

Professor H.A. Müller, PhD Peng FCAE
Department of Computer Science
Faculty of Engineering
University of Victoria
P.O. Box 1700
Victoria, BC V8W 2Y2
Voice: 250-472-5719

Fax: 250-472-5708 Email: hausi@cs.uvic.ca

Web: webhome.cs.uvic.ca/~hausi/

May 18, 2014

Professor Ulrike Stege, Chair Department of Computer Science University of Victoria

Re: Peer Teaching Evaluation of Dr. Celina Berg

Dear Ulrike,

In your letter of April 29, 2014 you asked me to conduct a peer teaching evaluation of Dr. Celina Berg since she requested that the Department conduct such an evaluation of her teaching this term for possible use in the future.

My evaluation is based on the course teaching materials provided by Dr. Berg as well as my class room visit. The materials include selected teaching materials for all the courses she has taught at UVic as well as selected course experience surveys (CES).

I studied her 81-page teaching dossier, which is very impressive and comprehensive, carefully. It begins with an interesting and ambitious teaching statement followed by a detailed description of the teaching responsibilities in the Department of Computer at the University of Victoria. She has taught a variety of courses including SENG 310 Human Computer Interaction, CSC 110 Fundamentals of Programming I, CSC 115 Fundamentals of Programming II, SENG 321 Requirements Engineering, SENG 330 Object-Oriented Software Development, and CSC462/562 Distributed Computing. That is a very impressive array of courses for a junior university teacher. The reminder of the teaching dossier includes interesting sections on education research, education outreach and teaching workshops. The appendix contains CES results for SENG 310 Spring 2013 and CSC 110 Fall 2012. Her CES results are excellent even for very big classes such as CSC 110.

I attended one of her SENG 310 class on Friday, May 9, 2014 from 8:30-10:00 am in ECS 108. I was five minutes late but the class room was full to almost the last seat. I fund a seat in the last row. Dr. Berg is clearly an excellent teacher and has an excellent rapport with her students.

The topic of the day was requirements gathering in interaction design, a core topic of SENG 310. She explained a simple interaction design model and then concentrated on techniques for gathering data as input to interaction design. In particular, she focused on user studies featuring the Likert scale, interviews, surveys, and ethnography as well as what types of information to collect. The lecture was a nice combination of text book knowledge and common sense.

The class was lively and interactive albeit more with the students at the front of the class. She used the class room media impressively and effectively including *PowerPoint slides, YouTube videos, document camera projector,* and *blackboard.* This, in itself, made the class room performance more interesting and lively. Moreover, to use different media is actually important for a course such as Human Computer Interaction (HCI). She used many little questions to check whether the class actually understands. Again, the front of the class (i.e., keeners) participated well whereas the back was not as much in tune. One recommendation is to use some of tricks of the trade get the back of the class more involved.

In summary, Dr. Berg is an outstanding teacher with an excellent track record and an impressive teaching portfolio.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

H. A. Müller, PhD PEng FCAE

Professor of Computer Science Associate Dean Research

Faculty of Engineering

University of Victoria

Appendix D Peer Teaching Evaluation Checklist

Instructor:	Dr. Celina Berg	Class:	SENG 310	
Observer:	Dr. H.A. Müller	Date:	May 9, 2014	
Estimated num	ber of students in the room:	40		

This checklist may be used as a guide for preparing your written report. The written report should specify the date of the evaluation, the evaluator, and the person evaluated. It should then address:

- the strong points of the classroom performance and areas for improvement; and
- the strong points of the other teaching materials and areas for improvement.

1. Checklist Questionnaire: Preamble

Suggestion: Respond to each of the following statements by checking the blank that corresponds to your

observation.

Yes = Observed

Sometimes = More emphasis needed

No = Not observed, would have been appropriate

N/A = not applicable

2. Checklist Questionnaire: Evaluation of course dossier

The evaluation of the course material can be performed better when the reviewer is familiar with the presented material, however, this will often not be the case.

What is the quality of the materials used in teaching?

	High	Sufficient	Low	N/A	Comments
Course outline	Yes				
Reading list	Yes				
Text used	Yes				
Study guide	Yes				
Non-print materials	Yes				
Hand-outs				N/A	
Online materials	Yes				
Problem sets	Yes				
Assignments	Yes				
Exams				N/A	

Is the presented material current? YES

Does the material represent the best in the field? YES

Is the material adequate and appropriate to course goals? YES

Does the material represent superficial or thorough coverage of course content? Thorough

3. Checklist Questionnaire: Evaluation of in-class visit(s) The first question simply aims at identifying the style used for the session

The session/lecture incorporated the following elements	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
Expository lecture	х				
Seminar				N/A	
Question and Answer Session				N/A	
Problem Solving	х				
Interactive lecture	х				
Blackboard	х				
Overheads	х				
Computer presentation	х				
Hardware demonstration				N/A	
In-class activities	х				
Case Study	Х				
Other					

Checklist of Teaching Skills

Content of the session: Organization and clarity	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
Stated the purpose of the class session.	Yes				
Presented a brief overview of the content and/or lesson plan for the day	Yes				
Made explicit the relation-ship between today's and other aspects of the course.	Yes				
Summarized the main ideas.	Yes				
Related the day's material to upcoming sessions.	Yes				

Lecture:	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
Defined terms, concepts and principles appropriately.	Yes				
Arranged and discussed the content in a systematic and organized fashion.	Yes				
Asked questions periodically.	Yes				
Presented clear and simple examples to clarify abstract concepts and ideas.	Yes				
Used alternate explanations.	Yes				
Explicitly stated the relationships among various ideas or concepts.	Yes				
The examples used were based on well motivated or real life applications.	Yes				

In case of blackboard use:	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
The blackboard picture was well organized.	Yes				
The writing was legible	Yes				

In case of overhead use:	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
The slides were organized.	Yes				
The text was readable	Yes				

In case of computer- presentation:	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
The equipment was handled competently.	Yes				
The slides were presented in an appropriate speed.	Yes				
The slides were organized.	Yes				
The slides were readable with respect to color choice and font size.	Yes				

In case of hardware demonstration:	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
Demonstration was effective				N/A	

Dealing with questions:	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
Paused after questions to allow the students to answer.	Yes				
Repeated answers when necessary so the entire class could hear.	Yes				
Received students' comments and questions in an appropriate way.	Yes				
Encouraged student questions.	Yes				
Answered student's questions.	Yes				
Adapted lecture content based on student questions /comments	Yes				
When appropriate, requested that time-consuming questions or questions of limited interest be discussed after class or during office hours.	Yes				

In case of problem solving:	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
Problems were solved in sufficient detail	Yes				
Amount of solution detail was adapted to student questions	Yes				