DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE
Peer Teaching Evaluation Committee

Peer Evaluation of Classsroom Teaching Performance

Name of Instructor: Celina Berg

Course Title: Computation, Programs, and Programming

Course: CPSC 110 **Section**: 103 **Room**: SCRF 100

Date: 2015/11/18 **Day**: W **Time**: 3:00

Number Present: approx 200

Visitor's Name: Dinesh K. Pai **Signature**:

1. **Analytic/Synthetic** *knowledge of subject, analytical presentation of material, discussion of current developments (if applicable), relation to other areas of knowledge, motivation*

This is a flagship introductory course to computer science, and was an "inverted classroom" closely linked to a MOOC on EdX developed by the same team. The class leveraged much of that material. Thus the usual metrics are not directly applicable.

My in-class experience was very similar to that of attending a previous offering, so my review is also similar. I will try to highlight the specific aspects of this offering.

The instructor was clearly knowledgable about the class topic, which was on accumulators (context-preserving and result-so-far). The students were supposed to have watched a video on this topic, available on EdX, before class. This video was not available on the course website, and it appeared that enrolling in the EdX course was required to access the video.

Despite the availability of the MOOC lecture, students were paying attention.

After introducing the topic, most of the class was devoted to in-class problem solving: "Design a function that takes a list of natural numbers and determines whether the list has only sequentially increasing numbers". In the course of working through the solution, the instructor illustrated more general aspects of programming.

After discussing and constructing the solution to first problem, assigned a second problem to be solved in the last five minutes (product of a list numbers).

2. **Organization and Clarity** *states objectives, summarizes major points, organized presentation, emphasis*

The lecture was well organized. After an introduction, the problem was assigned and students were given about 15 minutes to work on it themselves. The instructors and two TAs (I think) walked around the (very) large classroom, assisting students. After that, Celina worked through the solution on screen using Dr.Racket, a graphical environment for developing programs in the lisp-like teaching language used in this course.

It looked like the students were aware of and comfortable with this format.

3. **Lecturer/Group Interaction** *positive response when class doesn't understand, encouragement of*

student participation, welcomes questions

The instructor was confident, with very good rapport with class. The students seemed comfortable asking and answering questions.

Students were provided printed notes to help them use recipe.

Her questioning technique is good, with adequate wait-time. TAs flagged questions from students during the lecture.

Once or twice, when students were not quiet, she stopped lecturing until they stopped talking. I thought this worked well, with gentle pressure.

4. **Dynamism/Enthusiasm** *enthusiastic about subject, makes course interesting, has self-confidence*

The lecturer was self-confident, and dynamic.

The format of setting an in-class problem (in this case "Design a fun that takes a list of natural numbers and determines whether the list has only sequentially increasing numbers") and walking through the class discussing with students seemed to work well for the instructor, though it was hard for me to observe the interactions in the large class.

5. **Mechanical Aspects** *pace of lecture, legible handwriting, adequate graphic material, effective use of slides, etc.*

The pace was good, considering the non-traditional format of the lecture. I think the live problem solving approach worked well.

The room has a loud squeaky fan at the back, which was distracting. I mentioned this to Celina after the lecture, and the problem had been reported.

General Comments

I met with Celina after the lecture, and gave her my feedback. We discussed some the benefits and constraints of working with a multi-section MOOC-linked course.