

### PRACTICE OF COMPUTER SCIENCE - (CSC 106-A01) - (CRN20657) - Celina Berg

### UVic Course Experience Survey - Fall 2014/Spring 2015

Project Audience 195 Responses Received 61 Response Ratio 31%

Creation Date Mon, May 11, 2015



# I Instructor's Teaching - Students' Ratings on the Following Statements:

+/-0.78







**Standard Deviation** 



Statistics	Value
Response Count	60
Mean	3.78
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.14

5. The instructor ensured that your assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time



Statistics	Value
Response Count	61
Mean	4.07
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.93

7. The instructor demonstrated respect for

2. The instructor's explanations of concepts were clear



Statistics	Value
Response Count	61
Mean	4.21
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.76

## 4. The instructor was available to answer your questions or provide extra assistance as required



Statistics	Value
Response Count	60
Mean	4.30
Median	4.50
Standard Deviation	+/-0.81

6. The instructor was helpful in providing feedback to you to improve your learning in this course



Statistics	Value
Response Count	61
Mean	4.03
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.89

8. Overall, the instructor was effective in this

Copyright University of Victoria

### PRACTICE OF COMPUTER SCIENCE - (CSC 106-A01) - (CRN20657) - Celina Berg



### **II Course Design - Students' Ratings on the Following Statements:**





Statistics	Value
Response Count	61
Mean	3.84
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.00

## 3. The assigned work helped your understanding of the course content



2. The materials provided for learning the course content (e.g. handouts, posted material, lab manuals) were clear



Statistics	Value
Response Count	61
Mean	3.95
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-0.86

4. The course provided opportunities for you to become engaged with the course material, for example through class discussions, group work, student presentations, on-line chat, or experiential learning



Median

Standard Deviation

Copyright University of Victoria

4.00

+/-0.99

## 5. The methods of assessment used to evaluate your learning in the course were fair



## information (e.g. to other courses, your future career, or other contexts)

6. The course provided relevant skills and



Statistics	Value
Response Count	61
Mean	3.89
Median	4.00
Standard Deviation	+/-1.21

# 7. Overall, the course offered an effective learning experience



### **III Statements About The Students:**

### My primary reason for taking the course.



### The approximate number of classes or labs that I did not attend



### Relative to other courses I have taken at UVic, the workload in this course was



The approximate number of hours per week I spent studying for this course outside of class time:



As a result of my experience in this course, my interest in the material:



### **IV Additional Statments:**

# The instructor Celina Berg displays a good understanding of the material being presented



# The instructor Celina Berg uses the blackboard/overhead and/or visual aids effectively

### PRACTICE OF COMPUTER SCIENCE - (CSC 106-A01) - (CRN20657) - Celina Berg



# (Courses with labs) The laboratories contributed to my understanding of the course material



# (Courses with tutorials) The tutorials contributed to my understanding of the course material



# (Courses with a major project, i.e. 20% or more of the final grade) The project contributed to my understanding of the course material

### PRACTICE OF COMPUTER SCIENCE - (CSC 106-A01) - (CRN20657) - Celina Berg



### **IIV Student Comments:**

# What strengths did your instructor (Celina Berg) demonstrate that helped you learn in this course?

#### Comment

She would spend a lot of time on one single section of the course, the class moved very slowly, which helped.

She was a very good speaker.

She was well prepared and seemed to know what she was talking about

I really like how Celina starts concepts very simple and then works her way to up to the more advanced things. I also really like how she will visually represent certain things such as recursive function calls. Even though they can be tedious to draw out, it really helped me understand how the function is being controlled. Celina is also very kind and funny and it made her class a joy to attend. It also seemed like she often stayed after class to help other students and she is helpful during office hours.

She was tremendously enthusiastic throughout the course, helping avert frustration during otherwise dry topics.

She spoke in a clear and concise manner. She demonstrated a good understanding about the course material and also had a good interaction with the students. Also, she was capable of answering all of my questions during the lectures.

She gives a lot of passion and tells us that csc could be super useful.

Providing clear examples and engaging the students during class time helped me learn better in this course.

Celine did a good job interacting with the class and using the class's answers and examples are part of her lecture. She really slowed down the material when the material was especially meaningful or to make sure that students were properly understanding the key concepts, which was good as other teachers don't really take the time to slow down and make sure that the class is truly understanding what they are teaching.

Dr. Berg was extremely excellent at engaging the class. She consistently came with a great attitude and was energetic and excited about the topics at hand. You can really see her passion.

Demonstrations

She did a great job. The class was fun and she keeped everyone in it. She seemed like she enjoyed being there and it showed.

Professor Bergs availability to aid students in understanding concepts was extremely beneficial for myself and other students in the course. Berg also has a strong understanding of the material and a respect fro students ideas and opinions.

She is very personable and willing to help. During office hours she remembers her students' names and is always very positive. I really enjoyed having her teach me.

She tried to keep us engaged, even when half the class was zoned out and not paying attention. Props to her for that.

Celina is totally wonderful. She cares about her students and wants them to succeed. She worked hard to explain the concepts clearly, and went over examples to solidify our understanding. The guest speakers were great too! Very inspiring. It's nice to hear about the various applications of computer science.

She was very engaged with the class.

Enthusiam and passion for the subject

Dr. Berg was very helpful during class and outside of class when information was needed alongside the classwork.

Uses many examples when explaining topics.

Her enthusiasm was encouraging and I enjoyed the guest lecturers.

Extremely effective teaching methods, well informed, knowledgable, efficient, very kind and helpful!

A passionate teacher

The examples that the instructor gave in class, using different material to represent an algorithm, was very good and interesting.

Answered questions and was very inclusive in class.

#### Clarity of her lectures.

Celina has incredible enthusiasm and it's apparent she wants us to learn. Visual aids were very effective and concepts were explained well. Guest lectures were a nice way to give a glimpse of what can be explored using computer science.

her perseverance to make the whole class understand is admirable She did a good job with the challenges and the use of technology to improve her class the guest lectures i fun Fridays were really good.

Celina was great. She is exceedingly patient, which was evident as the class had the collective manners of banshees.

Celina was thoughtful and made the course material enjoyable. Celina was very aware if the students were struggling in certain sections or not and did her very best to make sure all students hade a good understanding of the material.

Celina was obviously very engaged by the material. Instructor enthusiasm for a topic is always a significant contributor to motivating students to learn: at least, once they've gotten past the first and second year feeling of being too cool to care about stuff.

Tons of guest speakers, very engaging

Celina is very friendly and willing to answer questions.

Taking questions from everyone and not just a few very active students

She clearly knows the topics she is teaching, and is able to explain them.

none

I liked how she would teach through a variety of methods and not just off slides. I liked that she gave us a lot of practice questions to do and that really helped in understanding the material. She is also very clear in her teaching and there isn't any confusion as to what you are learning and when the deadlines are and what is expected from you. She was always available during office hours and even outside office hours. She was very fair in helping students and didn't show favoritism. She actually cares about her students and is very approachable and therefore made learning this course a lot more enjoyable and easier than it would have been if someone else had been teaching this course. I wish that she could teach all of my Computer Science courses.

# Please provide specific suggestions as to how the instructor could have helped you learn more effectively.

#### Comment

She gave very vague instructions, and her TA's were hard markers. This led to a lot of assignments being pointless, for instance I am going to get a poor grade whether I work for 20 minutes or 3 hours, so why spend the 3 hours? Despite having a very good grasp on the material, I felt I was doing poorly on the assignments. She could be less condescending as well, it felt like she was always talking down to the class, and more so one on one. She was helpful to students she liked, and was quite rude to some others.

Nothing could be done, I just thought the material was pretty basic. (this isn't my first csc course).

In class you did a great job. I find it harder to learn in an environment that contains so many people so often times i would re learn everything in lab and that was effective enough for me to complete the assignments.

I'm not here to be convinced of Computer Science. Present the information as facts, not something I have to be convinced is true. The basics are the basics and they should be treated as such.

Sciences are based on facts. You don't hear about a Math professor trying to convince students that logic is what it is.

No suggestions necessary. The instructor's performance was outstanding.

No suggestions. She has provided different methods to help me learn effectively.

Sitting on the far left side of the lecture hall sometimes it was hard to see what was presented on the projectors when Celina had the overhead projector working along with her slides on the other side. This was frustrating at times as it was difficult to follow along with what the was working on, I found it easier to follow along when she used the blackboard instead of writing on a piece of paper and projecting it overhead. A full syllabus at the beginning of the semester would have been nice as there were times during the semester that I had time to get ahead but was unable to in this class because we are often learning of the day's material at the beginning of class. Celina could have also taken more control of the class in particular the noise level as people were talking in during her lectures.

PowerPoint slides and assignment descriptions were often messy and full of errors. Spellchecking, checking information, and having up-to-date descriptions of each assignment should be improved.

Different Tutorial leader. For the love of god.

More focus on explaining topics then assuming students know the topic as this course contains both first year and third year students and myself included knew and still don't know many of the topics that were assumed knowledge.

I think regular quizzes would have helped me to learn more effectively.

She could have taught more about assignments in lectures.

Slowly go over topics that might confuse some people.

Nothing, she was great!

Bit haphazard for learning, the way lectures were sequenced.

she could have gone a little faster or deeper in the material

The instructor's tone and demeanor suggested largely that the material being presented was new or unfamiliar, not necessarily in that she wasn't familiar with the concepts, but rather that the structure of the course and important topics to be conveyed were not well-prepared. Course material could be presented with more clarity and focus, and with a better progression over the course of a lecture. The central topic or key learning points of each lecture were unclear in many cases, and it was difficult to tell what points were important, what material was testable (if any,) etc. Additionally, midterm questions were somewhat ambiguous, re-marked at least once (as evidenced by pen-written changes in the grading) and made arbitrary, unstated assumptions which we were then graded on.

for the efficiency section it was cool when you clocked the processing time. More examples with stuff like that would have been cool

Explain in a better way, like prepare the classes a little bit more, as sometimes it seemed that she did not know what was coming in the next slide and was just going to elaborate about what was on the projector on the board or by asking questions, perhaps preparing a little bit more before class could be useful. Moreover, by demonstrating a little bit more seriousness, just a little bit not a lot like for example to be in the topic and to know how to use the tools of the class correctly.

give more details in ppt

### Please provide specific suggestions as to how this course could be improved.

#### Comment

It could be taken out of the Computer Science requirements for courses. Almost everything in this course is completely trivial if you have done anything related to computer science before, and the rest that a computer science student wouldn't know is all irrelevant. I met a lot of people who are taking it as an easy elective for other faculties because it is considered an incredibly easy course.

We need to cover more content. Through the course we barely learned anything and while all the guest lectures were interesting, the number should have been toned down so hat we could learn more relevant information

The course is almost completely irrelevant to computer science. No one needs to learn how to convert to binary or hexadecimal. Some topics were interesting but a vast majority weren't

The course doesn't seem to know what it is. It has an identity crisis. It is everywhere but nowhere. I would look at the courses from MIT and other FREE places to gain an understanding of what an Introduction to Computer Science class should be.

The lab was very underwhelming. My teacher just read the lab slides word-for-word and then the class would be over 20-30 minutes early. The lab slides were very well organized though. I just wish that the lab component of this course was more interesting and motivating.

There was too much overlap with CSC 115. I took the two classes in parallel, and we quite literally covered numerous concepts at the same time making both classes quite boring and repetitive.

The course should focus more on lab classes than in theoretical knowledge.

NO SCRATCH!! I don't want to be in a university course using a program they use to teach elementary students about computer science. The assignment marking was too subjective. Like one mark for "wow-factor". Often the T.A's messed up marking on the assignments.

Have the labs be a bit more engaging. The labs were clear and helped towards understanding the material but it can be quite boring sometimes.

Further guidelines for the assignments and possibly some examples of the level of work that is expected for full marks. Often times it was difficult to determine how much work or how little work could still receive full marks.

The laboratory portion of the course was very ineffective. It essentially acted as another lecture, and did not provide adequate exercises. The fact that it was essentially optional didn't motivated many students to come. Out of the 30+ spots in labs, only 5-6 students would regularly come.

TUTORIAL TEACHER. DIFFERENT ONE. PLEASE. HELP US.

A requirement for first year so you don't get the mix of first and third year students.

PowerPoint slides lacked detail when I was looking back for procedural information.

I can't help but wonder why this is a required course for a computer science major. This would be a great introductory class to computer science for people who had never programmed anything in their life. Anyone else would find the course boring.

Regular quizzes would solidify learning. Also, my lab TA wasn't very good; I stopped going to labs altogether.

Lectures could teach about what assignments are about and labs could implement it, instead of just learning it all and implementing it in lab.

#### Less Scratch

This course was quite challenging for me, as a student who has not done any CSC course before. I expected it to be a very low-level to mid-level understanding of what computer science actually is, and the topics varied a lot. I had trouble following the course outcomes because there was not a described syllabus that I could access online.

#### Everything was good

I understand that this course by nature has a lot of content overlap with other courses but I think that may have been dangerous for many students. If a student feels like they already know the content they will be less likely to study and then when new material is eventually introduced they might continue to not study because they consider CSC 106 to be their "easy course". Perhaps UVic should reconsider whether this course's content would not be better taught in other courses.

Add a little more opportunity for programming and coding practice.

lab can be more helpful

Much of the course material was small chunks of material that was covered in other classes that are also requirements for computer science. The class was also supposed to be an introduction to computer science for students who had taken no other computer science courses but the leap into the material for them was large without previous coding experience.

#### Don't know how.

It doesn't appear that we have a linear trajectory in 106- it just seems like there's a bunch of random modules at times. Maybe explaining how the present material relates to the bigger picture of computer science?

The course should be divided in persons with a major with computer science and not, because it seems like the persons who studied computer science new already most of the thing we saw in class and where very distracting during the lectures

This course would benefit greatly from more structured topics and material, with a clearly-stated syllabus and learning goals, as well as standardized assessment and/or assignment materials. The overall quality of assignment instructions and PDF files supplied was relatively poor, and this made it difficult to assess what was required for a specific task in an assignment. The use of iClicker questions as an exceedingly thinly-veiled attendance mechanism rather than the device's true strength as a gauge for class understanding of content feels vaguely like a slap in the face considering a Generation 2 iClicker is \$40 to purchase used. Overall, it felt like this course was based primarily on a student's ability to show up with a pulse rather than their actual engagement in the material. Learning, if it occurred, had to be self-directed, as the labs were not only of ambiguous requirement (in that no graded material occurred in them), but also the ones that I attended did not enhance or further clarify the subject material any. Assignment complexity feels like it exceeded (fairly substantially) the otherwise elementary scope of the course; at no point during an assignment did I feel like the time I was required to spend completing it was better spent that way than on material required of another course.

Student should get marks from attending labs. Those, in facts, seem pretty useless and there is no point in attending them.

For the hardware section i think it'd be cool to actually like dissect an old recycled computer. The pictures of the hardware didn't really help me. Some hands on hardware stuff would help it sink in

Part the the topics in this course is also mentioned in other courses, for example, binary tree and big o are also

#### taught in CSC115 during the same term.

Scratch was a pain to use, and the fun factor marks in assignments was totally ambiguous as a fun factor for me may not be a fun factor for the marker of for the Instructor. For me scratch was just horrible, took to long and was really annoying to use, perhaps using something different like Jeliot or something like that could prove more useful. The fun factor of assignments was really not a way to demonstrate if I learned the topic or not as this is really too ambiguous.