

Welcome, Martine Ceberio! Log Out

Search...

Manage Activities

Rapid Reports

PasteBoard

Run Reports

Help

< Edit Teaching Evaluations

You do not have access to modify some of the fields on this screen. If changes are needed, contact your Digital Measures Administrator, [Didi](#)

Term and Year

Fall 2013

Course

Fall 2013, CS 3360 Section 12910

N Count

28

Cancel

Section A: UT System Required Questions					
1. The instructor clearly defined and explained the course objectives and expectations.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
46.4000 %	35.7000 %	10.7000 %	3.6000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %
2. The instructor was prepared for each instructional activity.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
64.3000 %	17.9000 %	7.1000 %	10.7000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %
3. The instructor communicated information effectively.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
57.1000 %	21.4000 %	10.7000 %	7.1000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %
4. The instructor encouraged me to take an active role in my own learning.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
64.3000 %	25.0000 %	3.6000 %	3.6000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %
5. The instructor was available to students either electronically or in person.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
82.1000 %	3.6000 %	10.7000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %
Section B: The following questions refer to the instructor.					
6. Rate the effectiveness of the instructor in stimulating your interest in the subject:					
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
35.7000 %	35.7000 %	10.7000 %	7.1000 %	10.7000 %	0.0000 %
7. Rate the organization of the instructor:					
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
53.6000 %	32.1000 %	7.1000 %	3.6000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %
8. Rate the clarity of class assignments:					
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
28.6000 %	32.1000 %	14.3000 %	7.1000 %	17.9000 %	0.0000 %
9. Rate the relevance of class assignments:					
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
60.7000 %	10.7000 %	25.0000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %	3.6000 %
10. Rate the relevance of course materials to stated course objectives:					
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
60.7000 %	14.3000 %	17.9000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %	3.6000 %
11. Rate the varied use of questions, discussions, lectures, and/or group work in the class:					
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
50.0000 %	21.4000 %	14.3000 %	3.6000 %	7.1000 %	3.6000 %
12. Rate the instructor's availability during posted office hours:					
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
75.0000 %	7.1000 %	17.9000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %

75.0000 %

7.1000 %

17.9000 %

0.0000 %

0.0000 %

0.0000 %

13. Provide an overall rating of the instructor:

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
60.7000 %	21.4000 %	3.6000 %	10.7000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %

Section C: The following questions refer to this course.

14. I took this course:

To fulfill a requirement	As an elective	For my own interest	No Response
96.4000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %

15. Before taking this course, my level of interest in the subject was:

High	Average	Low	Unsure	No Response
39.3000 %	39.3000 %	17.9000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %

16. Estimate how much you learned in this course:

Well Above Avg	Above Avg	Average	Below Avg	Well Below Avg	No Response
21.4000 %	53.6000 %	14.3000 %	10.7000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %

17. Rate the effectiveness of this course in challenging you intellectually:

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
39.3000 %	39.3000 %	21.4000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %

18. Provide an overall rating of this course:

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Poor	No Response
32.1000 %	42.9000 %	10.7000 %	14.3000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %

Section D: Expected Grade

19. The final grade I expect in this course is:

A	B	C	D	F	I	P	S	U	No Respo
35.7000 %	39.3000 %	21.4000 %	0.0000 %	3.6000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %	0.0000 %

Imaged Paper Evaluations with Comments

No File Stored

Choose File...

Instructor Comments

🔒 Student Comments

Establishing a standard notation of topics between the TA and instructor would help. *** Ea both lab and homework helped in improving my skills and I encourage to add homework as next semester. *** Excellent course and all the assignments were extremely helpful in prep tests. The only suggestion I would have would be to work on some lab sessions taught by th were helpful, but could have been a bit more in depth and relevant to the assignments, as w lectures. *** Good overall, but sometimes some topics were explained in a way that made t harder than they actually were. Also, the languages we had to learn, nobody really thought i worked, yeah we got some powerpoints but i dont think it was good enough, specially with i would love to have seen more exercises resolved beforehand, I understand that you can lea things, but some us learn more effectively by seeing and hearing than doing. *** Ceberio h teach the class a few programming languages that we were required to learn in order to cor required projects. The TA seemed to have little to no experience in the languages he was tea was not very successful at answering questions. I had to learn most of the languages on my google or youtube videos. I was very disappointed in how the class was taught, it would have beneficial if a study guide was handed out for each of the languages and maybe cover more of how to use the language. *** The instructor should try to explain the material in a simple more examples common to the student's knowledge. She should take into account students background of the material as well as the ones with stronger background and work with the accordingly. The feedback provided on graded quizzes and exams is good, as well as providi answers to passed assignments and quizzes. Overall, good professor always accessible and *** The professor was great, very patient and understanding. My favorite part of the course other programming languages alongside their respective paradigms; on that note, maybe tl oriented paradigm assignment should be done in a language like Ruby/Python instead of JA felt like we covered very little theory because learning AspectJ, Haskell, Prolog and PHP took time but maybe that is just me. *** Exellent teaching unique and interesting. Wish more C'

time but maybe that is just me. *** Excellent teaching unique and interesting. Not more c
as personable and humane as her *** More time needs to be dedicated to teaching the ma
effectively by giving more examples instead of just one and then having students work out r
If more examples where done as a class questions that many students have may be answer
effectively instead of trying to answer questions individually. Also some times the quizzes to
time out of the course and thus left very little time to go over the material. It would help if q
shorter. *** i just feel there wasn't enough time to acomplish a full understanding of all the
from the in class homework, to the projects *** Very good professor, always willing to help
you do not understand something. She is there to help the students succeed in their educat
one of the better professors I have had. *** Dr. Ceberio uses coverage teaching - in other w
not directly teach a majority of the information in the class, instead expecting students to di
amounts of text. During class, she chose a few topics and covered them very (emphasized v
Also, she often split up students into groups during class for almost all of the class time, anc
students to learn from each other. This is a very naive approach to teaching, as students cor
unprepared and expecting to learn from the teacher. How can you learn the material fro...