| Academic Year: 201 | 9 Term : | January-April | Department: | CS |
|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------|--------|
| Instructor: Vinod Gana | pathy Course: | Operating Systems | Course No.: | E0 253 |

| | Instructor Feedback Summary | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|---------|------------------|------|----------------------------------|--|
| | Registered | | | Respond | ed | | | |
| | 26 | | | | 15 | | | |
| SI. No | Question | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Satisfactor y | Poor | Weighted Average(Out of 5) | |
| 1 | Overall rating | 8 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.40 | |
| 2 | Expertise in the subject | 9 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.47 | |
| 3 | Level of preparation for the lectures | 9 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4.40 | |
| 4 | Clarity of expression and Presentation | 8 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.40 | |
| 5 | Pace of teaching | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4.20 | |
| 6 | Coverage of the Subject | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4.07 | |
| 7 | Motivation for Advance Learning | 6 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4.13 | |
| 8 | Responsiveness and encouragement to questions | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.53 | |
| 9 | Accessibility outside the class | 11 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.67 | |
| 10 | Relevance of tests and assignments | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4.13 | |

Instructor Comments

4.07

Discussion of tests and assignments in the class

| SI. No | Comments |
|--------|--|
| 1 | His teaching is good. but sometimes i feel he unnecessarily complicates the subject by teaching new advanced things. |

| Course Feedback Summary | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------|---------|--|
| Registered | Responded | Percentage | Faculty | |
| | 14 | | ENGG | |

| Overall rating of the course | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|
| Excellent(5) | Good(4) | Average(3) | Below Average (2) | Poor(1) | Weighted Average (Out of 5) |
| 5 (35.7%) | 7 (50.0%) | 2 (14.3%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 4.21 |

| Depth of coverage in tests and assignments | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| High(3) | Moderate(2) | Low(1) | Weighted Average (Out of 3) | | |
| 9 (64.3%) | 5 (35.7%) | 0 (0.0%) | 2.64 | | |

Novelty of the course

| Very High(5) | High(4) | Moderate(3) | Low(2) | Very Low(1) | Weighted Average (Out of 5) |
|--------------|-----------|-------------|----------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| 2 (14.3%) | 8 (57.1%) | 4 (28.6%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 3.86 |

Organisation of the course Excellent(5) Good(4) Average(3) Below Average(2) Poor(1) Weighted Average (Out of 5) 3 (21.4%) 11 (78.6%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 4.21

| Coverage of contemporary advanced topics | | | | | |
|--|---------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Extensive(5) | Sufficient(4) | Average(3) | Limited(2) | Negligible(1) | Weighted Average (Out of 5) |
| 5 (35.7%) | 9 (64.3%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 4.36 |

| Availability of Study Material | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Extensive(5) | Sufficient(4) | Average(3) | Limited(2) | Negligible(1) | Weighted Average (Out of 5) |
| 9 (64.3%) | 5 (35.7%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 4.64 |

| Meeting Learning Expectations | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Extremely Satisfied(5) | Well Satisfied(4) | Satisfied(3) | Marginally Satisfied(2) | Not Satisfied (1) | Weighted Average (Out of 5) |
| 4 (28.6%) | 6 (42.9%) | 4 (28.6%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 4.00 |

| Number of hours per week spent by student | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
| 0-4 | 4-8 | 8-12 | 12-16 | Above 16 | |
| 0 (0.0%) | 3 (21.4%) | 6 (42.9%) | 2 (14.3%) | 3 (21.4%) | |

| Course Type | | | | |
|-------------|----------|----------|--|--|
| Core | Softcore | Elective | | |
| 11 (79%) | 1 (7%) | 2 (14%) | | |

| Additional Comments | |
|---------------------|--|
| SI. No | Comments |
| 1 | Certain topics like Networking was not touched upon. |
| 2 | In pintos is fun to solve but still useless workload, because it has nothing to do with what is taught, is class. So remove pintos and make project compulsory. |
| 3 | The assignment should be allowed to do in pairs as they require a lot of time. Other than that it would be helpful if assignment deals with the working of the real Linux kernel and not pintos kernel as our research will be more closely related to the real kernel which is much more complex and we will be more motivated too. |
| 4 | The class timings was a major drawback. |