# INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY MADRAS

## TCF Evaluation:JAN-MAY 2025

**Employee ID :**008606

**Faculty Name :** RUPESH NASRE

**Course No :**CS2810

**Course Name :** Object-Oriented Algorithms Implementation and Analysis Lab

**Responses / Regn :**79/101

**Department :**Computer Science and Engineering

**Summary**

| Evaluation | Mean | Median | Std Dev | MAD | Dept Mean | Institute Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Course | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.78 | 0.80 |
| Instructor | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.79 | 0.81 |
| Technical Staff | 0.82 | 0.80 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 0.82 |

**Question-Wise Response**

| Question No | SA | A | N | DA | SDA | NA | Mean | Institute Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 36 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0.84 | 0.79 |
| 2 | 40 | 30 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0.86 | 0.80 |
| 3 | 42 | 29 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0.87 | 0.78 |
| 4 | 37 | 26 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0.83 | 0.76 |
| 5 | 50 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0.90 | 0.83 |
| 6 | 41 | 26 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0.86 | 0.80 |
| 7 | 36 | 32 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0.84 | 0.78 |
| 8 | 25 | 35 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0.78 | 0.74 |
| 9 | 34 | 31 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0.84 | 0.77 |
| 10 | 41 | 31 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0.87 | 0.80 |
| 11 | 32 | 35 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0.84 | 0.82 |
| 12 | 28 | 33 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0.79 | 0.80 |

NOTE:SA(STRONGLY AGREE)=10 A(AGREE)=8 N(NEUTRAL)=6 DA(DISAGREE)=4 SDA(STRONGLY DISAGREE)=2 NA(Not Applicable/Do not wish to answer)=0

| Question list |
|---|
| 1.The course objectives were stated clearly and met largely |
| 2.Sufficient background material/manuals/instructions/computational resources were available in advance for each class |
| 3.The instructor provided help to understand the concepts involved and to improve my skill |
| 4.Evaluation was done in a fair and impartial manner |
| 5.The laboratory classes were conducted closely following the schedule |
| 6.The course implements the experimental aspects of the relevant concepts effectively |
| 7.The availability and condition of the equipment/computational resources were good |
| 8.The quantum of the work is adequate for the credits involved |

| |
|---|
| 9.The course motivated me to explore the subject area with interest |
| 10.Overall, the course provided a good value-addition to my knowledge/skill-set |
| 11.I received adequate support from the technical/laboratory staff |
| 12.I received adequate support from the teaching assistants |

NOTE:Qn 1 to 5 - Instructor evaluation : Qn 6 to 10 - Course evaluation : Qn 11 & 12 - TA evaluation

| **Student Remarks** |
|---|
| Very well structured! |
| Amazing course |
| The course was really good. also, Thank you for giving enough time to learn and code in 2 days for each lab. also, the questions were like 6 pages long, maybe most cant solve in 3 hours. questions made me learn much and good. but I heard and know some are using AI and Im very sad that ai is giving complete big code which is passing all testcases. those students are learning nothing. also the complexity of course doesnt worth 6 credits ig. The prof is good, teaches Concepts before each lab. |
| nice course |
| I feel that a few more algorithms could have been implemented in the assignments, a lot of unnecessary jargon the in Problem Statements made it lengthy for no reason and we lost out the essence of the algorithm in some sense. |
| okay |
| the course was well planned and provided a good addition to my knowledge of OOAIA |
| Rupesh Sir is one of the very few teachers I’ve come across in my 20 years of life who genuinely cares more about students learning, implementing, and engaging in meaningful discussions than just chasing marks. IIT M CS is truly fortunate to have such an inspiring professor. |
| The problems couldve been a little better... some of them felt like the concept was being forced in... The prof was really good though. |
| The testcases for most problems were not good, because the slightest change to the constant factor in your program makes a bunch of test cases fail. The test cases should be made a bit better, with more leeway for implementation differences. Also I feel like it would have been better for the assignments to be in lab assignments. |
| The course went on pretty well, providing precise insights on the OOP concepts and Algorithm Implementations, but just a small thing (not an exact suggestion but more like a feedback) is that the midsem couldve been slightly more on the hand, so as to make atleast 40% of the strength to solve it (cant expect more from Chahel though) (and hoping the ends will atleast meet the requirements) |
| Most of the lab assignments had OOPS being forced into it rather than it being expected naturally. The initial labs required much more effort than the expected effort from the credits because of debugging and poor testcases. The theory part was really good and I learnt a lot of OOPS |
| Teaching assistants should collaborate on making problems and proof read, significant energy of the student goes in figuring out an ambiguity introduced by the TA and at the end all good coding practises are lost to get a code that passes all test cases |
| Ta interaction was not good atleast with the set of tas I have got |
| The teaching was good, and interactive. The course helped alot in the area. The midsem alone didnt go as expected |
| good course |
| The midsem was too much like, it neither relates to OOPS nor to Algorithms. And the running time was made exact. |
| The evaluation was not uniform for all students. Some TAs were pretty strict with the evaluation scheme for midsem while others werent, especially when the exam was tough and lengthy and it was considered good to even get some testcases correct. |
| best prof ever. ez. |
| nice course and nice instructor |
| nyc teaching |

| |
|---|
| MOST of the TAs seem incompetent at setting labs and designing code. Except for Chahel, Rishabh and Gokul, most of them set labs with terrible code requirements. It was a nightmare to debug their mistakes in the design document and test cases, and an even worse nightmare to write code according to the design provided. |
| the last 4-5 labs could be done within the lab itself or with 2-3 hours of extra work but some labs like avengers needed a lot of combined effort the design document was limiting at times example , in lab 9 about DAGs,having different classes for different algos which caused copying the same graph 4 times in lab 10 , overloading * for multiplication class instead of the overloading* for the polynomial class other labs were very good and inspiring to explore the topics |
| The teaching component of the course was very good. The professor also cleared most of the doubts I had and it was a great learning experience. The lab component was also great except the fact that there was some ambiguity in PS or a few incorrect testcases sometimes. But except this, the course was good. |
| if the questions for the labs change every year, then I think it would be a good idea to provide the students with previous years hackerrank links for practice |
| The course material was great, and I learnt a lot of C++ even when I had some previous knowledge. The lab design documents sometimes went against common design principles - so that sometimes was confusing. Also, a lot of topics done in class were not really used in the lab - but that is something we can do at home. |
| Course was good, but I think different class slot will be better. But rupesh sir handeled it very well and gave us 2 days time for submission, which is very good. |
| There were often many ambiguities or errors in the testcases or problem statements. I feel more thought could have been put into making the problems and the design specifications. I feel having a portion of the course as some good projects might have helped provide a better learning experience. |

**Number of students who were not willing to participate in the evaluation for this course:**0

| **Comments by students who didn't fill the TCF for this Course** |
|---|
| No Remarks Given |