C S 201-0002 Software Development Methods - Fall 2008

School Of Engineering And Applied Science (301ug)

INSTRUCTORS: Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Respondents: 54 / Enrollment: 62

Summary: C S 201-0002 Software Development Methods - Fall 2008 (301ug)

Overall Course Rating

C S-201-0002 Mean 3.96 C S-201-0002 Std Dev 0.86 C S-201-0002 Response Count 270

Overall Instructor Rating

INSTRUCTOR: Sherriff, Mark Mean 4.35 Std Dev 0.78 Response Count 374

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~								
1. The subject matter was challenging.	Results for C S-201-0002								
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	54	4.07	0.61	11 (20.37%)	37 (68.52%)	5 (9.26%)	1 (1.85%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
2. The objectives of the course were	Results for	C S-201-0	002						
clearly stated and accomplished.	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly	Not
Question Type: Likert				Agree (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Disagree (1)	Applicable (NA)
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	54	4.28	0.53	17 (31.48%)	35 (64.81%)	2 (3.70%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
3. There was a reasonable level of effort	Results for C S-201-0002								
expected for the credit hours received. 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	54	4.04	0.78	14 (25.93%)	31 (57.41%)	6 (11.11%)	3 (5.56%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
4. The homework assignments helped	4. The homework assignments helped Results for C S-201-0002								
me learn the subject matter.	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly	Not
Question Type: Likert				Agree (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Disagree (1)	Applicable (NA)
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	54	4.26	0.68	20 (37.04%)	29 (53.70%)	4 (7.41%)	1 (1.85%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
5. The textbook increased my	Results for	C S-201-0	002						
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	54	3.10	1.07	4 (7.41%)	14 (25.93%)	23 (42.59%)	5 (9.26%)	6 (11.11%)	2 (3.70%)
6. The course material was well	Results for	C S-201-0	002, Sherriff	. Mark					
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	53	4.30	0.82	25 (47.17%)	21 (39.62%)	6 (11.32%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.89%)	0 (0.00%)
7. The instructor was knowledgeable	Depute for	C C 201 0	000 Chawitt	Moule					
about the subject matter.	Total		Std Dev	Strongly Agree	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
Question Type: Likert	54	4.61	0.63	(5) 37	13	4	0	(1) 0	(NA) 0
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	54	4.01	0.03	(68.52%)	(24.07%)	(7.41%)	(0.00%)	(0.00%)	(0.00%)
8. The instructor was well prepared for class.	Results for		002, Sherriff		Agree	Noutral	Disagras	Strongly	Not
Question Type: Likert		Mean		Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Disagree (1)	Applicable (NA)
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	53	4.60	0.66	36 (67.92%)	14 (26.42%)	2 (3.77%)	1 (1.89%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Question Type: Likert Standard Engineering and Applied Science Standard Engineering and Engineering and Applied Science Standard Engineering and A	~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~					~ 1	ANSWER	MATRI	CES ~			
Applied Appl		Results for	C S-	201-000	02, Sherrift	, Mark						
Security		Total			Std Dev	Agre					Disagre	e Applicabl
10. The grading policy was fair. Question Type: Likert Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (3) (2) (2) (2) (2) (3) (4) (4) (3) (2) (2) (2) (4) (4) (3) (2) (2) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4	Question Type: Likert	54	4.27		0.63	19	(54)				0	2
Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree	contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science					(35.19	1%) (51	1.85%) (9.26%		(0.00%	5) (0.00%	5) (3.70%)
Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science 53 4.08 0.83 17 26 (3) (3.2 18%) (3.2 1	10. The grading policy was fair.	Results for	C S-	201-000	02, Sherrift	, Mark						
13. The instructor responded adequately to in-class questions. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science 12. As a teacher, this instructor was better than most others in this School. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science 13. The average number of hours per Total Mean Sid Dev Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Not Designee Applied Science Agree Agr	Question Type: Likert	Total	Mean		Std Dev	Agre					Disagre	e Applicab
Adequately to in-class questions. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science 12. As a teacher, this instructor was hetter than most others in this School. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science 13. Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (3) (31,48%) (7,41%) (11,85%) (0,00%) (0,00%) 14. I searcher, this instructor was hetter than most others in this School. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering for this course was: Question Type: Multiple Choice contributed by Office of the Provost 14. I learned a great deal in this course. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 16. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was approachable and made himself/firestelf available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 19. The instructor was approachable and made himself/firestelf available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 19. The instructor was approachable and made himself/firestelf available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 1		53	4.08		0.83	17	17 26				0	0
Adequately to in-class questions. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science 12. As a teacher, this instructor was better than most others in this School. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science 13. The average number of hours per week I spent outside of class preparing for this course was: Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 14. I learned a great deal in this course. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 16. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was approachable and made hinself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 19. Contributed by O	11. The instructor responded	Posults for	C S-	201-000	na Sharriff	Mark						
Agrical Agri							gly A			Disagre	ee Strong	y Not
12. As a teacher, this instructor was better than most others in this School. Question Type: Likert Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Not Neutral	Question Type: Likert		Modif			Agre					Disagre	e Applicab
Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (2	contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science	54	4.48		0.72				7 4 48%) (7.41%)			
Applicate Commission Type: Likert Commission Co	12. As a teacher, this instructor was	Results for	C S-	201-000	02, Sherrift	, Mark						
Contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science 53 4.13 0.94 21 22 8 0 2 0.00% (0.00% 3.77%)	~	Total	I Mean		Std Dev							
13. The average number of hours per week I spent outside of class preparing for this course was: Question Type: Multiple Choice contributed by Office of the Provost 14. I learned a great deal in this course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, the instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree Ag	~	53			0 94	(5)		` ′		` ,	(1)	(NA)
Total Less than 1 1 3 4 6 7 9 100 rmore for this course was: Question Type: Multiple Choice contributed by Office of the Provost 44. I learned a great deal in this course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 16. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (11.11% (11.11%) (11.11					0.04		(41					
Contributed by Office of the Provost Standing of the Course of the Provost	13. The average number of hours per	Results for	C S-	201-000	02							
Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 4. I learned a great deal in this course. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile Course. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 16. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overall the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Course of the Provost 18. Overa		Total										
4. I learned a great deal in this course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 15. Overall, the instructor Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 16. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) (2) Disagree (4) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (4) Disagree (4) (3) (3) (4) Disagree (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) Disagree (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	Question Type: Multiple Choice	54	(1									
Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (5)	contributed by Office of the Provost											
Contributed by Office of the Provost 54 4.26 0.73 22 25 6 1 0 0.00%	14. I learned a great deal in this course.	Results for	C S-	201-000	02							
15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 6. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was approachable and made himself herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1) Disagree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (5) Disagree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (5) Disagree (6) Disagree (7) Disagree (7) Disagree (8) Disagree (8) Disagree (9) Disagree (1) D	Question Type: Likert	Total		Mean		ev s	Agree					Disagree
15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 6. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost Results for C S-201-0002 Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (7) Disagree (9) (1) Disagree (1) D	contributed by Office of the Provost	54		4.26	0.73		22					0
Course. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 6. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 7 total Mean Std Dev Strongly (43,40%) (43,40%) (9,43%) (3,77%) (0,00%) 8 Results for C S-201-0002, Sherriff, Mark Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) (0,00%) 9 Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2,27%) (0,00%) 10 Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) (1,00%) 11 The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 12 Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) (1,00%) 13 Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) (1,00%) 14 Agree (4) (3) (2) (1,00%) 15 Agree (4) (3) (2) (1,00%) 16 Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) (1,00%) 17 The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18 Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Ouestion Type: Likert	15 Overall this was a worthwhile	D 11 (0.0	004.000	20			(101	((1100,10)	(0100,0)
Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost Sample Contributed by Office of the Provost	*					ev S	Strongly	Ao	iree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly
6. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Students outside the Classroom. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Students outside the Provost 19. Overall type: Agree (4) (3) (2) (0.00%) 19. Overall type: Agree (4) (3) (2) (2) (2) (2) (3) (3) (2) (4) (3) (2)	Question Type: Likert				0.0.2		Agree	7.9				Disagree
were defined and adhered to by the instructor. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (5) Agree (5) (1)	contributed by Office of the Provost	53		4.26 0.7				(43.	23 (43.40%) (9			0 (0.00%)
instructor. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost Results for C S-201-0002, Sherriff, Mark Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (5.56%) (1.85%) (0.00%) Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1.85%) (0.00%) Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1.85%) (0.00%) Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1.85%) (0.00%) 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (9.26%) (1.85%) (0.00%) Results for C S-201-0002, Sherriff, Mark Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) Disagree (2) Disagree (4) (3) (2.2 Disagree (4) (3) (3) (2.2 Disagree (4) (3) (3) (3.2 Disagree (4) (3) (3.2 Disagree (4) (3.3 Disagree (4) Disagree (4) (3.3 Disagree (4) (3.3 Disagree (4) (3.3 Disagree (4) (3.3 Disagree (4) Disagree (4) (3.3 Disagree (4) Disagr	6. The course's goals and requirements	Results for	C S-	201-000	02, Sherrif	, Mark						
Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 17. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert Contributed by Office of the Provost Results for C S-201-0002, Sherriff, Mark Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (2) (1) (2) (3) (42.59%) (46.30%) (9.26%) (1.85%) (0.00%) 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (9.26%) (1.85%) (0.00%) Results for C S-201-0002, Sherriff, Mark Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (5) (5) (1) (2) Disagree (5) (1) (2) Disagree (5) (1) (2) Disagree (5) (1) (2) (2) (2) (2) (3) (42.59%) (46.30%) (40.3		Total		Mean	Std D	ev S	Agree					Strongly Disagree (1)
17. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Substituted by Office of the Provost Results for C S-201-0002, Sherriff, Mark Total Mean Std Dev Strongly (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1) (1) (1) (2) (1) (2) (2) (3) (42.59%) (46.30%) (9.26%) (1.85%) (0.00%) (9.26%) (1.85%) (0.00%) (9.26%) (1.85%) (0.00%) (9.26%) (1.85%	~	54	4.35		0.68		24					0
and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom. Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Ouestion Type: Like	3 30 0								,	,	, ,	, ,
Question Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost Section Type: Likert contributed by Office of the Provost 18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Section Type: Likert Outside Type: Likert Section Type: Likert Section Type: Likert Section Type: Likert Section Type: Likert Outside Type: Likert Section Type: Likert Section Type: Likert Outside Type: Liker	and made himself/herself available to						Strongly Agree					Disagre
18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher. Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Agree (5) Disagree (1) Strongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Agree (4) Office of the Property Strongly Agree (5) 10 11 12 13 14 15 14 15 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 19 19 19 19 19	~	54		4.30 0.7		2 23		(46.	25 30%)			0
Ouestion Type: Likert Total Mean Std Dev Strongly Agree (4) Agree (4) Neutral (3) Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1) Agree (5) 4.35 0.73 26 22 5 1 0	3 00 0									· ,	, ,	, ,,
Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Question Type: Likert Std Dev Stlongly Agree (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1) (1) (2) Disagree (1) (3) (2) Disagree (1) (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1) (4) (3) (2) Disagree (1) (4) (3) (4) (5) Disagree (1) (4) (5) Disagree (1) (5) Disagree (1) (6) Disagree (1) (6												
54 4.35 0.73 26 22 5 1 0	~	Total		Mean	Std D	ev S	Agree					Disagree
	contributed by Office of the Provost	54		4.35	0.73		26	(40.	22 74%)	5 (9.26%)		0 (0.00%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~						
19. Please make any overall comments	Results for C S-201-0002						
or observations about this course:	Total	Individual Answers					
Question Type: Short Answer	29	See below for Individual Results					
, , ,	Good professor, Wall prop	ared					

Good professor. Well prepared

Professor Sherriff brought a lot of energy to the classroom and through his enthusiasm really made the material relevant to the students.

Most definitely one the best teachers in SEAS. Really shows that he resembles his students and has a sense of humor we all can enjoy. Would take another class taught by him if I was a CS major.

Sherriff was an excellent teacher. The IM client was an interesting semester project. I would have liked more time on it, but it was still a lot of fun to do. As for some of his lectures, they were generally interesting and prepared you for future computing. For example, the lectures on Internet Security were some of the best lectures because it allows one to understand hackers' methods to attempt to obtain your personal information. All in all, Sherriff was an excellent teacher.

Sherriff was a very good professor. The only complaint I have is that sometimes I felt his tests were a little too focused on very specific details and were graded a little too harshly. Otherwise, it was a good class.

Definitely the most fun class that I took this semester. Very entertaining lectures for the most part

Professor Sherriff was very entertaining in lecture. I found him to be standoffish in my personal encounters. However, this did not greatly diminish my experience. I did not find the course material particularly useful, however this was hardly Professor Sherriff's fault.

Lively and engaging lectures, willing to help and answer questions and shape the course according to the interests of students.

Well Since this is the "BEST" course for my this semester. It would be "really long" to write down how I like this class. so I will try to find only something I don't like. - The clicker was too early I have to walk from Cable so some time I miss it. - The group work in class are not really effective. - Can't think of anything else The Best Class Thank you

I really enjoyed this class. Sherriff did a very good job teaching, he used slides, text and in class physical examples. I feel like he explained everything in several ways so that I could understand the concepts one way or another. My favorite class was talk like a pirate day.

Favorite class of the semester. I feel like I learned a lot more about programming, even though that wasn't the emphasis of the course. I found the instructor particularly knowledgeable and a good lecturer. I really enjoyed the class. Thanks.

Professor Sherriff is an amazing teacher, one of the best I have had here for certain. He teaches clearly and explains things well, but also has a sense of humor and keeps class interesting. Even on material I already knew I never found myself bored in class. I am seriously going to miss this class, and when I walked in the first day of 201 I said I didn't like CS at all!

Great professor who keeps you involved.

He make the class interesting.

his tests were extremely unfair....i struggled in cs 101 and i suck at coding and i can somewhat do it if we have the actual program to code in up but to write code by hand is ridiculous considering it would never be done....groups sucks cuz not everyone in the group does work.....overall tho hes a GREAT professor and is fair in everything else

I throughly enjoyed Prof. Sherriff's class. I was highly recommend it to anyone who wants to expand their knowledge of computer science, regardless of their major.

Amazing professor and a really awesome class.

na

The only suggestion I have is that in the future you make more clear what will be tested as you teach, and make more formal, exact definition of terms available. Before the test you make very clear what the test will be like, but in many cases I lack in my notes a definition I KNOW is correct; something I should study or memorize. Many definitions of terms tend to confuse me instead of clarifying the topic. I like that you involve the class by asking us to think out for ourselves what you will be teaching us, but in many cases I don't know whether a suggestion a student makes is something I will need to know for a test or something you kindly accept as an answer, even thought it's flat wrong and useless. The "work on this coding problem in a group" times are wonderful and worthwhile though.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

Prof. Sherriff's class reminded me why I decided to major in computer science last year. It is an engaging field that still has lots to offer society, and I want to be a part of that. The professor definitely went out of his way to make the material interactive and interesting, unlike other professors I've had in the e-school thus far. I liked the emphasis on theory over coding, but I felt that I could've benefited more from more in-class coding because I'm still not that good at coding things off the top of my head. The only thing I would fix about the project is that the roles of who codes should be somewhat more clearly defined by the instructor. In my group, the coding seemed to fall disproportionately on the software architect and GUI designer although their jobs are primarily coding; nonetheless, our project turned out fantastically. It also might be nice to have three midterms instead of two to encourage students to be regularly keeping up with material. The bubbling grading system was pretty cool, as was the Cheerwine. I look forward to perhaps having Prof. Sherriff again in a later CS course.

Professor Sheriff did a good job keeping students engaged while at the same time making the topics digestible. I also really enjoyed his approach to tests, that the goal wasn't to trick/surprise students, but rather to be transparent with what was expected. Found myself enjoying going to lectures, and while some topics were, well, very dull (UML diagrams, etc), there was a good mix of topics that actually help my interest (OS's, networking, for example). Project was stressful, but satisfying.

Professor Sherriff made this course a pleasure to take. He required a high but reasonable level of effort from students, and in return, provided more than usual support to students. He was readily accessible and answered questions promptly. Grades were returned extremely quickly. Grading was done fairly. He's enthusiastic about his subject and this shows in his delivery of the material. If you have a choice between instructors for a course, choose him.

I absolutely loved this class. Thank you so much for this experience. I had no requirement to take this class but it was more than worth while.

Needed to give some more formal explanations of topics. Sometimes when questions were asked, he would give another example as a definition or another ambiguous explanation.

Very good class. Thanks for not torturing us w/ the last assignment. Wish we could've done more w/ Internet Security stuff.

Thought the course was interesting and very useful information. Wished had spent more time studying the material beforehand so class was more worthwhile. Needs a somewhat thorough understanding by students in order to get a good grasp of such crucial material.

challenging

Really enjoyed the class. Very timely grading of assignments and tests. :) Sherriff was an excellent teacher, knew his material, explained things well, great sense of humor and very enthusiastic about the subject matter.

Mark Sherriff, please teach all my classes!