

STUDENTS' RATINGS/COMMENTS ON MODULE

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Academic Year: 2008/2009
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Semester: 2
 Module: COMPETITIVE PROGRAMMING - CS3233

Qn	Items Evaluated	Module Avg Score	Nos Responded
1	Overall opinion of the module.	4.235	17
2	Grade likely to get for the module.	4.529	17
3	Difficulty level of the module.	4.235	17

Qn\SCORE	5	4	3	2	1
Qn 1: Overall opinion of the module.	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Poor
Qn 2: Grade likely to get for the module.	A	B	C	D	F
Qn 3: Difficulty level of the module.	Very Difficult	Difficult	Average	Easy	Very Easy

Frequency Distribution (Qn 1: Students' Overall Opinion on the module)

Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)

ITEM\SCORE	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Poor
Module	6 (35.29%)	9 (52.94%)	2 (11.76%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Module at Same Level (Dept)	91 (22.25%)	190 (46.45%)	93 (22.74%)	24 (5.87%)	11 (2.69%)
Module at Same Level (Fac)	114 (17.30%)	286 (43.40%)	188 (28.53%)	47 (7.13%)	24 (3.64%)

Frequency Distribution (Qn 2: Grades likely to get for the module)

Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)

ITEM\SCORE	A	B	C	D	F
Module	9 (52.94%)	8 (47.06%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Module at Same Level (Dept)	131 (32.75%)	214 (53.50%)	46 (11.50%)	9 (2.25%)	0 (.00%)
Module at Same Level (Fac)	188 (28.97%)	363 (55.93%)	84 (12.94%)	14 (2.16%)	0 (.00%)

Frequency Distribution (Qn 3: Difficulty level of the module)

Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)

ITEM\SCORE	Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)				
	Very Difficult	Difficult	Average	Easy	Very Easy
Module	6 (35.29%)	9 (52.94%)	2 (11.76%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Module at Same Level (Dept)	89 (21.76%)	207 (50.61%)	111 (27.14%)	2 (.49%)	0 (.00%)
Module at Same Level (Fac)	96 (14.55%)	277 (41.97%)	275 (41.67%)	10 (1.52%)	2 (.30%)

Q1. Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the module, and suggest possible improvements.

1. The module is interesting and exciting. Many useful and uncommon algorithms and problems are taught in the module, and since the module is geared towards solving problems, the rate of application is higher (students can absorb more). Improvements to the organization of the module can increase teaching effectiveness, though.
2. Overall the module is good. However, I think randomly dividing students into teams for contests was not a good idea. Students should be selected carefully based on their scores or something to maintain a skill balance between teams.
3. NA
4. Good This module allows me to realise my strengths and weakness in my programming skills. (CS1102C is simple imo) Not graded on bell curve. No exams Bad Some topics are of very high level.
5. Strength: Many topics are covered. Provide a good starting point for those who haven't learned about competitive programming before and provide good exercise for those who involved in programming competition before. Weakness: Not many topics were covered extensively. But due to the time constraint, it can't be helped.
6. Learn a lot of chim algo with chim name. Test a lot on intelligence in understanding chim algo
7. this module is very fun. we are introduced to many interesting algorithms. however, this module is too heavy. but we did learn a lot in this module.
8. It is hard to come up with a good syllabus for this module as the scope of ACM-ICPC is extremely wide and because the people who are taking the course has extremely different level of skills. I think the module did a good job in striking the balance. I do wish that more difficult things are taught, but there is a limit if we take the students into consideration.
9. good start for the ACMICPC. learned quite a lot of basic ideas.
10. This module is quite tough because it is not easy to improve without spending much time practicing. The grading principle of this module is not that reasonable.
11. strengths: a lot of staff weaknesses: a lot of staff

The National University of Singapore has used reasonable endeavours to ensure that the information posted on this Website is correct at the time of posting. However, the University gives no warranty and accepts no liability for the accuracy or the completeness of the information provided.

In providing such student feedback, the University does not in any way, expressly or implicitly, endorse the views

19/6/2009

SOC TEACHER ASSESSMENT REPORT ...

expressed or the contents thereof.