### BACKGROUND

1. What is your cumulative grade point average?

   1) 3.5 or over  
   2) 3.0 to 3.49  
   3) 2.5 to 2.99  
   4) 2.0 to 2.49  
   5) below 2.0  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>No. Resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Why did you take this course?

   1) It was compulsory  
   2) I am interested in the course  
   3) No alternative course available  
   4) It looked like an easy credit  
   5) Other reasons  

   |        | 25| 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 86% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 29 | 5 |

### GENERAL

3. How often did you attend the lectures/seminars?

   - always  
   - essential  
   - too easy  
   - too little  
   - very  
   - relevant  

   |        | 21| 10| 1 | 2 | 0 | hardly ever | 62% | 29% | 3% | 6% | 0% | 3.47 | 34 | 0 |

4. The course prerequisites were

   - essential  
   - too easy  
   - too little  

   |        | 6 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 6 | not essential | 24% | 0% | 32% | 20% | 24% | 1.80 | 25 | 9 |

5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was

   - too easy  
   - too little  
   - very  

   |        | 2 | 6 | 13| 7 | 6 | too difficult | 6% | 18% | 38% | 21% | 18% | 1.74 | 34 | 0 |

6. The amount of work required for the course was

   - too little  
   - very  

   |        | 0 | 3 | 20| 8 | 3 | too much | 0% | 9% | 55% | 24% | 9% | 1.68 | 34 | 0 |

7. How valuable was the course content?

   - very  
   - relevant  

   |        | 7 | 10| 11| 2 | 3 | not very | 21% | 30% | 33% | 6% | 9% | 2.48 | 33 | 1 |

8. The course text or supplementary material was

   - relevant  

   |        | 3 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 9 | irrelevant | 10% | 13% | 19% | 29% | 29% | 1.45 | 31 | 3 |

9. I would rate this course as

   |        | 9 | 13| 8 | 3 | 1 |

   |        | 26% | 38% | 24% | 9% | 3% | 2.56 | 34 | 0 |
## COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE GRADING</th>
<th>Frequency Distribution</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>No. Resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The assignments and lecture/seminar were well related</td>
<td>24 6 1 1 2 unrelated</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The exams and assignments were on the whole fair</td>
<td>12 11 7 2 2 unfair</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The marking scheme was on the whole fair</td>
<td>10 13 9 2 0 unfair</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS

| 13. How informative were the lectures/seminars? informative | 19 11 2 2 0 uninformative | 3.38 | 34 | 0 |
| 14. The instructor's organization and preparation were excellent | 17 13 2 2 0 poor | 3.32 | 34 | 0 |
| 15. The instructor's ability to communicate material was excellent | 13 15 4 2 0 poor | 3.15 | 34 | 0 |
| 16. The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be high | 29 3 2 0 0 low | 3.79 | 34 | 0 |
| 17. The instructor's feedback on my work was adequate | 11 8 11 3 0 inadequate | 2.82 | 33 | 1 |
| 18. Questions during class were encouraged | 26 7 1 0 0 discouraged | 3.74 | 34 | 0 |
| 19. Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help? available | 18 11 3 1 0 never available | 3.39 | 33 | 1 |
| 20. Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints? very | 17 9 5 0 0 not at all | 3.39 | 31 | 3 |
| 21. Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was excellent | 24 9 0 1 0 poor | 3.65 | 34 | 0 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>No. Resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B C D F</td>
<td>59% 32% 3% 6% 0%</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the instructor, as a teacher?
   - Strong – available to help each person in class
   - Strongest – nice guy
   - Weakest – confuses himself, strays off
   - Strongest – intelligence
   - Weakest – communicate material in simplified enough format to be understandable
   - Strong – he is very passionate about programming, so it’s fun to listen to him teach
   - Weak – sometimes his explanation are much more confusing than they need to be
   - The strongest features of the instructor were his lectures
   - Strongest – friendly, approachable, was always available for extra help
   - Weakest – in lecture, just repeated lecture slide material
   - Strongest feature of teacher -- high level of interest in the course and good at explaining and readily available for help
   - Weakest feature of teacher – he made his midterms too time cramped@! He needs to consider how much time students have on a midterm. My grade on the midterm, because of this, did not reflect my progression in the class or understanding of the material
   - The strongest feature of the instructor was that he was relatively available for help
   - The weakest feature of the course was the assignments because they took way too long to do. Please cut the assignment size down
• The tests need to be made more challenging as many students’ ability is outside the scope of the marking scheme
• Outstanding teaching ability, great attitude towards students. Can’t think of a better faculty member to teach this course. Would have liked to hear more about his research during the course
• Strongest – very friendly, helpful, knowledgeable, always smiling
• Weakest – needs to stay for the office “hour” usually only stays 15 mins
• Dr. Funt is able to combine the relaxational atmosphere and deeper question solving in our class who is rare to see in SFU
• Best professor!
• He is a great prof but sometimes he does not define a term which makes the lecture hard to understand. Also, the assignments are related to one slide of a lecture
• Strongest – level of knowledge of subject
• Weakest – ability to know perspective of unknowledgeable student
• Weakness – some of the material needs to be explained more explicitly, especially for students with no coding experience (eg – formatting of functions)
• Strength – to tries are always helpful – good exam practice
• The strongest features are his slow pace and good explanations for beginners. On the weaker side – some exam questions were unfairly worded
• This course requires a lot more work than expected. An improvement I would suggest is trying to make it more relateable to MBB majors because much of the course doesn’t feel like it would help with the MBB program
• The strongest features – clarity of the lecture slides, very well done
• Brian was always very enthusiastic but it would have been more helpful if he gave the answers to the to tries
• He knew what he was teaching well and was able to get students to understand the subject well. No clear weak features
• Knowledge of material – strongest
• Weakest feature was the limited time for the midterm. I would’ve liked to see an evening exam with more allotted time.
• Strongest feature was the smaller class size that encouraged students to interact with the professor
• Great instructor. It would have been better if the midterms were more coordinated
• Strong features were he knew what he was teaching and tries to get students to understand the material. Stays after class to help students. I hope we could have more practice before we do the assignment 2 – it was hard to start that assignment.

2. What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the course?
• Weak – many students are not familiar with matrix. Should make linear algebra as recomm. co-req
• Strongest – conceptual understanding of programming
• Weakest – too difficult
• The weakest features of the course was the lack of to try answers, availability
• Strongest – straight forward
• Weakest – not very interesting
• Course is helpful and fair to inexperienced programmers
• He is always available to help no matter what, very nice and understanding
• Strongest – very hands-on work on computers
• Weakest – time required for 100 level course very high, if a new area of study
• GPA booster and fun too!
• The course makes a good introduction into computing science but need a follow-up course so students have somewhere to go after
• Brian was willing to help anyone who was having trouble and would often stay after class
• Strong – gets students thinking about computer logic
• Weak – not really a programming course
3. Any other comments or suggestions?

- I liked this course very much! I'm thinking of taking more CMPT – maybe even switching majors.
- The marking scheme and the difference between letter grades was never clarified. I have no idea what the difference between an A and an A+ is on an assignment, since an A was received with no mistakes.