DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE
Committee on Quality of Teaching

Instructor's Evaluation

Name of Instructor: Celina Berg

Course Title: Computations, programs and programming

Course: CPSC 110   Section: Fall   Room: SCRF 100

Date: 4 Nov, 2015   Day: Wed   Time: 15:00-16:00   Number Present: ∼120

Visitor's Name: Uri Ascher   Signature: ⸺⸺⸺⸺⸺

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

Confident knowledge of subject. This is our introduction to computer science (through programming) course, using a special functional language and emphasizing systematic program design. The course web page claims that it builds upon the edX Systematic Program Design courses (Gregor's).

Given the nature of this particular lecture there was no chance to observe discussion of current developments or relation to other areas of knowledge.

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

This was a continuation of previous material (perhaps learned by the students online, including lecture videos and slides) and it centered on an interactive solution of assigned tasks. Good organization and clarity in this sense.

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

Relatively to other courses, there was a lot of interaction and on-the-spot help. TAs walked up and down the aisles, ready to help. The instructor joined where appropriate. Questions were answered well and students appeared to be at ease asking them.

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

The instructor was self-confident and caring, and she connected with the audience.

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

This lecture hall is not conducive to both displaying slides and writing on the board, and indeed the latter was not attempted. But there was some writing on the slides. The pace of this tutorial-lecture was fine. The slides were OK though really not amazing. One of the projectors presented a computer program which the instructor occasionally updated, intermixed with results of clicker questions. I believe most/all of the audio-visual material used is canned stuff.

General Comments

This course apparently uses a "flipped model", where the lectures are pre-learned from videos and the class is really a super-tutorial. Whether this is a suitable model for everyone is another question (I know this issue is being evaluated, generally speaking). Another general question is whether such a model can benefit from the arrangement in Math, where TAs serve as instructors in much smaller classes. (Paul Carter should know: he was one such and excelled in that.)

However, let me get back to the point of peer evaluation and this report. As a visitor, I wished I could have seen the overview and motivation that must have been given at a previous lecture or in the assigned videos. However, and more importantly, the students seemed generally happy and not at all lost. This class was good and I saw no problem to point out regarding the instructor.