Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

Jae Lee *

1 - Course: Amount Learned												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respo	nses			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	1	1.18%	Ι				4.46				
Fair	(2)	2	2.35%									
Good	(3)	5	5.88%									
Very Good	(4)	26	30.59%									
Excellent	(5)	51	60.00%									
				0	25	50	100	Question				
Response Ra	ate					Mean			STD		Me	dian
85/218 (38.99	%)					4.46			0.81		5	.00

2 - Course: Appropriateness of Workload	l											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respor	nses			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	6	7.06%					0.75				
Fair	(2)	12	14.12%					3.75				
Good	(3)	13	15.29%									
Very Good	(4)	20	23.53%									
Excellent	(5)	34	40.00%									
			•	0	25	50	100	Question	1			
Response	Rate					Mean			STD		Me	edian
85/218 (38.9	99%)					3.75			1.31		4	.00

3 - Course: Fairness of Grading Process											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respor	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	6	7.06%					3.88			
Fair	(2)	10	11.76%					3.00			
Good	(3)	13	15.29%								
Very Good	(4)	15	17.65%								
Excellent	(5)	41	48.24%								
				0	25	50	100	Question			
Response Ra	ite					Mean			STD	Me	dian
85/218 (38.99	%)					3.88			1.32	4	.00

4 - Course: Overall Quality												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respo	nses			Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	1	1.18%	1				4.	26			
Fair	(2)	4	4.71%									
Good	(3)	11	12.94%									
Very Good	(4)	25	29.41%									
Excellent	(5)	44	51.76%									
				0	25	50	100	Que	estion			
Response Ra	te				I	Mean				STD	M	edian
85/218 (38.99	%)					4.26				0.94		5.00

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

25/218 (11.47%)

Instructor:

lae I ee *

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 2

• There's like no partial grading on exams. Otherwise, everything is perfect

Thanks to all the TAs and Jae!

• Good course learned a lot.

· Homework are too far apart, easy to forget content in between

• Jae is a legend and the course is simply as organized as it can be. You really learn a lot and feel confident in the concepts, but it's fair to say that not everyone might find systems programming that useful.

• Extremely pleased with the material I learned in this class. Although it was a tough class and I did not receive the best marks, I am walking away from this course a better programmer who has learned a lot. Professor Jae Lee is extremely knowledgeable, and every lecture was very motivating.

Love Jae!

• CRAZY. You can never be a programmer without taking this course by Jae Woo Lee. Follow the River and You will find C and Jae Woo Lee. Jae Woo Lee is the personification of C language itself. He speaks C, and we hear C whenever he opens his mouth in lectures. In the beginning of the programming history, there was C and Jae Woo Lee, and the rest stems from the two. Conclusion: At the end of 12 weeks of AP journey, you will be born again. Bless you in advance.

• AP is an excellent class to learn about programming fundamentals. Though Jae gives hard assignments, you will get something out of them, which I cannot say for many of the classes here.

• My biggest gripe with this course was Prof. Jae's insistence on using a 2-section, 500+ person, class email chain instead of EdStem. EdStem would'e prevented a number of issues that frequently came up in this class -- on EdStem you can see a person's role in the class and if a staff member has endorsed a student answer. So instead of getting 5 emails saying not a TA but... followed by multiple emails from different TAs correcting different aspects, there could just be one discussion post with multiple answers and one endorsed answer. Also, some of the inappropriate emails that went around, possibly from intoxicated students, could be filed under misc. or taken down, or perhaps said drunk student wouldn't have managed to log into EdStem and compose and file a post -- rather than just opening up their email and hitting send. EdStem also suggests similar posts to yours when you are making one so you can easily see if you are duping a question.

• I find the content of the course to be interesting. My frustration is largely with the way in which we are expected to learn it. Having more, smaller homeworks that actually reflect the how we will be tested would help us prepare. That is just how people learn. I feel this way about all Comp Sci courses but it is especially important for this one due to nature of the material and the way in which we are tested. If this is about learning material the course has to change. If it is about frustrating students and wasting our time then I suppose nothing needs to change. I have a very good grade in the class, but earning it has taken up twice the necessary amount of time. I am a GS student, I do not need to learn how to work hard. Please make learning the material easier.

· Great class, great professor definitely start your assignments early and start studying early too.

• Class was very well structured. Jae was a great professor who really wants everyone to understand the content and do well in the course. Exams are unbelievably hard though.

· Even though I do bad on exam, but I feel I learn so much from this class that I won't complain about it.

• The workload may be heavy, but for those who want to learn and advance in the CS field, take it seriously and you'll like it!

• This has been my favorite class so far at Columbia. The content and assignments have truly solidified my interest in pursuing computer science. With that said, I believe a few improvements could be made. I found Jae to be a great lecturer when teaching concepts on the blackboard, however, the quality of lectures declined after Exam 2. I understand the nature of the lectures will change with the content (e.g. learning about structs vs reviewing tcp-echo code), however, I urge Jae to find a way to continue teaching on the blackboard as much as possible. Simply displaying code on the board and going through line by line was often hard to follow and not engaging. I appreciate the amount of office hours held by the TAs, but I would've liked more opportunities to meet with Jae himself as well.

• My only gripe with this class is that the tests are so hard I now have test anxiety.

• Expectations should be lowered for a beginner programmer to be able to learn and understand what is necessary to complete homework. This is demonstrated by the average test scores, all being below 60 for exams. The course needs more hands-on learning on concepts that are broken down. For instance, let's implement a linked list over and over as homework by itself. Having to implement a linked list as part of a more significant programming problem containing multiple problem sets doesn't help me learn. Especially when I have never once implemented a linked list by itself.

• A lot of work

• Jae starts out as a great lecturer, but as soon as he leaves the chalkboard and goes to just reading off code the quality of his lectures greatly decrease. His talking about code style lectures were actually hard to sit through, and turns out by the end only about 50/200 people actually were sitting through them. He is also very non-emphathetic, even in the most desperate of times. His first exam was scheduled for October 12th, which you may recall was five days after the terrorist attack in Israel, and the same day as the first, biggest protest on campus. Many people were experiencing intense emotions that day. He should have moved the test, as it was an extenuating circumstance that without a doubt warranted some kind of action. His policy if you have to miss a test for medical emergency reasons is also abysmal: he will calculate your grade based off your other two exams. By not offering a makeup exam, Jae restricts anyone who is having a medical emergency and hasn't done well in the course from making up their grade at all. This just seems unfair and also not necessary. He has a billion TA's. Write a third exam. Overall, this class was hard, but not nearly as hard as everyone claims that it will be. It is most made difficult by Jae's intensity that he brings to each assignment and exam. He actually just needs to take a breath and realize that AP is not our lives and nor should it be his. If he would just calm down a little this class would be hard, but not the anxiety-producing thing he makes it.

· This class stressed me and my cardiologist out

• I have the biggest love-hate relationship with this course. On one hand, it was INCREDIBLE!! This was one of the rare courses I seriously looked forward to the lectures every week! I would be engaged every single time, even on my bad days. Even on days where I didn't feel bothered to focus and take notes, I would ALWAYS end up doing so just because of how engaging Professor Jae las as a lecturer but also how well thought out the course is I got to learn so many different things I always wished to learn about, especially Linux and the internet, which was a great surprise! The labs were really well designed and exciting challenges each time. On the other hand, some pieces of the course felt so unnecessarily old school and brutal and it really ruined my semester. First, this one is passable but, the system with the listerv was really irritating to me. It made it hard to ask for help and also stressed me out with the volume of emails despite setting up the filter. My email inbox is messy and while that is my fault, it made me struggle to keep up with some things and miss out on important updates. However, the TA's were amazing and dropped amazing advice and tips on the listerv, so it was really love/hate. One other small note, being in section 2 with all recordings saved in section 1 made it very difficult to access the recordings. You cannot save them in panopto or save a link, you have to follow a very specific chain of links for it to work, and it was quite a hindrance to me watching the recordings. Finally, my biggest issue with the course is the lack of flexibility with grading. This was a rough semester for so many of us, and with this course, one bad day with a midterm can ruin the entire course. I don't feel that this course openly why the exams were so unnecessarily evil, with various trick questions and very little room for error. I've never sate exams that actively seek to make us fail. I had one bad day with one of the midterms, and it really hurt, for a class I love so much to hurt me this bad. And t

• The homework for most of the class is incredibly simple, then by the end they are almost purposefully exhausting. The final labs are billed as something we are building up towards, and ultimately connecting them all together. While technically we do connect everything the process of doing so is very simple and given to us as boiler plate code. The entirety of the last lab is parsing a request line, which is not some sort of big achievement like it is billed to be it is tedious and not teaching us anything.

ver y good

• I feel like I genuinely learned in this course. I really learned from lecture and from completing the labs, and believe Jae as an excellent teacher. But the exams are insane. Absolutely insane.

Jae Lee *

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

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 and Preparation											
Jae Lee											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Means					
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		_4.62						
Fair	(2)	1	1.18%]							
Good	(3)	4	4.71%]							
Very Good	(4)	21	24.71%								
Excellent	(5)	59	69.41%								
				0 25 50 100	Instructor						
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median					
	85/218 (38.99%)			4.62	0.64	5.00					

7 - Instructor: Classroom Delivery

Jae Lee												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent I	Respo	nses			Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.	44			
Fair	(2)	3	3.53%									
Good	(3)	8	9.41%									
Very Good	(4)	23	27.06%									
Excellent	(5)	51	60.00%									
				0	25	50	100	Inst	ructor			
Response R	ate					Mean				STD	M	edian
85/218 (38.99	9%)					4.44				0.81		5.00

8 - Instructor: Approachability

Jae Lee						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Mea	ans
Poor	(1)	7	8.24%		3.88	
Fair	(2)	8	9.41%		5.00	
Good	(3)	14	16.47%			
Very Good	(4)	15	17.65%			
Excellent	(5)	41	48.24%			
				0 25 50 100	Instructor	
Response Ra	te			Mean	STD	Median
85/218 (38.99	%)			3.88	1.33	4.00

9 - Instructor: Overall Qua	lity						
Jae Lee							
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Меа	ns
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%		4.39	
Fair		(2)	5	5.88%			
Good		(3)	8	9.41%			
Very Good		(4)	21	24.71%			
Excellent		(5)	51	60.00%			
					0 25 50 100	Instructor	
	Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
	85/218 (38.99%))			4.39	0.89	5.00

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

10 - Would you nominate this professor for	r the SEA	S Distinguish	ed Faculty /	Award	?						
Jae Lee											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses		Ме	ans	
Yes	(1)	56	71.79%					1.28			
No	(2)	22	28.21%								
				0	25	50	100	Instructor			
Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	м	edian
78/218 (35.78)	%)					1.28			0.45		1.00

Instructor:

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

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

11 - If so, please explain why	
Jae Lee	
Response Rate	32/218 (14.68%)
Great lecturer, super clear in explaining diffi	cult concepts. Always answers students questions very clearly.
• Just overall a great professor. The course w	vas very well structured.
• Teaches students how to understand code t	thoroughly.
Excellent command of knowledge	
Despite AP being the hardest class I had ev	er taken, Jae always encouraged us to try our best. My best was not enough for this class, but at least I had my professor who encouraged me to try.
Professor Lee's classroom delivery is crysta	I clear and the course materials are highly organized. He truly makes students learn a lot and feel confident in the content.
Professor Jae Lee delivers his course mater any questions and topics I needed to be clear	rial very well. He breaks down every topic in a fundamental manner which allows the student to gain a better grasp of the topic. He was very helpful wit red up.
• He's just an epic professor.	
He speaks C, and we hear C whenever he o	ithout taking this course by Jae Woo Lee. Follow the River and You will find C and Jae Woo Lee. Jae Woo Lee is the personification of C language itsel opens his mouth in lectures. In the beginning of the programming history, there was C and Jae Woo Lee, and the rest stems from the two. Conclusion t AP, there can be no great CS students from Columbia. So, if he is the ultimate of cause of great outputs of Columbia, why don't we award him? Wh
	o make some pretty dry material interesting, relevant and challenging at the appropriate level. He is fair to a fault and devotes a lot of time to the class nom and office hours every week, and answering students' questions at all times of day.
Jae's instructions are so detailed and he has	s given so much support to students
program, showcasing a clever and intentiona	nization, with a carefully structured curriculum where each topic seamlessly built upon the previous one. The assignments were based on a centri al approach. The consistency in utilizing a core program, coupled with different alterations for each assignment, not only demonstrated the instructor gression but also provided students with a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter. I thought the course was very well designed.

· Jae's lecture is very organized and he is helpful

· He is one of the best professors in SEAS

• His enthusiasm and commitment to class is incredible. He was clearly happy to be there, and attempted to make class fun and engaging.

· Jae was a great professor who really wants everyone to understand the content and do well in the course.

· His notes are easy to understand and covering all topics in class. He is approachable.

. The Best lecturer I have ever met in my life!

• Jae is an exceptionally friendly and straightforward professor. During my attendance at his office hours, he not only addresses my inquiries but also delves deeply into the core concepts, which has greatly facilitated my comprehension of the subject matter.

• The professor is an amazing lecturer, and he challenges his students and makes sure that we should truly understand what we are learning.

• N/A

• One of the most organized professors!

• Jae is a master of computer science pedagogy. He not only goes to great lengths to make the material digestible, but his class is also incredibly accessible. Despite the challenge of managing hundreds of students, he still offers a pipeline for feedback after each exam. How a professor could make a student feel like they're not just a number under these constraints is unbeknownst to me, but Jae pulls it off. My only regret is I can't take more classes with him.

· Jae actually cares about what he teaches

Professor Lee is an amazing professor

• Professor Lee has created an incredibly important class, dare I say the most important, to the CS curriculum. Not only that, but his TAs are absolutely incredible and passionate about what they do. This class, if you put the work into it, gives you back so much.

· not the best at explaining topics.

· Although his course is extremely hard, Professor Lee delivers course materials in a manner that is easy to understand if one puts in the effort.

• He has developed such a beautiful narrative for this course, as expressed by follow the river to find the C. And is such an engaging and entertaining lecturer!

• Jae is so in control of the subject matter, it is insane. You can tell he has taught the course for a long time, and that he truly understans everything about C. He is also great at emphasizing the right things.

• he is like a father to me

• Professor Jae is genuinely an amazing lecturer. He does an amazing job of breaking down concepts and answering questions. I feel as though I genuinely learned from him in this course

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality												
Aidan Eichman												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	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				
R	esponse Rate					Mean			STD	M	ədian	
-	7/218 (3.21%)					4.86			0.38		5.00	

12 - Overall Quality												
Albert Jan												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	ises		Mea	ins	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					4.67			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	2	13.33%								
Very Good		(4)	1	6.67%								
Excellent		(5)	12	80.00%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rat	е					Mean			STD	M	edian
	15/218 (6.88%)					4.67			0.72	Į	5.00

12 - Overall Quality							
Andrew Cheng							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.63		
Fair	(2)	1	12.50%				
Good	(3)	0	0.00%]			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%				
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
Response	Rate			Mean		STD	Median
8/218 (3.	67%)			4.63		1.06	5.00

12 - Overall Quality											
Andrew Yang											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent F	Respon	ses		Μ	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 Rate				I	Mean			STD	M	edian
	3/218 (1.38%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality												
Avighna Suresh												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	cent	Respoi	nses		м	eans		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.88				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%									
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian	
	8/218 (3.67%)					4.88			0.35		5.00	

12 - Overall Quality												
Ben Harrison												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Меа	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.88			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good		(4)	1	12.50%								
Excellent		(5)	7	87.50%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate)					Mean			STD	N	edian
	8/218 (3.67%)						4.88			0.35		5.00

12 - Overall Quality							
Benjamin Vazzana							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ans
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		
Resp	onse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
5/21	8 (2.29%)			4.80		0.45	5.00

12 - Overall Quality												
Brennan McManus												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ins					
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.38							
Fair	(2)	1	12.50%									
Good	(3)	0	0.00%									
Very Good	(4)	2	25.00%									
Excellent	(5)	5	62.50%									
				0 25 50 100	TA							
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median					
	8/218 (3.67%)			4.38		1.06	5.00					

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality												
Chloe Ho												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respo	nses		Me	ans			
Poor	(1)	1	14.29%				4.00					
Fair	(2)	1	14.29%				1.00					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%]								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%]								
Excellent	(5)	5	71.43%									
				0 25	50	100	TA					
-	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	edian		
	7/218 (3.21%)				4.00			1.73	5	5.00		

12 - Overall Quality												
Christine Li												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent F	Respon	ises			Mea	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)	5	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100		TA			
Resp	onse Rate				I	Mean				STD	M	edian
5/21	8 (2.29%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

12 - Overall Quality												
Claudia Cortell												
Response Option	Weig	ht Frequer	ncy Percent	Pe	ercent	Respo	nses			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.89				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%									
Very Good	(4)	1	11.11%									
Excellent	(5)	8	88.89%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean	_		STD		Me	edian
	9/218 (4.13%)					4.89			0.33		Ę	5.00

12 - Overall Quality							
Dorothy Zhang							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.11		
Fair	(2)	1	11.11%				
Good	(3)	2	22.22%				
Very Good	(4)	1	11.11%				
Excellent	(5)	5	55.56%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	9/218 (4.13%)			4.11		1.17	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality												
Faustina Cheng												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent R	lespor	nses			Ме	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)	5	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
R	esponse Rate				ľ	<i>l</i> lean				STD	N	ledian
	5/218 (2.29%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

12 - Overall Quality										
Helen Chu										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	it Respons	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)	6	100.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	M	ədian
	6/218 (2.75%)				5.00			0.00	Į	5.00

12 - Overall Quality						
Jake Torres						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Меа	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.64	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1		
Good	(3)	2	14.29%			
Very Good	(4)	1	7.14%			
Excellent	(5)	11	78.57%			
			•	0 25 50 100	ТА	
Respon	nse Rate			Mean	STD	Median
14/218	(6.42%)			4.64	0.74	5.00

12 - Overall Quality											
Jeremy Carin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent R	espon	ses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	2	6.25%					4.56			
Fair	(2)	1	3.13%								
Good	(3)	1	3.13%								
Very Good	(4)	1	3.13%								
Excellent	(5)	27	84.38%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				N	lean			STD	M	edian
	32/218 (14.68%)				4	1.56			1.13	1	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality									
Joy He									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Resp	onses		Me	ans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.55		
Fair	(2)	1	9.09%						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1					
Very Good	(4)	2	18.18%						
Excellent	(5)	8	72.73%						
				0 2	25 50	100	TA		
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Median
	11/218 (5.05%)				4.55			0.93	5.00

12 - Overall Quality													
Justin Cange													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respor	ises			Mea	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					4	.40			
Fair		(2)	1	20.00%		l							
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	4	80.00%									
					0	25	50	100		ТА			
	Response Rat	e					Mean				STD	M	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)						4.40				1.34		5.00

12 - Overall Quality							
Kevin Li							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.40		
Fair	(2)	1	20.00%				
Good	(3)	0	0.00%]			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%				
Excellent	(5)	4	80.00%				
	·			0 25 50 100	TA		
Response	Rate			Mean		STD	Median
5/218 (2.2	9%)			4.40		1.34	5.00

12 - Overall Quality											
Luke Xue											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respor	nses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					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	IV	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality											
Noam Zaid											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Res	ponse	s		М	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)	5	100.00%								
		•		0 :	25 50	0 1	00	TA			
	Response Rate				Mea	in			STD	M	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)				5.00	0			0.00		5.00

12 - Overall Quality													
Patrick Puma													
Response Option	w	Veight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent I	Respon	ses			Mear	ıs	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					4.50				
Fair		(2)	1	16.67%									
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	5	83.33%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate						Mean			STD		Me	edian
	6/218 (2.75%)						4.50			1.22		5	i.00

12 - Overall Quality												
Patrick Tong												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses			Mear	ıs	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.50				
Fair	(2)	1	12.50%									
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%									
Excellent	(5)	6	75.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Me	dian
	8/218 (3.67%)					4.50			1.07		5	.00

12 - Overall Quality						
Phoebe Lu						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Poor	(1)	2	18.18%			
Fair	(2)	1	9.09%		3.73	
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1		
Very Good	(4)	3	27.27%			
Excellent	(5)	5	45.45%			
				0 25 50 100	TA	
Re	sponse Rate			Mean	STD Median	l
11.	/218 (5.05%)			3.73	1.62 4.00	

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

12 - Overall Quality											
Seyoung Ree											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	lespo	nses		Ме	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)	6	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				1	Mean			STD	N	edian
	6/218 (2.75%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

12 - Overall Quality													
Shimon Sarkar													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respor	nses			Me	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					5.0	C			
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	1			
	Response Rate	•					Mean				STD	1	/ledian
	4/218 (1.83%)						5.00				0.00		5.00

12 - Overall Quality											
Shreya Somayajula											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns				
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.84						
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%								
Very Good	(4)	3	15.79%								
Excellent	(5)	16	84.21%								
				0 25 50 100	TA						
Response	Rate			Mean		STD	Median				
19/218 (8.	/2%)			4.84		0.37	5.00				

12 - Overall Quality											
Stanley Lin											
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)	5	100.00%								
				0 25 50 100	TA						
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median				
	5/218 (2.29%)			5.00		0.00	5.00				

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_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 l	Respor	nses			Means		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.63				
Fair	(2)	1	12.50%									
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Median	
	8/218 (3.67%)					4.63			1.06		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	Percent Responses			nses	Means					
Poor	(1)	5	2.02%	1				4.64					
Fair	(2)	12	4.86%										
Good	(3)	7	2.83%										
Very Good	(4)	20	8.10%										
Excellent	(5)	203	82.19%										
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Response Ra	Response Rate								STD	M	edian		
				4.64					0.91	Į	5.00		

13 - Knowledgeability												
Aidan Eichman												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent l	Respor	nses			Меа	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	IV	edian
7/218 (3.2	1%)					4.86				0.38		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability											
Albert Jan											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns				
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.73						
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%								
Good	(3)	1	6.67%								
Very Good	(4)	2	13.33%								
Excellent	(5)	12	80.00%								
				0 25 50 100	TA						
Response Ra	ite			Mean		STD	Median				
15/218 (6.889	%)			4.73		0.59	5.00				

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability							
Andrew Cheng							
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%	1			
Excellent	(5)	7	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	7/218 (3.21%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Andrew Yang												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent l	Respor	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)	3	100.00%									
		•		0	25	50	100	T/	4			
	Response Rate					Mean				STD	1	/ledian
	3/218 (1.38%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability						
Avighna Suresh						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	М	eans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.88	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1		
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1		
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%			
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%			
				0 25 50 100	ТА	
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
	8/218 (3.67%)			4.88	0.35	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability	13 - Knowledgeability												
Ben Harrison													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent F	Respor	nses			Mear	ıs		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.88					
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1									
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%										
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%										
				0	25	50	100	TA					
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Me	edian	
	8/218 (3.67%)			4.88 0.35 5.00							5.00		

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability											
Benjamin Vazzana											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent F	lespor	nses		Me	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				I	lean			STD	м	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)					4.80			0.45		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability										
Brennan McManus										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	es		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.71			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1						
Very Good	(4)	2	28.57%							
Excellent	(5)	5	71.43%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
Respo	onse Rate				Mean			STD	M	ədian
7/218	8 (3.21%)				4.71			0.49	Į	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Chloe Ho												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Me	ans					
Poor	(1)	1	16.67%		4.33	3						
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%									
Good	(3)	0	0.00%									
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%									
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%									
	· · ·		•	0 25 50 100	TA							
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median					
	6/218 (2.75%)			4.33		1.63	5.00					

13 - Knowledgeability												
Christine 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)	5	100.00%									
				0 25 50 100	TA							
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median					
	5/218 (2.29%)			5.00		0.00	5.00					

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability											
Claudia Cortell											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Res	ponse	5		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.89			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	11.11%								
Excellent	(5)	8	88.89%								
				0 2	25 50) 10	0	TA			
	Response Rate				Mea	n			STD	M	edian
	9/218 (4.13%)				4.89	9			0.33		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Dorothy Zhang												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respo	nses			Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.25	_			
Fair	(2)	1	12.50%									
Good	(3)	1	12.50%									
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%									
Excellent	(5)	5	62.50%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
Response Ra	ite					Mean				STD		/ledian
8/218 (3.67%	»)					4.25				1.16		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability							
Faustina Cheng							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mear	ns
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)	5	100.00%				
			•	0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	5/218 (2.29%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Helen Chu												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent F	Respon	ses			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)	6	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate				1	Mean			STD		M	ədian
	6/218 (2.75%)					5.00			0.00		4	5.00

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability												
Jake Torres												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respo	nses		N	leans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.57			
Fair		(2)	1	7.14%								
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good		(4)	3	21.43%								
Excellent		(5)	10	71.43%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate	Э					Mean			STD	M	edian
	14/218 (6.42%))					4.57			0.85		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Jeremy Carin												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses		Меа	ins		
Poor	(1)	1	3.23%					4.71				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	1	3.23%									
Very Good	(4)	3	9.68%									
Excellent	(5)	26	83.87%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
Respo	onse Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian	
31/218	8 (14.22%)					4.71			0.82	Į	5.00	

13 - Knowledgeability												
Joy He												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Means						
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.80							
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	2	20.00%									
Excellent	(5)	8	80.00%									
			•	0 25 50 100	ТА							
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median						
	10/218 (4.59%)			4.80	0.42	5.00						

13 - Knowledgeability															
Justin Cange	ustin Cange														
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		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)	4	100.00%												
				0 25 50 100	TA										
Resp	onse Rate			Mean		STD	Median								
4/21	8 (1.83%)			5.00		0.00	5.00								

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability													
Kevin Li													
Response Option	We	eight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respor	ises			Mear	ıs	
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)	4	100.00%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					I	Mean			STD		Me	ədian
	4/218 (1.83%)						5.00			0.00		5	5.00

13 - Knowledgeability															
Luke Xue	uke Xue														
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent I	Respoi	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)	5	100.00%												
	•	•		0	25	50	100		TA						
Response	Rate					Mean				STD	M	edian			
5/218 (2.	29%)					5.00				0.00		5.00			

13 - Knowledgeability													
Noam Zaid													
Response Option	Wei	ght	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respor	nses			Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				5.	00			
Fair	(2	2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3	3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4	•)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5	5)	5	100.00%									
					0	25	50	100		TA			
	Response Rate	esponse Rate					Mean				STD	M	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)				5.00 0.00 5.00				5.00				

13 - Knowledgeability											
Patrick Puma											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	ercent l	Respon	ses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					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	N	ledian
	5/218 (2.29%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

13 - Knowledgeability											
Patrick Tong											
Response Option	Percent	Per	cent	Respor	nses		Me	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
	7/218 (3.21%)					4.86			0.38		5.00

Phoebe Lu											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent	Respo	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	1	9.09%					4.27			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	9.09%								
Very Good	(4)	2	18.18%								
Excellent	(5)	7	63.64%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	Me	edian
	11/218 (5.05%)				4.27 1.27			Ę	5.00		

13 - Knowledgeability													
Seyoung Ree													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses			Mea	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					5.0	0			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good		(3)	0	0.00%									
Very Good		(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent		(5)	6	100.00%									
					0	25	50	100	T/	۹.			
	Response Rate				_		Mean				STD	M	edian
	6/218 (2.75%)						5.00				0.00		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability									
Shimon Sarkar									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percer	nt Respon	ses		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)	4	100.00%						
				0 25	5 50	100	TA		
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Median
	4/218 (1.83%)				5.00			0.00	5.00

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_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	esponse Option Weight Frequency Per						nses			Меа	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.95				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	1	5.26%									
Excellent	(5)	18	94.74%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		м	edian
	19/218 (8.72%)					4.95			0.23			5.00

13 - Knowledgeability												
Stanley Lin												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent I	Respoi	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)	5	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	Т	۹.			
Response Rate						Mean				STD	1	ledian
	5/218 (2.29%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

13 - Knowledgeability											
Tameem Asif											
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)	7	100.00%								
	÷			0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Rate						Mean			STD	M	edian
7/218 (3.21%)					5.00			0.00		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	rcent	Respo	nses			Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	3	1.27%	1				4.80)			
Fair	(2)	2	0.85%	1								
Good	(3)	4	1.69%	1								
Very Good	(4)	22	9.32%									
Excellent	(5)	205	86.86%									
				0	25	50	100	TA	<i>۱</i>			
Response Rate						Mean				STD	N	ledian
						4.80				0.63		5.00

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_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	Percent	Percent	Respons	ses		Ме	ans		
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.86			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%]						
Very Good	(4)	1	14.29%							
Excellent	(5)	6	85.71%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Medi	an
	7/218 (3.21%)				4.86			0.38	5.00)

14 - Approachability										
Albert Jan										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respor	nses		Меа	ans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.67		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	2	13.33%							
Very Good	(4)	1	6.67%							
Excellent	(5)	12	80.00%							
				0	25	50	100	TA		
Response Rate						Mean			STD	Median
15/218 (6	6.88%)					4.67			0.72	5.00

14 - Approachability

Andrew Cheng												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent F	lespor	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%									
Excellent	(5)	7	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	-	TA			
Response	Rate				1	Nean				STD	M	edian
7/218 (3.2	1%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability										
Andrew Yang										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respons	es		Mea	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)	3	100.00%							
				0 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	edian
	3/218 (1.38%)				5.00			0.00	5	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability								
Avighna Suresh								
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Respo	onses		Меа	ans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1		4.88		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%					
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%					
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%					
				0 25 50	100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean			STD	Median
	8/218 (3.67%)			4.88			0.35	5.00

14 - Approachability											
Ben Harrison											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	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)	8	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	1	Median
	8/218 (3.67%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability						
Benjamin Vazzana						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Me	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	Median
5/218 (2.2	%)			4.80	0.45	5.00

14 - Approachability							
Brennan McManus							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		М	eans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		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
	7/218 (3.21%)			4.71		0.49	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability								
Chloe Ho								
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Resp	onses		Меа	ans
Poor	(1)	1	16.67%			4.33		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1				
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1				
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%					
				0 25 50	100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean			STD	Median
	6/218 (2.75%)			4.33			1.63	5.00

14 - Approachability											
Christine Li											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	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)	5	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Median
	5/218 (2.29%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability						
Claudia Cortell						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Me	ans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.89	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1		
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1		
Very Good	(4)	1	11.11%			
Excellent	(5)	8	88.89%			
				0 25 50 100	ТА	
Re	sponse Rate			Mean	STD	Median
9	(218 (4.13%)			4.89	0.33	5.00

14 - Approachability							
Dorothy Zhang							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	1	11.11%		4.44		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%]			
Very Good	(4)	1	11.11%]			
Excellent	(5)	7	77.78%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
Re	sponse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
9	/218 (4.13%)			4.44		1.33	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability							
Faustina Cheng							
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)	5	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	5/218 (2.29%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

14 - Approachability											
Helen Chu											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent I	Respor	nses		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)	6	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		ledian
	6/218 (2.75%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability											
Jake Torres											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Means					
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.86						
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	2	14.29%								
Excellent	(5)	12	85.71%								
	·		•	0 25 50 100	ТА						
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median					
	14/218 (6.42%)			4.86	0.36	5.00					

14 - Approachability												
Jeremy Carin												
Response Option	Weig	nt Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respor	ises		м	eans		
Poor	(1)	1	3.23%					4.61				
Fair	(2)	1	3.23%									
Good	(3)	1	3.23%									
Very Good	(4)	3	9.68%									
Excellent	(5)	25	80.65%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian	
	31/218 (14.22%)					4.61			0.95		5.00	

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability							
Joy He							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ins
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.60		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%				
Good	(3)	1	10.00%				
Very Good	(4)	2	20.00%				
Excellent	(5)	7	70.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	10/218 (4.59%)			4.60		0.70	5.00

14 - Approachability													
Justin Cange													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respon	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)	4	100.00%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate	Э					Mean			S	ſD	M	edian
	4/218 (1.83%)						5.00			0.	00		5.00

14 - Approachability										
Kevin Li										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respon	ses		Меа	ans	
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			
Resp	oonse Rate				Mean			STD	Me	ədian
4/21	8 (1.83%)				5.00			0.00	Ę	5.00

14 - Approachability												
Luke Xue												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	nt Respon	ses		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	Me	dian		
	5/218 (2.29%) 5.00 0.00 5.00											

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability							
Noam Zaid							
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)	5	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	5/218 (2.29%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

14 - Approachability											
Patrick Puma											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respon	ses		N	leans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1							
Excellent	(5)	5	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	N	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability											
Patrick Tong											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Resp	onses		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)	7	100.00%								
	÷			0 25 50	100	TA					
	Response Rate			Mear			STD	Median			
	7/218 (3.21%)			5.00			0.00	5.00			

14 - Approachability												
Phoebe Lu												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Me	ans					
Poor	(1)	3	27.27%									
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]	3.73							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%]								
Very Good	(4)	2	18.18%									
Excellent	(5)	6	54.55%									
				0 25 50 100	TA							
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median					
	11/218 (5.05%) 3.73 1.79 5.00											

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

14 - Approachability									
Seyoung Ree									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Res	ponses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1		4.83			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]					
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1					
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%						
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%						
				0 25 5	0 100	TA			
	Response Rate			Mea	an		STD	Mediar	ı
	6/218 (2.75%)			4.8	3		0.41	5.00	

14 - Approachability												
Shimon Sarkar												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	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)	4	100.00%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate	e					Mean			STD	IV	edian
	4/218 (1.83%)						5.00			0.00		5.00

14 - Approachability									
Shreya Somayajula									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Response	es		Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			4.89			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]					
Good	(3)	1	5.26%						
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%						
Excellent	(5)	18	94.74%						
				0 25 50	100	TA			
Response	Rate			Mean			STD	Me	dian
19/218 (8.7	2%)			4.89			0.46	5	.00

14 - Approachability											
Stanley Lin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	ent Re	spons	es		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)	5	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				Me	ean			STD	Me	ədian
	5/218 (2.29%)				5.	00			0.00	Ę	5.00

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_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	cent F	Respoi	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)	7	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Vedian
	7/218 (3.21%)					5.00			0.00		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	Respoi	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	6	2.53%	1				4.77			
Fair	(2)	1	0.42%								
Good	(3)	5	2.11%								
Very Good	(4)	18	7.59%								
Excellent	(5)	207	87.34%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	M	edian
						4.77			0.74		5.00

15 - Availability											
Aidan Eichman											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent F	lespor	nses		Me	eans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					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			
Respon	se Rate				I	Mean			STD	M	edian
7/218 (3.21%)					4.43			0.79		5.00

15 - Availability							
Albert Jan							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mean	s
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.57		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%				
Good	(3)	2	14.29%				
Very Good	(4)	2	14.29%				
Excellent	(5)	10	71.43%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean	STD		Median
	14/218 (6.42%)			4.57	0.76		5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability							
Andrew Cheng							
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%	1			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1			
Excellent	(5)	7	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	7/218 (3.21%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

15 - Availability									
Andrew Yang									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	t Respon	ses		Mea	ns
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%						
Excellent	(5)	2	66.67%						
				0 25	50	100	TA		
Res	ponse Rate				Mean			STD	Median
3/2	18 (1.38%)				4.67			0.58	5.00

15 - Availability											
Avighna Suresh											
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	t Respor	nses		Меа	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%	1			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 25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate	Э				Mean			STD	Me	edian
	8/218 (3.67%)					4.75			0.46	Ę	5.00

15 - Availability											
Ben Harrison											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent R	espon	ses		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.88			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%								
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%								
		-		0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				N	lean			STD	M	edian
	8/218 (3.67%)				4	1.88			0.35	Į	i.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability											
Benjamin Vazzana											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent F	Respo	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.60			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	2	40.00%								
Excellent	(5)	3	60.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	м	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)					4.60			0.55		5.00

15 - Availability												
Brennan McManus												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent l	Respon	ises		Mea	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					4.71			
Fair		(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good		(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good		(4)	2	28.57%								
Excellent		(5)	5	71.43%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rat	e					Mean			STD	N	ledian
	7/218 (3.21%))					4.71			0.49		5.00

15 - Availability											
Chloe Ho											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	1	16.67%					4.17			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%								
Excellent	(5)	4	66.67%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Respo	nse Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
6/218	(2.75%)					4.17			1.60		5.00

15 - Availability												
Christine Li												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respo	nses			Mea	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					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	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)					4.80			0.45		Ę	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability											
Claudia Cortell											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Re	espon	ses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.78			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	2	22.22%								
Excellent	(5)	7	77.78%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				M	ean			STD	M	ədian
	9/218 (4.13%)				4	.78			0.44		5.00

15 - Availability												
Dorothy Zhang												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	nses		Меа	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					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			
	Response Rate)					Mean			STD	M	ədian
	9/218 (4.13%)						4.67			0.71	4	5.00

15 - Availability							
Faustina Cheng							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mear	IS
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		4.20		
Fair	(2)	1	20.00%				
Good	(3)	0	0.00%				
Very Good	(4)	1	20.00%				
Excellent	(5)	3	60.00%				
	÷			0 25 50 100	TA		
Respor	se Rate			Mean	:	STD	Median
5/218	2.29%)			4.20		1.30	5.00

15 - Availability							
Helen Chu							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mear	IS
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	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	5	STD	Median
	6/218 (2.75%)			4.83	(0.41	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability							
Jake Torres							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	าร
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.71		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%				
Good	(3)	1	7.14%				
Very Good	(4)	2	14.29%				
Excellent	(5)	11	78.57%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	14/218 (6.42%)			4.71		0.61	5.00

15 - Availability											
Jeremy Carin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	1	3.45%					4.66			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	3.45%								
Very Good	(4)	4	13.79%								
Excellent	(5)	23	79.31%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
	29/218 (13.30%)					4.66			0.86		5.00

15 - Availability										
Joy He										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent R	espons	es		Mea	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			4.80			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1						
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1						
Very Good	(4)	2	20.00%							
Excellent	(5)	8	80.00%							
	· · ·		•	0 25	50	100	TA			
R	lesponse Rate			Ν	/lean			STD	Me	dian
1	10/218 (4.59%)				4.80			0.42	5	i.00

15 - Availability							
Justin Cange							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	ļ	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		
Respo	onse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
4/218	(1.83%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability											
Kevin Li											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent R	lespoi	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)	4	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				ľ	Nean			STD	N	edian
	4/218 (1.83%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

15 - Availability												
Luke Xue												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respor	ises		Меа	ans	
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%					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 Rat	e					Mean			STD	M	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)						4.80			0.45	4	5.00

15 - Availability							
Noam Zaid							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mear	ıs
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	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		
Res	oonse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
5/2	18 (2.29%)			4.80		0.45	5.00

15 - Availability											
Patrick Puma											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent F	Respon	ses		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)	5	100.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				I	Mean			STD	M	ədian
	5/218 (2.29%)					5.00			0.00	4	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

15 - Availability											
Patrick Tong											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent R	Respor	ises		Me	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				ľ	Mean			STD	M	ədian
	7/218 (3.21%)					4.86			0.38		5.00

15 - Availability													
Phoebe Lu													
Response Option	We	eight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respo	nses			Меа	ans	
Poor	((1)	2	18.18%						70			
Fair	(1	(2)	1	9.09%					3	.73			
Good	((3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	((4)	3	27.27%									
Excellent	((5)	5	45.45%									
					0	25	50	100		TA			
	Response Rate						Mean				STD	M	edian
	11/218 (5.05%)						3.73				1.62	4	4.00

15 - Availability							
Seyoung Ree							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.50		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]			
Good	(3)	1	16.67%				
Very Good	(4)	1	16.67%				
Excellent	(5)	4	66.67%				
	·			0 25 50 100	TA		
Resp	onse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
6/21	8 (2.75%)			4.50		0.84	5.00

15 - Availability									
Shimon Sarkar									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Respo	nses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1			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				Mean			STD	Median
	4/218 (1.83%)				4.75			0.50	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_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	Perc	cent F	Respor	ises		Me	eans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.74			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	5.26%								
Very Good	(4)	3	15.79%								
Excellent	(5)	15	78.95%				L				
				0	25	50	100	TA			
R	esponse Rate				1	Mean			STD	M	edian
1	9/218 (8.72%)					4.74			0.56		5.00

15 - Availability											
Stanley Lin											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent I	Respon	ises		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					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			
Respon	se Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
5/218 (2.29%)					4.80			0.45		5.00

15 - Availability													
Tameem Asif													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent l	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)	7	100.00%									
					0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rat	e					Mean			STD		Me	edian
	7/218 (3.21%)					5.00			0.00		Ę	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	cent	Respo	nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	4	1.71%	1				4.67			
Fair	(2)	2	0.85%	1							
Good	(3)	8	3.42%								
Very Good	(4)	39	16.67%								
Excellent	(5)	181	77.35%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	M	edian
						4.67			0.74		5.00

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_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	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percer	nt Respons	ses		Меа	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	Median
	7/218 (3.21%)				4.86			0.38	5.00

16 - Communication											
Albert Jan											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respor	nses			Mear	ıs
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					4.64			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	2	14.29%								
Very Good	(4)	1	7.14%								
Excellent	(5)	11	78.57%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Re	sponse Rate					Mean			STD		Median
14	/218 (6.42%)					4.64			0.74		5.00

16 - Communication Andrew Cheng **Response Option** Weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses Means 0.00% Poor (1) 0 5.00 Fair (2) 0 0.00% 0 0.00% Good (3) Very Good (4) 0 0.00% Excellent (5) 7 100.00% TA 25 50 100 0 Response Rate Mean STD Median 7/218 (3.21%) 5.00 0.00 5.00

16 - Communication											
Andrew Yang											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses			Means				
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		Median	
3/218 (1.38%)				5.00				0.00		5.00	
Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication											
Avighna Suresh											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent F	Respor	ises		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.88			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%								
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate				I	Mean			STD	M	edian
	8/218 (3.67%)					4.88			0.35		5.00

16 - Communication												
Ben Harrison												
Response Option	Weigh	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respoi	nses			Me	ans	
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)	8	100.00%									
			•	0	25	50	100	т	A			
	Response Rate					Mean				STD	1	/ledian
	8/218 (3.67%)					5.00				0.00		5.00

16 - Communication										
Benjamin Vazzana										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Respor	ises		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				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 2	25 50	100	TA			
Respo	nse Rate				Mean			STD	Me	edian
5/218	(2.29%)				4.80			0.45	Ę	5.00

16 - Communication												
Brennan McManus												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent F	Respo	nses		l	Means		
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				
	Response Rate				1	Mean			STD		Me	dian
	7/218 (3.21%)					4.57			0.53		5	.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication												
Chloe Ho												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	cent l	Respor	nses			Меа	ns	
Poor	(1)	1	16.67%					4.33				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1								
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	5	83.33%									
		•		0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Me	edian
	6/218 (2.75%)					4.33			1.63		Ę	5.00

16 - Communication											
Christine Li											
Response Option	Weigh	t 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)	5	100.00%								
		•		0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	1	Median
	5/218 (2.29%)					5.00			0.00		5.00

16 - Communication						
Claudia Cortell						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Me	ans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.88	
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1		
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1		
Very Good	(4)	1	12.50%			
Excellent	(5)	7	87.50%			
	•			0 25 50 100	ТА	
Respo	nse Rate			Mean	STD	Median
8/218	(3.67%)			4.88	0.35	5.00

16 - Communication											
Dorothy Zhang											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Resp	onses			Mear	ns	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%				4.44				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	2	22.22%								
Very Good	(4)	1	11.11%								
Excellent	(5)	6	66.67%								
				0 2	25 50	100	TA				
	Response Rate				Mean			STD		Me	dian
	9/218 (4.13%)				4.44			0.88		5.	.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication							
Faustina Cheng							
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)	5	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	5/218 (2.29%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

16 - Communication												
Helen Chu												
Response Option	Weigł	t Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respon	ses			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)	6	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
	Response Rate					Mean			STD		Me	edian
	6/218 (2.75%)					5.00			0.00		Ę	5.00

16 - Communication						
Jake Torres						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Mea	ans
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.71	
Fair	(2)	1	7.14%			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%			
Very Good	(4)	1	7.14%			
Excellent	(5)	12	85.71%			
				0 25 50 100	ТА	
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
	14/218 (6.42%)			4.71	0.83	5.00

16 - Communication											
Jeremy Carin											
Response Option	Weigh	t Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respon	ses		Ме	ans	
Poor	(1)	2	6.45%					4.61			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	1	3.23%								
Very Good	(4)	2	6.45%								
Excellent	(5)	26	83.87%								
		•		0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rate					Mean			STD	M	ədian
	31/218 (14.22%)					4.61			1.05	1	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication							
Joy He							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ins
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1	4.60		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]			
Good	(3)	1	10.00%] 🗖			
Very Good	(4)	2	20.00%				
Excellent	(5)	7	70.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	10/218 (4.59%)			4.60		0.70	5.00

16 - Communication												
Justin Cange												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respor	ises			Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%					5.00)			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1								
Good	(3)	0	0.00%									
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%	1								
Excellent	(5)	4	100.00%									
				0	25	50	100	TA	1			
	Response Rate					Mean				STD	IV	ledian
	4/218 (1.83%)					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%				
Excellent	(5)	4	100.00%				
	·			0 25 50 100	TA		
Resp	onse Rate			Mean		STD	Median
4/21	8 (1.83%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

16 - Communication										
Luke Xue										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent I	Responses			Меа	ins	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			Ę	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)	ТА			
	Response Rate				Mean			STD	Me	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)				5.00			0.00	Ę	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication												
Noam Zaid												
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	ent Re	spon	ses			Mean	IS	
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				Me	ean			STD		Me	dian
	5/218 (2.29%)				5.	.00			0.00		5	.00

16 - Communication												
Patrick Puma												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	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)	5	100.00%								
					0	25	50	100	TA			
	Response Rat	e					Mean			STD	N	ledian
	5/218 (2.29%)						5.00			0.00		5.00

16 - Communication						
Patrick Tong						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Mea	ins
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	ТА	
	Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
	7/218 (3.21%)			4.86	0.38	5.00

16 - Communication							
Phoebe Lu							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ins
Poor	(1)	3	27.27%				
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]	3.64		
Good	(3)	0	0.00%]			
Very Good	(4)	3	27.27%				
Excellent	(5)	5	45.45%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	11/218 (5.05%)			3.64		1.75	4.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

16 - Communication							
Seyoung Ree							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Меа	ns
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 50 100	TA		
	Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
	6/218 (2.75%)			4.83		0.41	5.00

16 - Communication													
Shimon Sarkar													
Response Option	We	eight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent I	Respor	ises			Меа	ins	
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)	4	100.00%									
					0	25	50	100	Т	۹.			
	Response Rate						Mean				STD	N	ledian
	4/218 (1.83%)						5.00				0.00		5.00

16 - Communication											
Shreya Somayajula											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	ent R	espons	es		Меа	ans	
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	1				4.89			
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%	1							
Good	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
Very Good	(4)	2	10.53%								
Excellent	(5)	17	89.47%								
			•	0	25	50	100	TA			
Response F	ate				N	lean			STD	M	edian
19/218 (8.72	%)				4	4.89			0.32	Į	5.00

16 - Communication							
Stanley Lin							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%	I	5.00		
Fair	(2)	0	0.00%]			
Good	(3)	0	0.00%]			
Very Good	(4)	0	0.00%]			
Excellent	(5)	5	100.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
Respon	se Rate			Mean		STD	Median
5/218 (2.29%)			5.00		0.00	5.00

Course:

Instructor: Jae Lee *

COMSW3157_002_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	Per	cent F	Respor	ises		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	M	edian
7/218 (3.21%)						4.86			0.38		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	Percent Responses			nses		Me	ans	
Poor	(1)	6	2.55%	1				4.74			
Fair	(2)	1	0.43%	1							
Good	(3)	6	2.55%	I							
Very Good	(4)	22	9.36%								
Excellent	(5)	200	85.11%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response Ra				Mean			STD	M	edian		
						4.74			0.76	1	5.00

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Aidan Eichman													
Response Option							nses		Mea	ans			
Yes	(1)	7	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				
7/218 (3.21%)						1.00			0.00		.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Albert Jan													
Response Option								nses			Ме	ans	
Yes		(1)	14	93.33%									
No		(2)	0	0.00%	1				L _	1.13			
N/A		(3)	1	6.67%									
					0	25	50	100		TA			
				Mean				STD	M	edian			
	15/218 (6.88%)						1.13				0.52		1.00

Jae Lee *

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

17 - Does this TA communica	17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Andrew Cheng													
Response Option						Respoi	nses		M	eans			
Yes	(1)	7	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		
7/218 (3.21%)						1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Andrew Yang												
Response Option						Respor	ises		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			ľ	Mean			STD	Me	edian			
3/218 (1.38%)						1.00			0.00	1	.00	

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Avighna Suresh												
Response Option					rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans		
Yes	(1)	7	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	м	edian			
7/218 (3.2				1.00			0.00		1.00			

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englisł	1?									
Ben Harrison											
Response Option	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans			
Yes	(1)	8	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	edian		
8/218 (3.67%				1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Benjamin Vazzana													
Response Option	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses			Ме	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										STD	M	edian
	5/218 (2.29%)										0.00		1.00

Yang, Claudia Cortell

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Brennan McManus												
Response Option						Respo	nses			Means		
Yes	(1)	6	85.71%									
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.29				
N/A	(3)	1	14.29%									
				0	25	50	100	TA				
				Mean			STD	M	edian			
	7/218 (3.21%)					1.29			0.76		.00	

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Chloe Ho												
Response Option								Ме	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					
	Response Rate							STD	Me	edian		
6/218 (2.75%)					1.00			0.00	1	.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?												
Christine Li												
Response Option							nses		Ме	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				
Respo				Mean			STD	Me	ədian			
5/218 (2.29%)						1.00			0.00	1	1.00	

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englisł	1?											
Claudia Cortell													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Mea	ans			
Yes	(1)	9	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	edian				
9/218 (4.13%				1.00			0.00		1.00				

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Dorothy Zhang													
Response Option Weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses Means													
Yes		(1)	9	100.00%									
No		(2)	0	0.00%	1					1.00			
N/A		(3)	0	0.00%	1								
					0	25	50	100		TA			
				Mean				STD	M	edian			
	9/218 (4.13%)					1.00				0.00		1.00

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

17 - Does this TA communicate	effectively in Englis	1?									
Faustina Cheng											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Ре	rcent	Respo	nses		Меа	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			
				Mean			STD	M	edian		
	5/218 (2.29%)					1.00			0.00		1.00

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Helen Chu													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percen	t Respoi	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	Me	edian					
			1.00			0.00	1	.00					

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Jake Torres													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans			
Yes	(1)	14	100.00%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00					
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Respo				Mean			STD	M	edian				
14/218				1.00			0.00		1.00				

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englisi	1?											
Jeremy Carin													
Response Option	nses		Меа	ans									
Yes	(1)	30	96.77%										
No	(2)	0	0.00%	I.				1.06					
N/A	(3)	1	3.23%								-		
				0	25	50	100	TA					
Response Ra				Mean			STD	M	edian				
31/218 (14.229	%)					1.06			0.36		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Јоу Не													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Pe	rcent	Respo	onses			Mea	ins			
Yes	(1)	9	90.00%										
No	(2)	1	10.00%					_	1.10				
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1									
				0	25	50	100		TA				
Response				Mean				STD	M	edian			
10/218 (4				1.10				0.32		1.00			

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Justin Cange													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respoi	nses		Me	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	M	edian		
4				1.00			0.00		.00				

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?													
Kevin Li													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perc	cent R	espor	ises		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					
Resp			Ν	<i>l</i> lean			STD	Me	edian				
4/21				1.00			0.00	1	.00				

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englis	1?									
Luke Xue											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Ме	ans	
Yes	(1)	5	100.00%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%					1.00			
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
Response R				Mean			STD	м	edian		
5/218 (2.29%				1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englisi	1?											
Noam Zaid													
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	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 Ra				Mean			STD	M	edian				
5/218 (2.29%)					1.00			0.00		1.00		

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively in English?														
Patrick Puma														
Response Option Weight Frequency Percent Percent Responses Means														
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 Ra				Mean				STD	M	edian				
5/218 (2.29%	5/218 (2.29%)									0.00		1.00		

Jae Lee *

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

Instructor:

17 - Does this TA communic	ate effectively in I	English	1?									
Patrick Tong												
Response Option	v	Veight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent l	Respor	nses		M	eans	
Yes		(1)	7	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	Me	edian
	7/218 (3.21%)						1.00			0.00	1	.00

17 - Does this TA communicate e	effectively in English	1?									
Phoebe Lu											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Per	rcent	Respo	nses		Ме	ans	
Yes	(1)	10	90.91%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.18			
N/A	(3)	1	9.09%								
				0	25	50	100	TA			
R	esponse Rate					Mean			STD	M	edian
1	1/218 (5.05%)					1.18			0.60		1.00

17 - Does this TA commun	cate effectively	in English	1?									
Seyoung Ree												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	onses		Ме	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			
	Response Ra	te					Mean			STD	M	edian
	6/218 (2.75%)					1.00			0.00		1.00

17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englisł	1?									
Shimon Sarkar											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	rcent	Respo	nses		Me	ans	
Yes	(1)	4	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	edian		
4/218 (1.83%)					1.00			0.00	1.00	

17 - Does this TA communica	ate effectively i	n Englisł	ו?										
Shreya Somayajula													
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Pe	ercent	Respo	nses			Me	ans	
Yes		(1)	19	100.00%									
No		(2)	0	0.00%					1.	00			
N/A		(3)	0	0.00%									
					0	25	50	100	1	TA			
	Response Rate	e					Mean				STD	M	ədian
	19/218 (8.72%))					1.00				0.00		1.00

Course: COMSW3157_002_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 Cortel	l						
17 - Does this TA communicate effectively	in Englis	1?					
Stanley Lin							
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses		Mea	ns
Yes	(1)	5	100.00%				
No	(2)	0	0.00%		1.00		
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%				
				0 25 50 100	TA		
Response Ra	ate			Mean		STD	Median
5/218 (2.29%	b)			1.00		0.00	1.00

17 - Does this TA communicate et	fectively in English	1?									
Tameem Asif											
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Perce	ent Resp	onse	5		Me	ans	
Yes	(1)	7	100.00%								
No	(2)	0	0.00%	1				1.00			
N/A	(3)	0	0.00%	1							
				0 2	25 50	10	0	TA			
Re	sponse Rate				Mear	1			STD	Me	edian
7/	218 (3.21%)				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		Mear	IS
Yes	(1)	231	97.88%				
No	(2)	1	0.42%	I	1.04		
N/A	(3)	4	1.69%	I			
				0 25 50 100	TA		
Response Ra	te			Mean	STD		Median
				1.04	0.27		1.00

18 - Comments	
Aidan Eichman	
Response Rate	3/218 (1.38%)
So helpful! Helps even outside of OH N/A	

great explainer

18 - Comments	
Albert Jan	
Response Rate	6/218 (2.75%)
 One of the best TA's when it comes to problem, not rushing through it, and clari 	how they communicate and deliver information. Easy to understand and ask questions to. Super helpful during the review sessions with breaking down the ying when needed.

· Explains concepts so well

• N/A

· Enjoyed his practice exam session. Wish he could have done many more, as his communication style was great!

• Albert was a fantastic teacher, and he took the time to explain things from the ground up. Really smart and effective TA.

very cool

Course:	COMSW3157_002_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 Cheng	
Respo	nse Rate 2/218 (0.92%)
He's so nicee	
• N/A	
18 - Comments	
Andrew Yang	
-	nse Rate 1/218 (0.46%)
• N/A	
18 - Comments	
Avighna Suresh	
	nse Rate 2/218 (0.92%)
• N/A	
All TA's in this cou	rse were exceptional!
18 - Comments	
Ben Harrison	
Respo	nse Rate 2/218 (0.92%)
• N/A	
• Entertaining and i	formative. Great job!
18 - Comments	
Benjamin Vazzar	a
Respo	nse Rate 1/218 (0.46%)
• N/A	
18 - Comments	
Brennan McMan	
Respo	nse Rate 1/218 (0.46%)
• N/A	
18 - Comments	
Chloe Ho	nse Rate 1/218 (0.46%)

• N/A

18 - Comments	
Christine Li	
Response Rate	2/218 (0.92%)
• N/A	
Very knowledgeable about course material	and sweet

Course: COMSW3157_002_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	
Claudia Cortell	
Response Rate	3/218 (1.38%)
Claudia is one of the best TA's I've ever had. She takes the time to diagram everything and has no issue reexplaining things. She is knowledgable, patient, and kind.	

• Really appreciated how she made CARDS exams more fun, for example I appreciated her making sure we got stickers during the final.

• N/A

18 - Comments	
Dorothy Zhang	
Response Rate	3/218 (1.38%)
Dorothy is knowledgable, but unapproachable. Others also share the same opinion.	
• N/A	
Good, but sometimes unable to assist.	
18 - Comments	
Fausting Chang	

Faustina Cheng	
Response Rate	2/218 (0.92%)
• N/A	
• good explainer	

18 - Comments	
Helen Chu	
Response Rate	3/218 (1.38%)
• I spent most of a day working on a lab and making no progress before coming to office hours and having Helen ask me a simple question that made the rest of the process much easier. She is the	

• I spent most of a day working on a lab and making no progress before coming to office hours and naving Helen ask me a simple question that made the rest of the process much easier. She is the best. 10/10

• N/A

excellent explainer

18 - Comments	
Jake Torres	
Response Rate	3/218 (1.38%)
• N/A	

Approachable and relatable!

One of the most helpful TAs I've ever had. Stayed 2 hours over time in office hours to help students. Incredibly good at explaining concepts.

18 - Comments	
Jeremy Carin	
Response Rate	8/218 (3.67%)
• One of the best TA's when it comes to how they communicate and deliver information. Easy to understand and ask questions to. Super helpful during the review sessions with breaking down the problem, not rushing through it, and clarifying when needed.	
• N/A	
• Fair.	
The goat	
• Such a pro.	

• This class is lucky to have Jeremy as a TA. He feels like a master in his domain, but he is also a good teacher. He's going to go on to do amazing things after college.

• not the best at explaining things, is smart himself but cant dumb down the material

very cool

Course: COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING

1/218 (0.46%)

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	
Joy He	
Response Rate	4/218 (1.83%)
Thank you for everything you did for us.	
• N/A	
• She possesses a strong knowledge base; however, one area where I've encountered some difficulty is in her ability to articulate her thoughts and knowledge as effectively as some other TAs do.	
She is very knowledgeable and helpful.	
18 - Comments	
Justin Cange	

N/A	

18 - Comments	
Kevin Li	
Response Rate	2/218 (0.92%)
Kevin is patient and knowledgable. N/A	

18 - Comments	
Luke Xue	
Response Rate	2/218 (0.92%)
• N/A	

Very knowledgeable about course material

Response Rate

18 - Comments	
Noam Zaid	
Response Rate	1/218 (0.46%)
• N/A	

18 - Comments		
Patrick Puma		
Response Rate	Response Rate 2/218 (0.92%)	
• N/A		
Very knowledgeable about course material		

18 - Comments		
Patrick Tong		
Response Rate	1/218 (0.46%)	
• N/A		

Course: COMSW3157_002_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		
Phoebe Lu		
Response Rate	5/218 (2.29%)	
Phoebe was not approachable. When I asked her if I can ask her a question about AP, she straight up said no.		
• Did not fulfill the TA's responsibilities and should not be head of TA, was very arrogant and unfriendly, and was directly rejected when politely asked her questions.		
• N/A		
not the best at explaining things, is smart herself but cant dumb down the material		

very cool

18 - Comments		
Seyoung Ree		
Response Rate	3/218 (1.38%)	
• so nice		
• N/A		
• good explainer		

18 - Comments		
Shimon Sarkar		
Response Rate	1/218 (0.46%)	
• N/A		

18 - Comments Shreya Somayajula		
• The best TA!		
 One of the best TA's when it comes to problem, not rushing through it, and clarify 	ow they communicate and deliver information. Easy to understand and ask questions to. Super helpful during the review sessions with breaking down the ing when needed.	
• N/A		
She is very knowledgeable and helpful.		
• Well done! By far the best at explaining	everything.	
• Such a pro.		
Shreya has clearly mastered the materia	l, but explains it in such an approachable way that she makes it all click. She is a fantastic TA.	
Best explainer (should be Head TA)! AP	s ace TA.	
• you are the best		
18 - Comments		
Stanley Lin		
Response Rate	2/218 (0.92%)	
THE PERFECT GUY		

• N/A

18 - Comments	
Tameem Asif	
Response Rate	4/218 (1.83%)
Tameem is really nice and is really good at explaining concepts.	
• N/A	
Hee is very knowledgeable and helpful.	
shoutout to my boy	

• N/A

COMSW3157_002_2023_3 - ADVANCED PROGRAMMING **Course:** Jae Lee * Instructor: 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 · Phoebe was not approachable. When I asked her if I can ask her a question about AP, she straight up said no. The best TA! · So helpful! Helps even outside of OH • Did not fulfill the TA's responsibilities and should not be head of TA, was very arrogant and unfriendly, and was directly rejected when politely asked her guestions · Thank you for everything you did for us. so nice • THE PERFECT GUY • One of the best TA's when it comes to how they communicate and deliver information. Easy to understand and ask questions to. Super helpful during the review sessions with breaking down the problem, not rushing through it, and clarifying when needed • One of the best TA's when it comes to how they communicate and deliver information. Easy to understand and ask questions to. Super helpful during the review sessions with breaking down the problem, not rushing through it, and clarifying when needed. • One of the best TA's when it comes to how they communicate and deliver information. Easy to understand and ask questions to. Super helpful during the review sessions with breaking down the problem, not rushing through it, and clarifying when needed. · He's so nicee · Explains concepts so well · Tameem is really nice and is really good at explaining concepts · Kevin is patient and knowledgable. Dorothy is knowledgable, but unapproachable. Others also share the same opinion. • Claudia is one of the best TA's I've ever had. She takes the time to diagram everything and has no issue reexplaining things. She is knowledgable, patient, and kind. • I spent most of a day working on a lab and making no progress before coming to office hours and having Helen ask me a simple question that made the rest of the process much easier. She is the best. 10/10 · Really appreciated how she made CARDS exams more fun, for example I appreciated her making sure we got stickers during the final. • N/A • N/A

Course:	COMSW3157_002_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,Aida Eichman,Dorothy Zhang,Ben Harrison,Jake Torres,Luke Xue,Avighna Suresh,Noam Zaid,Stanley Lin,Christine Li,Andrew Yang,Claudia Cortell	
• N/A		
She possesses a	strong knowledge base; however, one area where I've encountered some difficulty is in her ability to articulate her thoughts and knowledge as effectively as some other TAs do.	
Hee is very know	ledgeable and helpful.	
 She is very knowl 	edgeable and helpful.	
She is very knowl	edgeable and helpful.	
• Fair.		
 Enjoyed his pract 	ice exam session. Wish he could have done many more, as his communication style was great!	
• Well done! By far	the best at explaining everything.	
Good, but someting	mes unable to assist.	
 Entertaining and i 	nformative. Great job!	
Approachable and	d relatable!	
• The goat		
Such a pro.		
• Such a pro.		
 This class is lucky 	to have Jeremy as a TA. He feels like a master in his domain, but he is also a good teacher. He's going to go on to do amazing things after college.	
 Albert was a fanta 	astic teacher, and he took the time to explain things from the ground up. Really smart and effective TA.	
 Shreya has clearl 	y mastered the material, but explains it in such an approachable way that she makes it all click. She is a fantastic TA.	
 not the best at ex 	plaining things, is smart himself but cant dumb down the material	
 not the best at ex 	plaining things, is smart herself but cant dumb down the material	
 excellent explained 		
 good explainer 		
 Best explainer (st 	nould be Head TA)! AP's ace TA.	
 good explainer 		
 great explainer 		
 Very knowledgea 	ble about course material	
 Very knowledgea 	ble about course material	
 Very knowledgea 	ble about course material and sweet	
 you are the best 		
All TA's in this co	urse were exceptional!	
 shoutout to my bo 	ay a second s	
 very cool 		
 very cool 		
 very cool 		
One of the most h	nelpful TAs I've ever had. Stayed 2 hours over time in office hours to help students. Incredibly good at explaining concepts.	