/244	(0.00%)				0.00			0.00	0.00

15 - Availability												
Brennan McManus												
Response Option	W	/eight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respo	nses		Меа	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.50			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	1	12.50%								
Very Good		(4)	2	25.00%								
Excellent		(5)	5	62.50%								
	•				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate						Mean			STD	Me	edian
	8/244 (3.28%)						4.50			0.76	Ę	5.00

15 - Availability									
Chloe Ho									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	5		Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1		4.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]		4.00			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]					
Very Good	(4)	1	100.00%						
Excellent	(5)	0	0.00%	]					
			•	0 25 50 10	0	TA			
R	esponse Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian
1	/244 (0.41%)			4.00			0.00	4	.00

15 - Availability							
Christine Li							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				
Fair	(2)	1	50.00%		3.50		
Good	(3)	0	0.00%				
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%				
Excellent	(5)	1	50.00%				
		•		0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	2/244 (0.82%)			3.50		2.12	3.50

# Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability										
Claudia Cortell										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respon	ses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.33			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]						
Good	(3)	2	33.33%							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1						
Excellent	(5)	4	66.67%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian
	6/244 (2.46%)				4.33			1.03	5	i.00

15 - Availability												
Dorothy Zhang												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respon	ises		м	eans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					5.00			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent		(5)	5	100.00%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate	Э					Mean			STD	M	edian
	5/244 (2.05%)						5.00			0.00		5.00

15 - Availability									
Faustina Cheng									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Respor	nses		Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1		5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	ון					
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	]					
Excellent	(5)	1	100.00%						
	·			0 25 50	100	TA			
Respon	ise Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian
1/244	0.41%)			5.00			0.00	5	.00

15 - Availability												
Helen Chu												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respor	ises			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			ST	D	M	ədian
	3/244 (1.23%)					5.00			0.0	0	4	5.00

# Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability											
Jake Torres											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respoi	nses		Mea	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.90			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	10.00%								
Excellent	(5)	9	90.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	10/244 (4.10%)					4.90			0.32	1	5.00

15 - Availability											
Jeremy Carin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent F	Respo	nses		м	eans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.40			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	5	20.00%								
Very Good	(4)	5	20.00%								
Excellent	(5)	15	60.00%								
				0 3	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				1	Mean			STD	M	edian
	25/244 (10.25%)					4.40			0.82		5.00

15 - Availability									
Joy He									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1		5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1					
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	]					
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%						
			•	0 25 50 100	)	TA			
Respons	e Rate			Mean			STD	Me	edian
3/244 (1	23%)			5.00			0.00	Ę	5.00

15 - Availability									
Justin Cange									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	nt Respor	ises		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			5.00		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1					
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1					
Excellent	(5)	1	100.00%						
		•		0 2	5 50	100	TA		
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Median
	1/244 (0.41%)				5.00			0.00	5.00

# Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability												
Kevin Li												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Respo	ises		Меа	ins				
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1		5.00						
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	]								
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%									
				0 25 50	100	TA						
	Response Rate			Mean			STD	Median				
	3/244 (1.23%)						0.00	5.00				

15 - Availability												
Luke Xue												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respor	ises		Me	ans		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.86				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	1	14.29%									
Excellent	(5)	6	85.71%									
		•		0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian	
	7/244 (2.87%)					4.86			0.38		5.00	

15 - Availability												
Noam Zaid												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Respons	es		Mea	ins				
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1		5.00						
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	]								
Excellent	(5)	2	100.00%									
			•	0 25 50	100	TA						
Response	Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian			
2/244 (0.8	2%)			5.00			0.00	5	.00			

15 - Availability							
Patrick Puma							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Means	;
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	I	4.83		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]			
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%				
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean	STD		Median
	6/244 (2.46%)			4.83	0.41		5.00

# Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability												
Patrick Tong												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	ent R	espor	nses			Me	eans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.00				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	4	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate				N	lean				STD	N	ledian
	4/244 (1.64%)									0.00		5.00

15 - Availability											
Phoebe Lu											
Response Option	Weigh	t Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent F	Respon	ses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	20.00%								
Very Good	(4)	3	60.00%								
Excellent	(5)	1	20.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				1	Mean			STD	Me	edian
	5/244 (2.05%)					4.00			0.71	4	l.00

15 - Availability												
Seyoung Ree												
Response Option	Wei	eight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent l	Respor	nses		Mea	ans	
Poor	(*	(1)	0	0.00%	1							
Fair	(2	(2)	0	0.00%	1				3.67			
Good	(3	(3)	2	66.67%								
Very Good	(4	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(!	(5)	1	33.33%								
	· · ·				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate						Mean			STD	M	edian
	3/244 (1.23%)						3.67			1.15	:	3.00

15 - Availability												
Shimon Sarkar												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	ercent F	Respon	ses			Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			:	STD	M	edian
	3/244 (1.23%)									0.00		5.00

# Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

15 - Availability												
Shreya Somayajula												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Res	oonses		Me	eans			
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.60					
Fair	(2)	1	3.33%									
Good	(3)	2	6.67%									
Very Good	(4)	5	16.67%									
Excellent	(5)	22	73.33%									
				0 2	25 50	100	TA					
	Response Rate				Mea	n		STD	Median			
	30/244 (12.30%)				4.60	)		0.77	5.00			

15 - Availability													
Stanley Lin													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses			Mea	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					4.3	3			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good		(3)	1	33.33%									
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	2	66.67%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate	e					Mean				STD	M	edian
	3/244 (1.23%)						4.33				1.15		5.00

15 - Availability												
Tameem Asif												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respor	ises		N	leans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.00			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent		(5)	4	100.00%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	N	edian
	4/244 (1.64%	)					5.00			0.00		5.00

#### 15 - Availability

Aidan Eichman, Albert Jan, Andrew Cheng, Andrew Yang, Avighna Suresh, Ben Harrison, Benjamin Vazzana, Brennan McManus, Chloe Ho, Christine Li, Claudia Cortell, Dorothy Zhang, Faustina Cheng, Helen Chu, Jake Torres, Jeremy Carin, Joy He, Justin Cange, Kevin Li, Luke Xue, Noam Zaid, Patrick Puma, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Seyoung Ree, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Stanley Lin, Tameem Asif

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.62			
Fair	(2)	2	1.22%								
Good	(3)	18	10.98%								
Very Good	(4)	21	12.80%								
Excellent	(5)	123	75.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	M	edian
						4.62			0.73	ł	5.00
# Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

16 - Communication												
Aidan Eichman												
Response Option	Weigh	t Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respo	nses			Means		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.75				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	1	25.00%									
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%									
		•		0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Me	dian
	4/244 (1.64%)					4.75			0.50		5	.00

16 - Communication												
Albert Jan												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent I	Respo	nses			Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.0	0			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	6	100.00%									
		•		0	25	50	100	T/	Ą			
	Response Rate					Mean				STD	I	ledian
	6/244 (2.46%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

#### 16 - Communication

Andrew Cheng												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent I	Respo	nses			Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.	20			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	1	20.00%									
Very Good	(4)	2	40.00%									
Excellent	(5)	2	40.00%									
				0	25	50	100	-	ΓA			
Response I	Rate					Mean				STD	M	edian
5/244 (2.05	%)					4.20				0.84		4.00

16 - Communication											
Andrew Yang											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respon	ses		Mea	ins		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				4.33				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]							
Good	(3)	1	33.33%								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%								
				0 25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian	
	3/244 (1.23%)				4.33			1.15	5	.00	

## Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication											
Avighna Suresh											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.86			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	14.29%								
Excellent	(5)	6	85.71%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	м	edian
	7/244 (2.87%)					4.86			0.38		5.00

16 - Communication													
Ben Harrison													
Response Option	We	eight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respo	nses			Mear	ıs	
Poor	(	(1)	0	0.00%					4.67				
Fair	()	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(	(4)	1	33.33%									
Excellent	(	(5)	2	66.67%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate						Mean			STD		Me	dian
	3/244 (1.23%)						4.67			0.58		5	.00

16 - Communication											
Benjamin Vazzana											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ns				
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1							
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%								
Excellent	(5)	0	0.00%		0.00						
				0 25 50 100	TA						
Response R	ate			Mean		STD	Median				
0/244 (0.00	%)			0.00		0.00	0.00				

16 - Communication										
Brennan McManus										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	es		Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				4.43			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]						
Good	(3)	1	14.29%							
Very Good	(4)	2	28.57%							
Excellent	(5)	4	57.14%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	dian
	7/244 (2.87%)				4.43			0.79	5	.00

## Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication											
Chloe Ho											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respor	nses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1				4.00			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	100.00%								
Excellent	(5)	0	0.00%	1							
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	1/244 (0.41%)					4.00			0.00	4	.00

16 - Communication												
Christine Li												
Response Option	Weig	nt Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent l	Respoi	nses			Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%									
Fair	(2)	1	50.00%					3	.50			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	1	50.00%									
				0	25	50	100	1	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean				STD	M	edian
	2/244 (0.82%)					3.50				2.12		3.50

16 - Communication									
Claudia Cortell									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	5		Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			4.83			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]					
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%						
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%						
				0 25 50 10	0	TA			
	Response Rate			Mean			STD	Me	edian
	6/244 (2.46%)			4.83			0.41	5	5.00

16 - Communication									
Dorothy Zhang									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	;		Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1		4.60			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	71					
Good	(3)	1	20.00%						
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	71					
Excellent	(5)	4	80.00%						
				0 25 50 10	D	TA			
	Response Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian
	5/244 (2.05%)			4.60			0.89	5	.00

# Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication											
Faustina Cheng											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent l	Respoi	nses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1							
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	0	0.00%	1				0.00			
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	0/244 (0.00%)					0.00			0.00		0.00

6 - Communication												
Helen Chu												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respor	nses			Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.	00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100		TA			
Response F	ate				l	Mean				STD	м	edian
3/244 (1.23	%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

16 - Communication							
Jake Torres							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.70		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]			
Very Good	(4)	3	30.00%				
Excellent	(5)	7	70.00%				
	· ·		•	0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	10/244 (4.10%)			4.70		0.48	5.00

16 - Communication							
Jeremy Carin							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.44		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%				
Good	(3)	3	12.00%				
Very Good	(4)	8	32.00%				
Excellent	(5)	14	56.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	25/244 (10.25%)			4.44		0.71	5.00

## Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication											
Joy He											
Response Option	Weigl	t Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses		N	leans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%								
		•		0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Median
	3/244 (1.23%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

16 - Communication											
Justin Cange											
Response Option	Weig	ht Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respon	ises		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	1	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	1/244 (0.41%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

16 - Communication							
Kevin Li							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	5.00		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1			
Excellent	(5)	3	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
Respo	onse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
3/244	(1.23%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

16 - Communication							
Luke Xue							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.71		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	]			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	]			
Very Good	(4)	2	28.57%				
Excellent	(5)	5	71.43%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	7/244 (2.87%)			4.71		0.49	5.00

## Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication							
Noam Zaid							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ans
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)	2	100.00%				
				0 25 50 10	D TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	2/244 (0.82%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

16 - Communication												
Patrick Puma												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent F	Respoi	nses		Me	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					4.67			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good		(4)	2	33.33%								
Excellent		(5)	4	66.67%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rat	e				I	Mean			STD	N	ledian
	6/244 (2.46%)						4.67			0.52		5.00

16 - Communication							
Patrick Tong							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	5.00		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%				
Excellent	(5)	4	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
Res	oonse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
4/24	14 (1.64%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

16 - Communication							
Phoebe Lu							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.20		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%				
Good	(3)	1	20.00%				
Very Good	(4)	2	40.00%				
Excellent	(5)	2	40.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	5/244 (2.05%)			4.20		0.84	4.00

# Course:

# Instructor: Jae Lee \*

### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication													
Seyoung Ree													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	t Respo	nses		Me	ans				
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1									
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1			3.67						
Good	(3)	2	66.67%										
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1									
Excellent	(5)	1	33.33%										
				0 25	50	100	TA						
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	M	edian			
	3/244 (1.23%)				3.67			1.15	:	3.00			

16 - Communication												
Shimon Sarkar												
Response Option	Weigl	nt Frequency	Percent	Perce	nt Respon	ses		Меа	ans			
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.67					
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	1	33.33%		I							
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%									
				0 25	5 50	100	TA					
			Mean	STD		Median						
	3/244 (1.23%)				4.67			0.58	Ę	5.00		

16 - Communication														
Shreya Somayajula	Shreya Somayajula													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent I	Respon	ses		Mea	ns					
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.66							
Fair	(2)	1	3.45%											
Good	(3)	2	6.90%											
Very Good	(4)	3	10.34%											
Excellent	(5)	23	79.31%											
				0 25	50	100	TA							
Response			Mean			STD	Median							
29/244 (11.8			4.66			0.77	5.00							

16 - Communication												
Stanley Lin												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respo	nses			Mea	ıs	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.67				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	1	33.33%									
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		M	edian
	3/244 (1.23%)				4.67			0.58			5.00	

## Course:

#### Instructor: Jae Lee \*

#### COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

16 - Communication											
Tameem Asif											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent F	Respor	ises		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.75			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	25.00%								
Excellent	(5)	3	75.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
			1	Mean		STD		Median			
	4/244 (1.64%)					4.75			0.50		5.00

#### 16 - Communication

Aidan Eichman, Albert Jan, Andrew Cheng, Andrew Yang, Avighna Suresh, Ben Harrison, Benjamin Vazzana, Brennan McManus, Chloe Ho, Christine Li, Claudia Cortell, Dorothy Zhang, Faustina Cheng, Helen Chu, Jake Torres, Jeremy Carin, Joy He, Justin Cange, Kevin Li, Luke Xue, Noam Zaid, Patrick Puma, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Seyoung Ree, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Stanley Lin, Tameem Asif

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respor	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.61			
Fair	(2)	2	1.25%	1							
Good	(3)	12	7.50%								
Very Good	(4)	32	20.00%								
Excellent	(5)	114	71.25%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Rat	te			Mean			STD		M	edian	
						4.61		0.68		5.00	

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Aidan Eichman													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		М	eans			
Yes	(1)	4	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Response		Mean				STD		M	edian				
4/244 (1.6	4%)					1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Albert Jan													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans		
Yes		(1)	6	100.00%									
No		(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00				
N/A		(3)	0	0.00%	1								
					0	25	50	100	TA				
				Mean		STD		Median					
				1.00			0.00		1.00				

Jae Lee \*

### Course: COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

#### Instructor:

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Andrew Cheng												
Response Option         Weight         Frequency         Percent         Percent Responses         Means												
Yes	(1)	6	100.00%									
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00				
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
				0	25	50	100	TA				
Re		Mean				STD		M	edian			
6/244 (2.46%) <b>1.00</b> 0.00 1.00												

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Andrew Yang													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent F	Respor	ises		M	eans			
Yes	(1)	4	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%										
				0	25	50	100	TA					
		Mean				STD		Median					
				1.00			0.00		1.00				

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Avighna Suresh													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans			
Yes	(1)	6	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Re		Mean				STD		Median					
6/				1.00			0.00		1.00				

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?														
Ben Harrison														
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans				
Yes	(1)	3	100.00%											
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00						
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1										
				0	25	50	100	TA						
Response Ra		Mean				STD		Median						
3/244 (1.23%	)					1.00			0.00		1.00			

17 - Does this TA communi	7 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
lenjamin Vazzana														
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	ercent	Respo	nses			Mea	ns		
Yes		(1)	0	0.00%	Ι									
No		(2)	0	0.00%	1									
N/A		(3)	0	0.00%	1				0.00					
					0	25	50	100	TA					
Response Rate							Mean			STD		Me	edian	
0/244 (0.00%)							0.00			0.00		(	0.00	

#### Instructor:

Brennan McManus											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respor	nses		Ме	ans	
Yes	(1)	5	71.43%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.57			
N/A	(3)	2	28.57%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate								STD	M	edian
7/244 (2.87%)						1.57			0.98		.00

17 - Does this TA communica	te effectively in Englis	h?									
Chloe Ho											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respo	nses		M	eans	
Yes	(1)	1	100.00%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00			
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Rate						Mean			STD	M	edian
1/244 (0.41%)						1.00			0.00		1.00

17 - Does this TA communicate effectiv	ely in Englisi	1?									
Christine Li											
Response Option									Mea	ans	
Yes	(1)	2	100.00%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00			
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Rate						Mean			STD	M	edian
2/244 (0.	2/244 (0.82%)								0.00		1.00

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englisł	1?									
Claudia Cortell											
Response Option							nses		Mea	ans	
Yes	(1)	6	100.00%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%	I				1.00			
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Ra				Mean			STD	M	ədian		
6/244 (2.46%				1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communica	te effectively i	n English	1?											
Dorothy Zhang	Jorothy Zhang													
Response Option		Percent	Ре	rcent	Respo	nses			Ме	ans				
Yes		(1)	4	80.00%										
No		(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.40	)				
N/A		(3)	1	20.00%										
					0	25	50	100	TA					
	Response Rate						Mean				STD	м	edian	
	5/244 (2.05%)						1.40				0.89		1.00	

Jae Lee \*

### Course: COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

#### Instructor:

17 - Does this TA communication	te enectively in Englis												
Faustina Cheng													
Response Option	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respor	nses		Me	ans					
Yes	(1)	1	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
	·		•	0	25	50	100	TA					
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian		
1/244 (0.41%)						1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicat	e effectively in English	ו?									
Helen Chu											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respor	nses		Me	ans	
Yes	(1)	3	100.00%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00			
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Rate						Mean			STD	м	edian
3/244 (1.23%)						1.00			0.00		1.00

17 - Does this TA communicate ef	fectively in English	1?									
Jake Torres											
Response Option									Me	ans	
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	м	edian
10	10/244 (4.10%)					1.00			0.00		1.00

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englisi	1?									
Jeremy Carin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans	
Yes	(1)	23	92.00%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.16			
N/A	(3)	2	8.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Rate						Mean			STD	M	ədian
25/244 (10.25%)						1.16			0.55		1.00

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englis	h?										
Joy He												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses			Меа	ans	
Yes	(1)	3	100.00%									
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				_	1.00			
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
				0	25	50	100		TA			
Response Rate						Mean				STD	M	edian
3/244 (1.23%)						1.00				0.00		1.00

### Instructor:

# Jae Lee \*

17 - Does this TA commun	cate effectively	in Englisł	1?									
Justin Cange												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses		М	eans	
Yes		(1)	1	100.00%								
No		(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00			
N/A		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate						Mean			STD	M	edian
1/244 (0.41%)							1.00			0.00		.00

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Kevin Li												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans		
Yes	(1)	3	100.00%									
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00				
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
				0	25	50	100	TA				
Response F		Mean					STD	M	edian			
3/244 (1.23%)						1.00			0.00	1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Luke Xue													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	cent	Respo	onses		Me	ans		
Yes		(1)	6	85.71%									
No		(2)	1	14.29%					1.14				
N/A		(3)	0	0.00%	1								
					0	25	50	100	TA				
Response Rate							Mean			STD	Median		
7/244 (2.87%)							1.14			0.38		1.00	

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Noam Zaid													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans			
Yes	(1)	2	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Response Ra				Mean		STD		Median					
2/244 (0.82%)						1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Patrick Puma													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses			Меа	ans		
Yes	(1)	6	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%						1.00				
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%										
				0	25	50	100		TA				
Response Rate						Mean				STD	M	edian	
6/24	6/244 (2.46%)					1.00		0.00 1.00			1.00		

Instructor:

# Jae Lee \*

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Patrick Tong													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respoi	nses		Ме	ans			
Yes	(1)	4	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Response Rate						Mean			STD	Median			
4/244 (1.64%)						1.00		0.00 1.00			1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Phoebe Lu												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans		
Yes	(1)	5	100.00%									
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00				
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
				0	25	50	100	TA				
Response Rate						Mean			STD	Median		
5/244 (2.05%)						1.00			0.00		.00	

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Seyoung Ree													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans		
Yes		(1)	2	66.67%									
No		(2)	1	33.33%					1.33				
N/A		(3)	0	0.00%	1								
					0	25	50	100	TA				
Response Rate							Mean			STD	Median		
	3/244 (1.23%)						1.33			0.58		1.00	

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Shimon Sarkar													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Ме	ans			
Yes	(1)	3	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Response Ra				Mean			STD	Median					
3/244 (1.23%)						1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Shreya Somayajula													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	onses			Mear	ıs	
Yes		(1)	27	93.10%									
No		(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.14				
N/A		(3)	2	6.90%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
Response Rate							Mean		STD			Median	
29/244 (11.89%)					1.14 0.52 1.0						.00		

#### Instructor:

#### Ictor: Jae Lee \*

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Stanley Lin													
Response Option	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans					
Yes	(1)	3	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Response		Mean					STD	Median					
3/244 (1.23%)						1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Tameem Asif												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respoi	nses		Mea	ans		
Yes	(1)	4	100.00%									
No	(2)	0	0.00%	]				1.00				
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
	•			0	25	50	100	TA				
Response Rate						Mean			STD	Median		
4/244 (1.64%)						1.00			0.00	1.00		

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

Aidan Eichman, Albert Jan, Andrew Cheng, Andrew Yang, Avighna Suresh, Ben Harrison, Benjamin Vazzana, Brennan McManus, Chloe Ho, Christine Li, Claudia Cortell, Dorothy Zhang, Faustina Cheng, Helen Chu, Jake Torres, Jeremy Carin, Joy He, Justin Cange, Kevin Li, Luke Xue, Noam Zaid, Patrick Puma, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Seyoung Ree, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Stanley Lin, Tameem Asif

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means			
Yes	(1)	153	94.44%					
No	(2)	2	1.23%	I	1.10			
N/A	(3)	7	4.32%	I				
				0 25 50 100	ТА			
Response Ra			Mean	STD	Median			
			1.10	0.42	1.00			

18 - Comments	
Aidan Eichman	
Response Rate	0/244 (0%)

18 - Comments	
Albert Jan	
Response Rate	2/244 (0.82%)
• Albert Jan is an incredible TA that shaped my experience in AP into a much more positive one than I was expecting. His explanations were always clear and succinct while still ouiding me to figure	

This experience in the also did a great job at managing office hours even when they would get extremely crowded before deadlines, he always made sure he was able to get to everyone even at the expense of his own personal time. After taking many CS classes I have never had as positive of an experience at office hours or with a TA until having Albert as one. I hope to have him as a TA in future courses!

• I really enjoyed Albert's review sessions before exams. I think they really helped me solidify my understanding of the practice midterms

18 - Comments	
Andrew Cheng	
Response Rate	2/244 (0.82%)
Helped me out a lot with a question I had that other TAs didn't have knowledge about, even outside of his office hours. King!	
Andy was a great TA! I found his office hours were always super helpful and I left feeling way more confident about my assignments and homework. He's a super smart and well rounded TA, and always went to drawing diagrams and focusing on getting my understanding rather than telling me answers. Super great work!	

Course:	COMSW3	157_001_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING
Instructor:	Jae Lee *	
	Brennan McManus,Tameem Asif,Justin Cange,Andrew Cheng,Joy He,Patrick Puma,Kevin Li,Jeremy Carin,Chloe Ho,Patrick Tong,Phoebe Lu,Helen Chu,Seyoung Ree,Benjamin Vazzana,Albert Jan,Shimon Sarkar,Shreya Somayajula,Faustina Cheng,Aidan Eichman,Dorothy Zhang,Ben Harrison,Jake Torres,Luke Xue,Avighna Suresh,Noam Zaid,Stanley Lin,Christine Li,Andrew Yang,Claudia Cortell	
18 - Comments		
Andrew Yang		
Respo	nse Rate	1/244 (0.41%)
Andrew Yang is th	e best TA	
18 - Comments		
Avighna Suresh		
Respo	nse Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments		
Ben Harrison		
Respo	nse Rate	1/244 (0.41%)
• great explain and o	debug	
18 - Comments		
Benjamin Vazzan	a	
Respo	nse Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments		
Brennan McManu	ıs	
Respo	nse Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments		
Chloe Ho		
Respo	nse Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments		
Christine Li		
Respo	nse Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments		
Claudia Cortell		
	nse Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments		
Dorothy Zhang		
	nse Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments		
Faustina Cheng		
	nse Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments		
Helen Chu		
	nse Rate	2/244 (0.82%)
One of the best TA	As I have ever had!	
• I did not go to offic	e hours, this is based	d purely on listserv responses.

#### Course: COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

Jae Lee \* Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick

Tong,Phoebe Lu,Helen Chu,Seyoung Ree,Benjamin Vazzana,Albert Jan,Shimon Sarkar,Shreya Somayajula,Faustina Cheng,Aidan Eichman,Dorothy Zhang,Ben Harrison,Jake Torres,Luke Xue,Avighna Suresh,Noam Zaid,Stanley Lin,Christine Li,Andrew Yang,Claudia Cortell

18 - Comments	
Jake Torres	
Response Rate	3/244 (1.23%)
Great TA, appreciate all his work.	

• Jake is one of the friendliest and approachable TAs there are. His work on the listserv does not go unnoticed either! He is great at explaining concepts and clearing up confusion. I've gained a much better understanding of the class as a whole due to his help. Whenever I was confused I knew to go to him first. We need more TAs like jake in this department !!!

Very helpful and patient, please hire again

18 - Comments	
Jeremy Carin	
Response Rate	5/244 (2.05%)
Super helpful with some practice exam walkthroughs.	
Literally so good at teaching, henestly should become a professor. He knew a latter about C and was always extremely helpful not only in office hours, but in the practice midterm review sessions as	

• Literally so good at teaching, honestly should become a professor. He knew a lotttt about C and was always extremely helpful not only in office hours, but in the practice midterm review sessions as well.

• most concise speaker I've ever heard. able to distill complex topics into intelligible ideas without sacrificing complexity.

Thanks!

1

Review session he led was great!

18 - Comments	
Joy He	
Response Rate	1/244 (0.41%)
• super approachable and helpful in OH!	

18 - Comments	18 - Comments	
Justin Cange		
Response Rate	0/244 (0%)	
18 - Comments		

Kevin Li	
Response Rate	0/244 (0%)

18 - Comments	
Luke Xue	
Response Rate	3/244 (1.23%)
Great TA, appreciate all his work.	
Helpful in office hours.	
• great TA	

18 - Comments	
Noam Zaid	
Response Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments	
Patrick Puma	
Response Rate	0/244 (0%)

### Course: COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

#### r: Jae Lee \*

Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell

18 - Comments	
Patrick Tong	
Response Rate	2/244 (0.82%)
Ran very good review sessions that really helped me improve my understanding in preparation for the exams.	

• this TA made my AP experience. I met with him outside of his OH and he took the time to walk me through really difficult concepts and ideas into something easily digestible for me, especially given that I don't have much of a CS background. Patrick is super patient and genuinely committed towards making sure that his students learn and takeaway something meaningful from the material.

18 - Comments		
Phoebe Lu		
Response Rate	0/244 (0%)	
18 - Comments		
Seyoung Ree		

Response Rate

0/244 (0%)

18 - Comments		
Shimon Sarkar		
Response Rate	1/244 (0.41%)	
Great TA, appreciate all his work.		

18 - Comments		
Shreya Somayajula		
Response Rate	5/244 (2.05%)	
Excellent and knowledgable TA!		
very great explanations and diagrams. best TA at explaining how to approach exam questions		
Clear delivery in all explanations in office hours and Exam preparation. Thankful for her help.		
Super good at explaining thoroughly.		
• She is the reason schools like this exist. She is a genius with a kind heart. Never have I ever met a better TA.		

18 - Comments	
Stanley Lin	
Response Rate	0/244 (0%)
18 - Comments	

18 - Comments		
Fameem Asif		
Response Rate	0/244 (0%)	

## COMSW3157\_001\_2023\_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING **Course:** Instructor: Jae Lee \* Brennan McManus, Tameem Asif, Justin Cange, Andrew Cheng, Joy He, Patrick Puma, Kevin Li, Jeremy Carin, Chloe Ho, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Helen Chu, Seyoung Ree, Benjamin Vazzana, Albert Jan, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Faustina Cheng, Aidan Eichman, Dorothy Zhang, Ben Harrison, Jake Torres, Luke Xue, Avighna Suresh, Noam Zaid, Stanley Lin, Christine Li, Andrew Yang, Claudia Cortell 18 - Comments Aidan Eichman, Albert Jan, Andrew Cheng, Andrew Yang, Avighna Suresh, Ben Harrison, Benjamin Vazzana, Brennan McManus, Chloe Ho, Christine Li, Claudia Cortell, Dorothy Zhang, Faustina Cheng, Helen Chu, Jake Torres, Jeremy Carin, Joy He, Justin Cange, Kevin Li, Luke Xue, Noam Zaid, Patrick Puma, Patrick Tong, Phoebe Lu, Seyoung Ree, Shimon Sarkar, Shreya Somayajula, Stanley Lin, Tameem Asif Response Rate · Excellent and knowledgable TA! · very great explanations and diagrams. best TA at explaining how to approach exam questions · Super helpful with some practice exam walkthroughs · Great TA, appreciate all his work. · Great TA, appreciate all his work Great TA, appreciate all his work. • Albert Jan is an incredible TA that shaped my experience in AP into a much more positive one than I was expecting. His explanations were always clear and succinct while still guiding me to figure things out on my own. He also did a great job at managing office hours even when they would get extremely crowded before deadlines, he always made sure he was able to get to everyone even at the expense of his own personal time. After taking many CS classes I have never had as positive of an experience at office hours or with a TA until having Albert as one. I hope to have him as a TA in future courses • Jake is one of the friendliest and approachable TAs there are. His work on the listserv does not go unnoticed either! He is great at explaining concepts and clearing up confusion. I've gained a much better understanding of the class as a whole due to his help. Whenever I was confused I knew to go to him first. We need more TAs like jake in this department !!! • I really enjoyed Albert's review sessions before exams. I think they really helped me solidify my understanding of the practice midterms · Helped me out a lot with a question I had that other TAs didn't have knowledge about, even outside of his office hours. King! Ran very good review sessions that really helped me improve my understanding in preparation for the exams. · Clear delivery in all explanations in office hours and Exam preparation. Thankful for her help. Literally so good at teaching, honestly should become a professor. He knew a lotttt about C and was always extremely helpful not only in office hours, but in the practice midterm review sessions as well · Super good at explaining thoroughly · Helpful in office hours · One of the best TAs I have ever had! great explain and debug · super approachable and helpful in OH! most concise speaker I've ever heard, able to distill complex topics into intelligible ideas without sacrificing complexity. • this TA made my AP experience. I met with him outside of his OH and he took the time to walk me through really difficult concepts and ideas into something easily digestible for me, especially given that I don't have much of a CS background. Patrick is super patient and genuinely committed towards making sure that his students learn and takeaway something meaningful from the material. great TA Andrew Yang is the best TA Thanks! · Review session he led was great · Very helpful and patient, please hire again · I did not go to office hours, this is based purely on listserv responses • Andy was a great TA! I found his office hours were always super helpful and I left feeling way more confident about my assignments and homework. He's a super smart and well rounded TA, and always went to drawing diagrams and focusing on getting my understanding rather than telling me answers. Super great work! · She is the reason schools like this exist. She is a genius with a kind heart. Never have I ever met a better TA