

Instructor: B FUNT  
 Course: CMPT 412  
 Semester: 14-1

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

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

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

GENERAL

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

always 27 5 4 2 0 hardly ever  
 71% 13% 11% 5% 0%

4. The course prerequisites were

essential 16 9 8 3 1 not essential  
 43% 24% 22% 8% 3%

5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was

too easy 0 1 19 18 0 too difficult  
 0% 3% 50% 47% 0%

6. The amount of work required for the course was

too little 1 0 25 12 0 too much  
 3% 0% 66% 32% 0%

7. How valuable was the course content?

very 12 17 6 3 0 not very  
 32% 45% 16% 8% 0%

8. The course text or supplementary material was

relevant 10 12 9 0 1 irrelevant  
 31% 38% 28% 0% 3%

A B C D F

9. I would rate this course as

18 14 5 1 0  
 47% 37% 13% 3% 0%

Frequency Distribution

Weight: 4 3 2 1 0

Mean Valid Responses No Resp.

3.41 32 6

17 8 7 0 0  
 53% 25% 22% 0% 0%

1 28 1 0 1  
 3% 90% 3% 0% 3%

31 7

3.50 38 0

2.97 37 1

1.55 38 0

1.74 38 0

3.00 38 0

2.94 32 6

3.29 38 0

Instructor: B FUNT  
 Course: CMPT 412  
 Semester: 14-1

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

COURSE GRADING	Frequency Distribution					Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.	
	Weight:	4	3	2	1				0
10. The assignments and lecture/seminar were well related		17 45%	13 34%	3 8%	4 11%	1 3%	3.08	38	0
11. The exams and assignments were on the whole fair		16 43%	13 35%	5 14%	2 5%	1 3%	3.11	37	1
12. The marking scheme was on the whole fair		14 37%	12 32%	7 18%	4 11%	1 3%	2.89	38	0
INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS									
13. How informative were the lectures/seminars?	informative	21 55%	13 34%	4 11%	0 0%	0 0%	3.45	38	0
14. The instructor's organization and preparation were excellent		13 34%	17 45%	8 21%	0 0%	0 0%	3.13	38	0
15. The instructor's ability to communicate material was excellent		19 50%	15 39%	3 8%	1 3%	0 0%	3.37	38	0
16. The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be high		31 82%	4 11%	3 8%	0 0%	0 0%	3.74	38	0
17. The instructor's feedback on my work was adequate		19 50%	8 21%	8 21%	1 3%	2 5%	3.08	38	0
18. Questions during class were encouraged		33 87%	2 5%	3 8%	0 0%	0 0%	3.79	38	0
19. Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help?	available	29 78%	5 14%	3 8%	0 0%	0 0%	3.70	37	1
20. Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints?	very	23 66%	7 20%	5 14%	0 0%	0 0%	3.51	35	3
21. Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was excellent		29 76%	6 16%	3 8%	0 0%	0 0%	3.68	38	0
		A	B	C	D	F			
22. I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as		22 58%	13 34%	3 8%	0 0%	0 0%	3.50	38	0

**Simon Fraser University**

**School of Computing Science – Burnaby Campus**

**Instructor Evaluation**

**Instructor's Name: Brian Funt**

**Course: CMPT 412 – Spring Semester (1141)**

**1. What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the instructor, as a teacher?**

- Strongest – interesting topic and engaging lectures
- Weakest – no lecture notes available and/or books
- He is passionate about the topic
- Weak feature – was how we had a total of 2 sample problems for the whole semester, pre-midterm, this does not allow students to prepare
- Strongest feature is that the class is interesting
- This course is really informative and highly intuitive. The professor is really nice and responsible
- Strong – the course material is very useful. Assignment interesting
- Weak – too much time on simple math
- He is an excellent lecturer to let us know the material. However, there is not enough sample questions to study on
- I like this course! Useful information and very practical – Thanks!
- Strongest – good explanation in question
- Weakest – unclear topic instruction
- Strong – he's able to relate well and does everything he can to make sure we understand
- Weak – sometimes writes complex equations and gets too far ahead
- Brian is the nicest professor I have ever met. He cares about students' interests and value our opinions and feedback
- Course materials are very interesting

- Assignments are kind of tough to manage
- Strongest feature – good talker. Kept my interest every lecture
- Weakest – implementation details were often fuzzy
- High interest in the course and student – very willing to provide extra help
- Strongest features – he is an expert of this field, very informative. The design of the homework really helps students to understand the material
- Weakest features – notes can be more organized
- Interesting lectures with insightful analogies and fun-related assignments
- Strongest – very informative and interested in the course
- Weakest – A supplementary textbook would be helpful
- Assignments and lectures should be more closely linked
- Practice questions for midterm and final would have been excellent
- Excellent enthusiastic professor overall
- Professor is very helpful and easy to reach out
- Assignments were poorly explained, extremely time consuming and had no rubric – it was impossible to know what was being assessed
- Good – available to help students in a lot of his free time
- Bad – lectures on chalkboard not good, power points should be used more often
- Notes suck – I look at online lectures
- The assignments were only slightly related to the course material
- The exams had a relation to the course material but there were no practice problems or examples given in class so we had to guess the format of the exams making it difficult to study for
- A great professor, interesting course
- The weakest feature of the course is the lack of a text or practice material. There were many instances where I understand the theory, but I do not know how to use it when a practical question is asked
- Strengths – instructor is a fantastic teacher and lectures very effectively – fun assignments and exams
- Weaknesses – I found the lectures focusing on the math/derivations to be much less interesting and harder to follow

- Strong – very good at breaking complicated concepts into simpler terms – open to questions
- Weak – sometimes lectures felt disorganized. Despite the course involving a lot of math, no practice questions are given which makes studying difficult
- Instructor is really responsible person, always available for helping of assignment or other questions
- Brian tried to explain thing very specifically, so we can understand the material, but the course still needs strong math background
- Great communication. Wording on questions could improve. Sometimes I find it unclear what the question wants for an answer. Overall, great instructor.

## 2. What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the course?

- Weak feature – assignments irrelevant to exams – exams had little to do with vision – more with physics. I am pretty disappointed at the expectation of this.
- Strongest – knowing graphic view on computer vision
- Strong – very persistent on us learning the material for assignments
- Weak – assignments were too much
- Interesting course – also relevant
- Weakest – no proper material
- For the course – I hope some homework could be assigned which are related to midterm and final. We are only given coding assignments, not so much theory assignments
- Chalkboard notes were a mess – would have been helpful to have more organized presentation
- I think the time for this course is not quite enough. Instructor may can decrease some materials and explain other materials with more detail explanations
- Brian is very helpful and his teaching style is useful. I like him

**3. Any other comments or suggestions?**

- It'd be helpful to have notes for class available – not just scans from other books
- Some effort should be made to assign course material
- The lecture should be more organized
- Very enthusiastic presentation of material
- The exam counts too much percent of the total grades