

## Mid-term course evaluation

This evaluation will help us improve 6.170. Please **be specific** and **name names** in your comments; generalities will not help us improve the course. We have provided some questions as guidelines, but please write whatever you think will be helpful to the course staff.

### The staff

**Comment on the lectures.** Do they benefit you? Are they practical? well-motivated? comprehensible? interesting? Are questions answered well? Is too much background assumed? Is the blackboard style effective? If you don't attend, why not? If you don't understand issues, do you ask questions? If not, why not? How can lectures be improved? Answer these questions for both Prof. Ernst and Prof. Guttag.

Michael Ernst:

John Guttag:

**Comment on the recitations.** Give the name of your recitation instructor. \_\_\_\_\_  
Use the questions above (for lectures) as a guideline for your comments.

**Comment on the remainder of the course staff.** This question can include lecturers, TAs, and LAs. Is the staff knowledgeable, with adequate technical background? Is the staff helpful, accessible, friendly, and willing to answer questions? Were you able to get attention from the course staff when you needed it? Use this space for any other comments on the staff.

(over)

## The written material

**Comment on the assignments.** Is the material taught before you have to do them? What other parts of the course are essential for doing well on the assignments? Are they helpful in learning the subject matter? Do they challenge you? How can they be improved? Also comment on hardware and software quality, availability, accessibility, etc.

Do you do the reading? Is it useful?

## The course

How many hours per week does this course require during an *average* week? \_\_\_\_\_

Rate the *conceptual* difficulty of this course, where 0=trivial, 5=average, 10=painful. \_\_\_\_\_

Is the course well-organized? How can it be improved?