

Term	Spring, 2018 (2018A)	Enrollment	23	School	ENGINEERING & APPLIED SCIENCE					
Activity Type	LEC	Eligible	23	Division	-					
Cross Listed Sections	-	Responses	23	Department	COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE					
		Response Rate	100%	Subject	COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCI					
Average Ratings										
Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	This Instructor Only Worst Rating...Best Rating					Responses	
				-	0	1	2	3	4	
1 Overall quality of the instructor. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent</i>	3.65	3.65	3.65	-	0%	4%	4%	13%	78%	23
2 Overall quality of the course. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent</i>	3.35	3.35	3.35	-	0%	4%	9%	35%	52%	23
3 Please rate the difficulty of the course. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Easy, Somewhat Easy, Neutral, Somewhat Difficult, Difficult</i>	2.06	2.06	2.06	-	0%	22%	50%	28%	0%	18
4 Instructor was appropriately accessible outside of class time. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent</i>	3.67	3.67	3.67	-	0%	0%	11%	11%	78%	18
5 Overall quality of the TA(s), if applicable. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent</i>	3.25	3.25	3.25	-	0%	6%	19%	19%	56%	16
6 Instructor's ability to communicate the subject matter. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent</i>	3.56	3.56	3.56	-	0%	0%	11%	22%	67%	18
7 Instructor's ability to stimulate student interest. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent</i>	3.56	3.56	3.56	-	0%	6%	0%	28%	67%	18
8 Value of assigned readings. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent</i>	3.13	3.13	3.13	-	0%	0%	38%	13%	50%	16
9 Amount learned from this course in terms of knowledge, concepts, skills and thinking ability. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent</i>	2.78	2.78	2.78	-	6%	17%	22%	6%	50%	18
10 Please rate the amount of work required for this course. <i>Scale: 0 to 4: Very Little, Little, Neutral, Much, Very Much</i>	2.44	2.44	2.44	-	0%	6%	50%	39%	6%	18
11 Would you recommend this course to a major? <i>Scale: 0 to 4: No, May Not, Would Consider, Yes, Strongly</i>	2.94	2.94	2.94	-	0%	11%	28%	17%	44%	18
12 Would you recommend this course to a non-major? <i>Scale: 0 to 4: No, May Not, Would Consider, Yes, Strongly</i>	2.61	2.61	2.61	-	0%	6%	39%	44%	11%	18
24 To your knowledge, has there been cheating in this course? <i>Scale: 0 to 1: Yes, No</i>	0.93	-	-	-	7%	93%	-	-	-	15

Cheating Comment

students would copy each other's code, as well as code derived from online, but this was sanctioned by the professor.

Comment Suggestion

I had so much fun with this course. I spent a lot of time on class work because I couldn't stop thinking about the projects! If I have any complaints, it's that it was too much fun and I found it difficult to keep the rest of my life in balance. :)

Course was extremely enjoyable and a refreshing break from the usual structure of classes here at Penn

Very unique course. Will only work with a very small class (20ish students)

Very interesting course! It might not have been for me personally but I think it's an exciting and engaging educational opportunity.

I really enjoyed this course overall. I loved the group project focus. "Soft" skills like being able to work in a team are often overlooked in CS programs, and this class provides an excellent opportunity to develop them. I learned so much about how to work on group projects between the first project and the last. This class let me test different strategies for handling collaboration, and I now have a better idea of what I need to do to have a good experience while working in a team. My one suggestion for future iterations of this course is to dedicate a class at the beginning of the semester to GIT basics and GIT workflows (branching, keeping a branch up to date as master is updated, and then merging the branch back onto master). Poor understanding of GIT lead to a lot of problems in this class, and it causes a lot of problems in the working world as well. Lack of basic understanding of GIT is unacceptable at a master's level.

I felt like the projects had diminishing marginal value in terms of learning -- this may have been because I didn't put enough time into the projects myself, or that I didn't know enough to enjoy the later projects. One of the things that I had trouble with is participation. I was often too scared to speak up because I wasn't confident about my ideas, or thought that they weren't worthy of wasting the class' time on. I'm not sure if there were other people in the same boat, or what the best way to solve this would be, but it would be great if there was an easier way to allow people to participate without having to feel impostor syndrome or otherwise.

This has been the best course I have taken in my two years at Penn! It is very stimulating, fun and encourages team work and thinking from many different points of view. It is one of those courses where you work because you WANT to, and because the projects are simply just that interesting!

The course did a good job simulating what its like to work on a team in real software engineering jobs. Working with teammates towards a common goal and conveying progress and results in a structured manner were very useful skills not often taught in other courses. It could have been helpful to utilize the recitations more with some lab sessions on things like git, command line usage, etc. They also could have been used to go over algorithms, either more relatively common ones that non-CIS majors may not have experience with, to less commonly known algorithms which could be useful for projects or at least stimulating ideas for the project. I think it would be best for the course to not use past code from previous iterations of the course (as in project 2), as it seemed to lead to just utilizing old code to excel, as opposed to developing new strategies based on current groups players and strategies. While utilizing other groups code is allowed, I think more emphasis should be placed on how exactly groups were improving upon other groups' code, as it sometimes seemed like groups simply used other groups code to perform as well as them (sometimes performing even worse than the group they took code from). More time could also have been devoted to discuss tips on writing scientific papers and giving presentations on results , as they were generally described at the start of the course, but more feedback was only received by talking with the instructors. This could be another use of recitation times, where the instructor could provide more tips/feedback on presentations and reports, and even give examples on good presentation delivery (in class/recitation examples, videos of good talks, etc.). Overall, the course was an enjoyable and unique experience, providing a lot more interaction with both the instructor and other students than other courses tend to.

Instructor Comment

Swap was quite hands-off with this class. He would initiate discussions but mostly served as a moderator. He provided some really great material for us to work on and discuss and encouraged us to find our own solutions. But he was available whenever he was needed to deal with problems.

Excellent instructor! Could have given the class discussions a little bit more formal direction, but I know he was avoiding that to let us come up with our own ideas.

Dr. Swap is an excellent instructor, and I'd recommend taking any course he teaches. I particularly appreciate his ability to provide clear expectations on code functionality and project timelines. The extra preparation he puts into his classes makes for a very pleasant learning experience.

Swap is super understanding and always has the best interest of his students at heart.

Excellent Instructor! Very inspiring how much he knows about the subject. I really appreciate his work ethic and approachability too.

The instructor did a great job leading class discussions and presenting project descriptions and strategies. While most class revolved around students' ideas and progress, it could have been useful to go over some lesser known algorithms that could be useful for projects, or lead to other types of approaches that were not considered by groups.