IPRO 328

Spring 2008

Result of IPRO Deliverables

Project Plan	Grade: 14
<u>Midterm Report</u>	Grade: 1
Code of Ethics	Grade: 1

Work Results

	Book R	esulta	<u>5</u>	Exercise 2	Res			
/	Revised Chap	oters	7	total time sper	ent (n			
	Completely N Chapters		4	average time sp (min / prob)				
	Total Chapte	ers	11	average grade (out of 5)				
	Book Ch	nange	<u>S</u>	Exercise	Cha			
	Insertions	49	97	Changed				
	Deletions	51	8	Added				
	Total Changes	10	15	Deleted				
	<u>Lecture Slid</u>	le Res	<u>ults</u>	Exercise	Di			
	Chapters w/ S	lides	5	21%				
	Chapters w/o S	Blides	5					
	Total Slide	S	152	39%				

<u>Chapter Comments Score Board</u>

Team Member	Major	Chapters	Average/Chapter
Allen, David	Non-CS	1 0	12.2
Bathum, Nicholas	C S	8	4.8
Jeong, Seon	Non-CS	1 O	7.9
Johnson, Leland	C S	1 O	4.3
Kwak, Noh Hyup	Non-CS	1 0	8.5
Patel, Vivek	Non-CS	1 0	6.8
Schmitz, Peter	C S	8	4.1
Tilatti, Michael	Non-CS	1 0	11.0
H a m m e s , K a th e rin e	Non-CS	2	5.0
Kofman, Roman	C S	2	5.0
Tran, Harry	Non-CS	2	6.5
Rymek, Phil	C S	2	5.5

Testing and Improving a New Text for **Teaching Computer Science**

Code of Ethics



Easy Medium Hard

Overarching Standard

- All book-contributors will:
- Fulfill all requirements set forth by the client
- Submit only original work
- Never lose sight of the best interest of the consumers
- Never act unfairly toward fellow members

Paradigm of Code of Ethics

such as driving or making sandwiches. • All of our content is original and created with our audience in mind.

Meeting Structure

1. Two consecutive class hour meeting 2. Thursday IRC online chat 3. Wednesday Editing Subteam meeting

Name/Week	1/28-2/3	2/4-2/10	2/11-2/17	2/18-2/24	2/25-3/2	3/3-3/9	3/10-3/16	3/17-3/23	3/24-3/30	3/31-4/6	4/7-4/13	4/14-4/20	total
David Allen	7.0	6.0	6.8	9.6	13.5	12.3	3.0	5.5	6.0	7.5	9.0	7.0	93.2
Nicholas Bathum	7.3	3.5	7.0	11.5	10.0	10.0	7.0	1.0	6.0	3.0	8.0	6.0	80.3
Katherine Hammes	3.5	12.0	9.0	11.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	9.5	11.0	9.0	112.0
Seon Jeong	2.5	10.5	9.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	2.0	11.0	6.0	7.0	10.0	96.0
Leland Johnson	5.0	8.5	8.3	10.0	10.0	6.0	6.5	6.5	6.0	6.5	7.0	4.0	84.3
Roman Kofman	7.1	6.0	3.0	6.0	8.5	12.0	7.0	0.0	8.0	8.0	8.5	7.8	81.9
Noh Hyup Kwak	3.5	7.5	8.5	11.0	8.5	12.0	7.0	3.5	6.5	10.0	9.0	9.0	96.0
Vivek Patel	3.5	9.8	9.5	6.5	10.0	10.0	7.5	0.0	6.5	6.0	9.0	11.5	89.8
Phillip Rymek	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	8.0	0.0	9.0	8.5	9.0	10.0	96.5
Peter Schmitz	5.9	6.3	4.0	4.8	8.0	8.8	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	14.0	72.3
Michael Tilatti	5.0	10.0	6.5	6.0	10.0	10.5	6.0	0.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	8.0	86.0
Harry Tran	2.6	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	11.0	10.0	112.6
week total	57.9	100.1	89.6	105.4	116.5	120.6	81.0	41.5	94.0	85.5	102.5	106.3	1100.9
week average	4.8	8.3	7.5	8.8	9.7	10.1	6.8	3.5	7.8	7.1	8.5	8.9	91.7

- The book uses multicultural examples and exercises

IPRO Deliv

- Project P
- Midterm R
- Midterm Prese
 - Final Rep
- IPRO Day Pres
 - IPRO Day P
 - Code of Et
 - Website
 - Abstrac
 - Meeting Mi
 - CD-ROM
 - Team Debri

Mileston

Chapters 1 Midterm r Chapters Final Repo Deliverab

Time Spent

Project Plan

erable	S tart	Finish
lan	1 /2 5 /2 0 0 8	2 /2 2 /2 0 0 8
eport	3 /3 /2 0 0 8	3 /1 4 /2 0 0 8
entation	3 /3 /2 0 0 8	3 /1 4 /2 0 0 8
ort	4 /2 1 /2 0 0 8	5 /2 /2 0 0 8
sentation	4 /2 0 /2 0 0 8	5 /2 5 /2 0 0 8
Poster	4 /2 1 /2 0 0 8	4 /2 5 /2 0 0 8
thics	2 /1 5 /2 0 0 8	3 /7 /2 0 0 8
е	4 /1 8 /2 0 0 8	4 /2 5 /2 0 0 8
ct	4 /2 1 /2 0 0 8	4 /2 5 /2 0 0 8
nutes	1 /2 5 /2 0 0 8	4 /1 8 /2 0 0 8
Μ	4 /2 5 /2 0 0 8	5 /2 /2 0 0 8
ie fin g	5 /5 /2 0 0 8	5 /2 6 /2 0 0 8
nes	Start	Finish
-4 and eport	2 /4 /2 0 0 8	3 /1 6 /2 0 0 8
5 - 9	3 /1 4 /2 0 0 8	4 /2 8 /2 0 0 8
rtand bles	3 /1 4 /2 0 0 8	5 /2 /2 0 0 8

$|\mathbf{PRO}| 3 2 8$

Spring 2008

Editing Team 1: Katherine Hammes, Roman Kofman, **Phillip Rymek, Harry Tran**

- Created new chapters 1 through 8
- •Re-edited chapters 1 through 8 based upon others' comments
- Commented on chapters 9 and 10

Editing Team 2: Nicholas Bathum, Peter Schmitz

- Created new chapters 9 and 10
- Edited chapters 9 and 10 based upon others' comments
- Commented on chapters 1 through 8
- Initially helped the exercise team



][



Testing and Improving a New Text for Teaching Computer Science

IPRO 328 Members

David Charles Allen, Nicholas Bathum, Katherine Hammes, Seon Jeong, Leland Johnson, Roman Kofman, Noh Hyup Kwak, Vivek Patel, Phillip Rymek, Peter Schmitz, Michael Tilatti, Harry Tran, Yacin Nadji (Student Advisor), David Grossman (Advisor)

Exercise Team: David Allen, Nicholas Bathum, Seon Jeong, Noh Kwak, Vivek Patel, Peter Schmitz, Michael Tilatti

- Responsible for learning Ruby and all concepts presented in the book.
- Completed all homeworks to test proficiency of the book.
- Commented on every chapter of the new book.

Development Cycle

Step B



Editing Teams modify new chapter based upon Exercise teams comments

Grading Team grades homework turned in by Exercise Team

Exercise **Fixing Team** fixes exercises from chapter

Grading Team: Leland Johnson, Phillip Rymek

• Created lecture slides

• Taught the book in a lecture format

• Graded all the homeworks

• Commented on every chapter

Exercise Fixing Team: David <u>Allen, Seon Jeong, Noh Kwak,</u> Vivek Patel, Michael Tilatti

• Modified, deleted, and created problems for every chapter of the book. Populated new chapters with problems • Commented on every chapter





$|\mathsf{PRO}| = \frac{1}{2} |\mathsf{RO}|$

Spring 2008

Background

Most Traditional Computer Science Texts are:

- Long and Imposing
- Out of touch with student needs
- Out of touch with industry

Problem

Create an effective text:

•Assess and improve the text

- Create teaching tools
- Create new problem sets

Objectives

•Text itself

•Revise or rewrite all 8 Chapters

- •Teaching Tools Create and test slides
- •Problem Sets •Test and revise for all 8 Chapters

Results

- One entirely new book
- A lot of edits based upon real results
- An almost complete set of lecture slides
- Problems rearranged, edited, and recreated based on student feedback

Testing and Improving a New Text for Teaching Computer Science

Phase One (Create original book draft)



•They accomplished the following tasks:

- Improved & edited the text itself
- Developed 20~30 exercises per chapter and solutions for every exercise.
- Developed 5-6 programming examples
- Creating figures & accompaniments
- Created two Model Eliciting Activities

• The book was not perfected and needed a large scale revision phase, Phase 2 – this semester of IPRO 328

- Returning members from last years IPRO taught the class the contents of the book.
- Homework was assigned to class and graded by whoever lectured that week.
- Grades and class input were tracked using Google Docs and was used to drive changes to the book.

This innovative method allowed us to accomplish the following:

•Last semester's IPRO was given a bare bones draft of a Ruby textbook provided by Prof. Frieder & Prof.

After all the requirements are refined, the engineer will start solving the problem. He will draft and possibly redraft a design for the pridge. He will then assess how well the bridge design meets the

omputer science is no different. For example, someone might say: " need a piece of software that will allow me to keep track of all of my baseball cards." It is impossible to simply start hammering out software. A properly trained computer scientist will talk to the user and refine the requirements. How many baseball cards do you anticipate having? What information do you wish to store for each aseball card? Given the requirements, he will then draft a design. He will develop an *algorithm* – a sequence of steps used to solve the problem. He will then evaluate how well the design solves the problem and change it to solve its deficiencies. He is then finally able to write the code or to turn over the actual writing task to programmers-- just as a bridge engineer might turn over the bridge evelopment task to a team of carpenters and welders The design stage is key to any successful project. If we design a bridge that will collapse under certain wind conditions, the best carpentry in the world will do nothing to prevent it. In computer science, the design phase is often neglected or completely skipped. It is tempting to just write some code and see how things work

We believe that the heart and soul of computer science is abou algorithms. While not every project requires a fully detailed design, you should always put in the time to develop a good algorithm. If you skip this step and start writing code in the computer language of your choice, you might implement a solution that has more limitations that you imagined.

What is an Algorithm An *algorithm* is a sequence of steps for performing a task, often based on some input. Any series of steps can be thought of as an algorithm. For example if Nancy gives Scott directions to her house she is giving him an algorithm to follow. This algorithm may include such For computer science, it is convenient to write algorithms as a nbered series of steps. Directions from Scott's house are given elow in such a manner. In order to solve the problem of getting to Nancy's house, Scott simply needs to follow the 5 steps in order

Start going South on *River* road Turn left at *Main* stree

Take a right after three lights, at *Ruby* lane. Turn left at first Stop sign. You will now be on *Algorithm* House number 345 on the left is Nancy's

Phase Two (Test and Revise)



• We completely revised 7 of the chapters and created three entirely new chapters. • 8 of the 10 chapters have lecture slides, and they have all been successfully tested. • Problems from every chapter were revised and many new problems created.

