

CS 615 — Class Survey

Wes Weimer

Fall 2006

This survey *completely anonymous* (although you can sign your name if you feel like it). You should complete this survey even if you are not taking the class for a letter grade.

I (try to) use the information you provide to improve my teaching, both for this semester and for future ones. In my opinion of the purpose of the class is to help you learn the material. It should be a good use of your time. The goal of this class is to introduce you to modern programming language design and analysis techniques so that you can recognize them and apply them to your own projects.

You may turn in the survey by putting it (face down, say) on a pile on Tuesday’s class, by slipping it under my door, or by putting it in my faculty mailbox (a once-in-a-lifetime experience!).

Put a check mark in the appropriate box to indicate how much you agree with the statement. If you have no opinion or the statement does not apply to you, leave it blank. You may (always) scribble comments off to the sides.

Intent: Positive and negative statements are interspersed. If you disagree with a statement or feel that it is not true (e.g., “We mention Kofi Annan too much in this class”), check box #1.

	← Disagree ← ... → Agree →				
Question	1	2	3	4	5
I know how much work is expected of me.					
I know what quality of work is expected of me.					
The class is tough.					
The class is fair (i.e., the class is as difficult as it should be).					
This course has too much flash and not enough substance.					

I feel comfortable answering questions in class.					
I feel comfortable asking questions in class.					
I feel comfortable interrupting Wes.					
If I ask a question about something in class, the answer is helpful.					
Wes is intimidating.					
I like the amount of humor used in class.					
Wes is good at explaining the subject matter.					
I am bored during lectures.					
I am tired during class and thus do not participate.					

Wes talks too quickly.					
Wes talks too slowly.					
Too much material is covered too quickly.					
We do not cover enough material.					
I like the “early” lectures (from the beginning of the semester, when we covered >40 slides per lecture and there was less interaction).					
I like the “modern” lectures (more recently, when we cover <30 slides per lecture and spend more time going over fewer concepts).					
It is useful when Wes poses review questions to the class (e.g., “we’ll use axiomatic semantics to solve this — what is axiomatic semantics?”).					
I like it when Wes poses open-ended questions to the class (e.g., “how can we solve this?” or “what is wrong with this proof?”).					
I like it when Wes “sits on the table” and tells anecdotes about how this research plays out in real life.					
Wes makes it clear when something is “just his opinion.”					
Wes should stick to presenting standard material and leave his opinions at the door.					
Wes takes (non-contradictory) student suggestions seriously.					

Survey continued overleaf.

Question	← Disagree ← ... → Agree →				
	1	2	3	4	5
The presented material is well-motivated.					
The slide font size is large enough.					
Key words and definitions are clear and clearly defined.					
I know what I should be paying the most attention to during each lecture.					
The PDF copies of the slides are useful.					
The lectures are organized (e.g., outlines, material presented in dependency order, etc.).					
This class does not have enough notation — dude, could you add some more Greek?					

The homework focused on “just facts” rather than synthesis and analysis.					
Wes’ comments on my work are useful to me.					
The amount of work in this class meant that it couldn’t all be thoroughly comprehended.					
This class places too much emphasis on written communication.					
This class places too much emphasis on presenting my ideas clearly.					
It is useful to have Wes critique my written English prose.					
The assignments covered real-world research tasks (e.g., writing papers, evaluating related work, networking, building analyses).					

The required outside reading is useful.					
The reading was worth my time.					
I have read some of the optional reading.					
I like the older readings with perspectives from the “dawn of PL history”.					
There were too many assigned readings.					
There were enough alternate textbooks and presentations available.					

Wes is available after class for questions.					
Wes is available in his office for questions.					
(Assume department email is reliable.) Wes is available via email for questions.					
Department email is reliable.					
I enjoyed the bonus lecture.					
The bonus lecture was useful.					

I find it easy to remember the high-level content summaries (e.g., “operational semantics mumble program meaning mumble interpreter”).					
I find it easy to remember moderately detailed content (e.g., when you might use small-step opsem instead of large-step).					
I find it easy to remember low-level details (e.g., an opsem inference rule for if – then – else statements).					
I feel like I can recognize current PL research techniques.					
(If it were applicable) I could get started using PL on a problem in my research.					
Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this course.					

My least favorite readings (optional or required) are:

My favorite readings (optional or required) are:

My least favorite topics (in this class) are:

My favorite topics (in this class) are:

Wes should change the way he lectures so that ...