### ENGR (18485)

INSTRUCTORS: Bloomfield, Aaron S. (asb2t)

Respondents: 20 / Enrollment: 40

Summary: CS 2150-102 Program & Data Representa	tion - Fall 20	12 (18485)								
Overall Course Rating CS-2150-102 Mean 4.08 CS-2150-102 Std Dev 1.12 CS-2150-102 Response Count 100				Overall Instructor Rating INSTRUCTOR: Bloomfield, Aaron S. Mean 4.58 Std Dev 0.66 Response Count 139						
Difference from Category Mean, Expressed in Category Standard Deviations				Difference from Category Mean, Expressed in Category Standard Deviations				-2 -1 0 1 2 0.50		
SEAS, 2000-level courses Mean 4.07 SEAS, 2000-level courses Std Dev 0.97 SEAS, 2000-level courses Response Count 12847			SEAS,	2000-level	courses Mea courses Std courses Res	Dev 0.95	nt 38505			
~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~				~ ANS	WER MATR	CES ~				
1. The course addressed technically	Results for	CS-2150-1	02							
rigorous subject matter consistent with the course objectives. ~	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicabl (NA)	
Question Type: Likert $\tilde{r}$	20	4.75	0.44	15 (75.00%)	5 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
2574	4.40	0.70	1264 (49.11%)	1123 (43.63%)	131 (5.09%)	39 (1.52%)	11 (0.43%)	6 (0.23%)

### 2. The instructor used methods other than/in addition to traditional lectures (for example, active learning, in-class problems, collaborative learning, inclass discussion) effectively in this course.

Results for	Results for CS-2150-102, Bloomfield, Aaron S.									
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)		
20	4.50	0.69	12 (60.00%)	6 (30.00%)	2 (10.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)		

Question	Type:	Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

3. There was a reasonable level of effort expected for the credit hours received. Question Type: Likert contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses									
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)	
5534	3.96	1.03	1454 (26.27%)	1431 (25.86%)	792 (14.31%)	217 (3.92%)	128 (2.31%)	1512 (27.32%)	

Results for CS-2150-102										
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)		
20	3.30	1.53	6 (30.00%)	5 (25.00%)	1 (5.00%)	5 (25.00%)	3 (15.00%)	0 (0.00%)		

### Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) Neutral Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1) Not Agree (5) Applicable (3) (NA) 194 (7.53%) 1156 (44.86%) 2577 4.15 0.94 1027 126 65 9 (0.35%) (39.85%) (4.89%) (2.52%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~				~ ANS	WER MATR	ICES ~			
4. The homework assignments helped	Results for	CS-2150-1	102						
me learn the subject matter.	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	20	4.55	0.60	12 (60.00%)	7 (35.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 200	00-level cou	ses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
	2570	4.25	0.87	1130 (43.97%)	1020 (39.69%)	219 (8.52%)	91 (3.54%)	38 (1.48%)	72 (2.80%)
5. The textbook increased my	Results for	CS-2150-1	102						
understanding of the material. Question Type: Likert	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
~ contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	20	3.62	1.26	4 (20.00%)	3 (15.00%)	4 (20.00%)	1 (5.00%)	1 (5.00%)	7 (35.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 200	00-level cou	ses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
	2568	3.54	1.18	520 (20.25%)	750 (29.21%)	488 (19.00%)	298 (11.60%)	150 (5.84%)	362 (14.10%)
6. The course material was well	Results for	CS-2150-1	102, Bloomfi	eld, Aaron S	5.				
organized and developed. Question Type: Likert	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	20	4.50	0.83	13 (65.00%)	5 (25.00%)	1 (5.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 200	00-level cou	ses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
	5503	4.04	0.96	1432 (26.02%)	1571 (28.55%)	673 (12.23%)	160 (2.91%)	94 (1.71%)	1573 (28.58%)
7. The instructor was knowledgeable	Results for	CS-2150-1	102, Bloomfi	eld, Aaron S	5.				
<b>about the subject matter.</b> Question Type: Likert	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	20	4.80	0.52	17 (85.00%)	2 (10.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 200	00-level cou	rses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
	5503	4.34	0.88	2250 (40.89%)	1285 (23.35%)	481 (8.74%)	73 (1.33%)	74 (1.34%)	1340 (24.35%)
8. The instructor was well prepared for	Results for	CS-2150-1	102, Bloomfi	eld, A <u>aron S</u>	3				
<b>class.</b> Question Type: Likert	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
~ contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	20	4.80	0.41	16 (80.00%)	4 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 200	00-level cou	ses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
	5490	4.22	0.90	1863 (33.93%)	1462 (26.63%)	541 (9.85%)	117 (2.13%)	67 (1.22%)	1440 (26.23%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~					~ ANS	WER MATH	PICES ~				
9. I received adequate preparation from	Results for	CS-21	50-102								
the prior courses in the curriculum to be successful in this course.	Total	Mea		Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)	
Question Type: Likert $\sim$	20	4.0	0 0.8	2	5 (25.00%)	10 (50.00%)	3 (15.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (5.00%)	
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science						(00.0070)	(10.0070)	(0.0070)	(0.0070)	(0.0070)	
	Results for										
	Total	Mea	an Std E	Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)	
	2558	3.9	4 0.9	3	646 (25.25%)	1007 (39.37%)	403 (15.75%)	119 (4.65%)	43 (1.68%)	340 (13.29%)	
10. The grading policy was fair.	Results for	CS-21	50-102, Blo	omfie	eld, Aaron S						
Question Type: Likert	Total	Mea	an Std E	Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)	
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	20	4.3	5 0.8	1	(3) 11 (55.00%)	5 (25.00%)	4 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
	Results for SEAS, 2000-level courses										
	Total	Mea			Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly	Not	
	Total	Wea			Agree (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Disagree (1)	Applicable (NA)	
	5497	3.9	5 0.9	6	1305 (23.74%)	1782 (32.42%)	729 (13.26%)	244 (4.44%)	94 (1.71%)	1343 (24.43%)	
11. The instructor responded	Results for	CS-21	50-102, Blo	omfie	eld, Aaron S						
adequately to in-class questions. Question Type: Likert	Total	Mea			Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)	
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	19	4.5	3 0.7	0	12 (63.16%)	5 (26.32%)	2 (10.53%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
	Deculto for	0540	2000 laval								
	Total	Mea	, 2000-level an Std E		Strongly Agree	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	
	5488	4.1	9 0.9	0	(5) 1736 (31.63%)	1552 (28.28%)	526 (9.58%)	111 (2.02%)	(1) 74 (1.35%)	(NA) 1489 (27.13%)	
						,		( )	()		
12. The instructor effectively used technology in support of the learning					eld, Aaron S						
goals for this course.	Total	Mea	an Std E	Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)	
Question Type: Likert	20	4.6	0 0.5	0	12 (60.00%)	8 (40.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
and Applied Science	Results for	SEAS	, 2000-level	cour	ses						
	Total	Mea	an Std E	Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)	
	5490	4.0	4 0.9	3	1386 (25.25%)	1441 (26.25%)	755 (13.75%)	146 (2.66%)	65 (1.18%)	1697 (30.91%)	
13. The average number of hours per	Results for	<u></u>	50-102								
week I spent outside of class preparing for this course was:	Total	00-2	Less than (NA)	1	1 - 3 (NA)		4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	1(	) or more (NA)	
Question Type: Multiple Choice	20		0 (0.00%)		0 (0.00%	) (	3 15.00%)	6 (30.00%	6) (	11 55.00%)	
contributed by $D \widetilde{ffice}$ of the Provost	Results for	SEAR	2000-lovel	0011	202						
	Results for Total	SEAS	Less than		1 - 3		4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	1(	) or more	
	2575		(NA) 136 (5.28%)		(NA) 892 (34.64%	6) (	(NA) 974 37.83%)	(NA) 398 (15.46%	6)	(NA) 175 (6.80%)	
	L		(0.2070)		(0-1.0-17	~, (	000707	(10.+07	~/	0.0070	

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~				~ ANSWER	MATRICES ~			
14. I learned a great deal in this course.	Results for	CS-2150-102						
Question Type: Likert	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
contributed by Office of the Provost	20	4.60	0.60	13 (65.00%)	6 (30.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 2000-	evel courses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
	2571	4.27	0.89	1255 (48.81%)	926 (36.02%)	261 (10.15%)	87 (3.38%)	42 (1.63%)
15. Overall, this was a worthwhile	Results for	CS-2150-102						
<b>course.</b> Question Type: Likert	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
contributed by $Office$ of the Provost	20	4.50	0.61	11 (55.00%)	8 (40.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 2000-	evel courses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
	2569	4.25	0.93	1257 (48.93%)	899 (34.99%)	263 (10.24%)	94 (3.66%)	56 (2.18%)
16. The course's goals and requirements	Results for	CS-2150-102	, Bloomfield,	Aaron S.		1		
were defined and adhered to by the instructor.	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Question Type: Likert <i>contributed by Office of the Provost</i>	20	4.60	0.50	12 (60.00%)	8 (40.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 2000-	evel courses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
	5389	3.79	1.10	1637 (30.38%)	1779 (33.01%)	1538 (28.54%)	67 (1.24%)	368 (6.83%)
17. The instructor was approachable	Results for	CS-2150-102	, Bloomfield,	Aaron S.				
and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom.	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Question Type: Likert <i>contributed by Office of the Provost</i>	20	4.35	0.93	12 (60.00%)	4 (20.00%)	3 (15.00%)	1 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 2000-	evel courses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
	5354	3.85	1.06	1778 (33.21%)	1622 (30.30%)	1581 (29.53%)	120 (2.24%)	253 (4.73%)
18. Overall, the instructor was an	Results for	CS-2150-102	, Bloomfield,	Aaron S.		1		
effective teacher. Question Type: Likert	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
$\tilde{r}$ contributed by Office of the Provost	20	4.60	0.68	14 (70.00%)	4 (20.00%)	2 (10.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Results for	SEAS, 2000-	evel courses					
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
	5360	3.80	1.08	1726 (32.20%)	1563 (29.16%)	1631 (30.43%)	173 (3.23%)	267 (4.98%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~		~ ANSWER MATRICES ~				
19. Please make any overall comments	Results for CS-2	2150-102				
or observations about this course: $\tilde{a}$	Total	Individual Answers				
Question Type: Short Answer	9	See below for Individual Results				
contributed by $Office$ of the Provost						
	<ul> <li>While I spent more time on this class than any other class I've taken at UVA, and while I didn't alwa appreciate it at the time, in retrospect I learned more in this class than any class I've taken before. Professor Bloomfield spends a lot of time planning this class and makes a very difficult course mor manageable for students by being incredibly well-organized and handling any issues promptly.</li> <li>I particularly enjoyed the non-report only labs</li> <li>Strangely, this course was one of the hardest I've taken and yet one of the few I learned so much from. I found it difficult to follow the lectures without the use of a textbook. I bought the textbooks a found them extremely useful when covering C++ (the data structures portion was alright, your teaching was better than the textbook for that). If you're planning on not using the textbook in the future, could you at least give us handouts and pages from the books in the future? the C++ one we extremely useful and I felt that would have helped me do better on the first exam (i only bought that was soo lost after I spent late night hours head-banging against the wall at small c++ compile mistakes and such.</li> </ul>					
	2150 has also to The one thing to really liked how lot - he kept at explained the c the slides work needed could b of his tabs corre were very useful comfortable in a was great expo very applicable hours students	ken 2150, I really feel like a CS major. While one of the hardest classes I've taken, been one of the most worthwhile. I learned so much from both the labs and lectures. hat CS is often lacking in terms of engineering is the "take things apart" aspect, so I we "got under the hood" a bit more in this class. I liked Bloomfield's teaching style a fast pace going through the material while still keeping humor in his lectures. He oncepts really well, and took advantage of the technology he was using - draving on ed well for explaining certain things. I liked his overhaul of collab - everything we e found there. (Although the mobile/ipod touch version of collab doesn't render some ectly; they show up as "Linked Tool" and don't load properly.) The uploaded lectures al for reviewing and studying the material. I'm glad that this class forced us to get a different development environment - learning to use emacs, unix, terminal, bash, etc sure and super useful. Basically, almost everything in this class, for the amount of in the real world. I would agree with Prof. Bloomfield that the class, for the amount of invest in it, should be a 4 credit class, although I know the department makes it ge it. Overall, thanks for a great semester!				
	Awesome cours	Se				
	Thanks for even taken here. You	rything, Professor Bloomfield. I learned more in your class than in any other course I've I're the man!				
	PLEASE PLEA make it four cre about it! The ar midterm exams painfully obviou pointer syntax v IBCM was not f - it was a waste teach us all the Intro to C++, th bother with C a preferably, don' was just plain n let's be honest: numerical induc UNIX command programming si into the course these parts; but later post-labs v analysis!"sain good stuff. The	to start with the negative stuff and save the good stuff (there is some!) for the end. SE PLEASE FOR THE LOVE OF K&R either reduce the workload for this course or dits (preferably both)!! Heck, split it into two courses if you want. Just do something nount of time spent on the lab assignments outside of class is LUDICROUS, and the were absolute horrors. This class is trying to do too much in one semester, and it's is. Throwing the Linked List lab at us when we were just beginning to learn C++ and vas mean-spirited. I spent well over 10 hours on that lab, and I'm a good programmer. ard, but it did not AT ALL help with learning actual x86 assembly! They're too different of time! Why did all the assembly stuff fall right in the middle of the course? Why not C++ stuff at once and then the unrelated stuff? The course seemed really disjointed: en assembly/x86, THEN advanced C++? Where's the logic behind that? And why ever nd Objective-C when it's just one post-lab each? Either go all-in with them or, t, since the course is trying to do too much already Shoving proofs into the exams toon and proof logic in their day-to-day jobs? I'm gonna guess, "barely any." Why put sa and Ermacs shortcuts on the exams? Seriously, what's the point of that? The actual tuff is enough to learn, so why add more layers of complexity on top of that? I came with a lot of existing UNIX experience (Ubuntu, luckily for me), so I did just fine on a la tof of people didn't, and that doesn't seem at all fair to me. The lab write-ups for the were very tedious, and I didn't feel like I learned anything from them. "Yay! Complexity d no-one ever. So basically, the curriculum needs a MAJOR revamp. Now for the electures were great. Prof. Bloomfield is a very engaging/enteraining lecturer and a that that helped tremendously. That's actually the only good thing about this course.				
	<b>U</b>	dit hours received for the course. Go back to 4!!				
	x86 and IBCM I					