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**: V01 **Room**: ORCH 4074

Date: 2017/03/24 **Day**: F **Time**: 11:00

Number Present: approx 45

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 the Vantage college version of a huge computer science course 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 the standard offerings of the course, 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 defining data representations for networks (e.g., railway).

The students were supposed to have gone through the material available on EdX, before class, but I was not able to reiew it, since it required enrolling in the EdX course was. Actually I found it hard to find the syllabus on the course website https://sites.google.com/site/ubccpsc110/Home ... may be I didn't look hard enough. E.g., searching for "syllabus" on the site's search box returned no results)

After an initial review of topic, most of the class was devoted to in-class problem solving. In the course of working through the solution, the instructor illustrated more general aspects of programming, especially some elementary aspects of graph theory (directed/undirected graphs, cycles, etc.)

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

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

I missed the first few minutes of the lecture, since the room number I was given (ORCH 4065) was incorrect. The lecture was well organized, and well rehearsed. After the review (which covered also earlier material, since the final exam was getting close), a problem was assigned and students worked on it for about 20 minutes.

Problem 1: Design a data definition to represent the network.

Problem 2: design a function that consumes a station and produces a list of stations that can be reached from it.

The instructor and three TAs (I think) walked around the classroom, assisting students. This is an amazing ratio of instructors to students! The pod structure helped for this type of problem solving exercise.

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 in this class were less ready to ask questions (potentially reflecting the difference between Vantage college and our regular program). One or two students did ask/answer questions.

Students were provided printed notes to help them use the recipe.

Her questioning technique is very good, with adequate wait-time.

The TAs were very good too. One TA seemed particularly good, and proactively explained material to the students. The other two were a bit more passive.

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 and walking through the class discussing with students seemed to work well for the instructor.

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.

General Comments

I have mixed feelings about the class room.

On the positive side the room is very fancy, with all the latest in classroom technology available. The students sit in small pods (about 10 pods, 4-5 per pod), arranged in a semi-circle around a large monitor.

The challenge is that this arrangement reduced/eliminated eye contact with instructor for many. Some are facing away from the instructor podium, with the instructor now a "talking voice" behind them. Most were focused on their own screens, and did not seem to take advantage of the pod setting for discussions.