Instructor:	B FUNT
Course:	CMPT 412
Semester:	13-1

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

		Frequency Distribution						Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
	Weight:	4	3	2	1	0				
BACKGROUND										
1. What is your cumulative grade point average?		14	6	8	3	0		3.25	31	7
		45%	19%	26%	10%	0%				
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?		0	28	1	1	1			31	7
		0%	90%	3%	3%	3%				
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	25	8	5	0	0 hardly ever		3.53	38	0
		66%	21%	13%	0%	0%				
4. The course prerequisites were	essential	15	10	4	3	3 not essential		2.89	35	3
		43%	29%	11%	9%	9%				
5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was	too easy	2	2	19	12	3 too difficult		1.68	38	0
		5%	5%	50%	32%	8%				
6. The amount of work required for the course was	too little	1	1	20	15	1 too much		1.63	38	0
		3%	3%	53%	39%	3%				
7. How valuable was the course content?	very	12	18	2	5	1 not very		2.92	38	0
		32%	47%	5%	13%	3%				
8. The course text or supplementary material was	relevant	13	7	7	2	3 irrelevant		2.78	32	6
		41%	22%	22%	6%	9%				
		A	B	C	D	F				
9. I would rate this course as		23	10	2	2	1		3.37	38	0
		61%	26%	5%	5%	3%				

```
Instructor:    B FUNT
Course:        CMPT 412              COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION
Semester:      13-1
```

		Frequency Distribution						Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
	Weight:	4	3	2	1	0				

COURSE GRADING

		4	3	2	1	0		Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
10. The assignments and lecture/seminar were	well related	24 / 63%	7 / 18%	4 / 11%	3 / 8%	0 / 0%	unrelated	3.37	38	0
11. The exams and assignments were on the whole	fair	21 / 55%	6 / 16%	8 / 21%	3 / 8%	0 / 0%	unfair	3.18	38	0
12. The marking scheme was on the whole	fair	19 / 51%	11 / 30%	6 / 16%	1 / 3%	0 / 0%	unfair	3.30	37	1

INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS

		4	3	2	1	0		Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
13. How informative were the lectures/seminars?	informative	23 / 61%	10 / 26%	3 / 8%	1 / 3%	1 / 3%	uninformative	3.39	38	0
14. The instructor's organization and preparation were	excellent	17 / 45%	14 / 37%	4 / 11%	1 / 3%	2 / 5%	poor	3.13	38	0
15. The instructor's ability to communicate material was	excellent	18 / 47%	13 / 34%	4 / 11%	2 / 5%	1 / 3%	poor	3.18	38	0
16. The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be	high	33 / 87%	4 / 11%	1 / 3%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	low	3.84	38	0
17. The instructor's feedback on my work was	adequate	18 / 50%	11 / 31%	7 / 19%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	inadequate	3.31	36	2
18. Questions during class were	encouraged	31 / 82%	7 / 18%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	discouraged	3.82	38	0
19. Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help?	available	28 / 74%	7 / 18%	3 / 8%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	never available	3.66	38	0
20. Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints?	very	28 / 78%	6 / 17%	0 / 0%	1 / 3%	1 / 3%	not at all	3.64	36	2
21. Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was	excellent	34 / 89%	3 / 8%	0 / 0%	1 / 3%	0 / 0%	poor	3.84	38	0

		A	B	C	D	F		Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
22. I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as		23 / 61%	10 / 26%	4 / 11%	0 / 0%	1 / 3%		3.42	38	0

Simon Fraser University

School of Computing Science – Burnaby Campus

Instructor Evaluation

Instructor's Name: Brian Funt

Course: CMPT 412 – Spring 2013 (1131)

1. **What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the instructor, as a teacher?**
    - I would like to have a class website for assignments/lecture notes, etc.
    - Better to have clearer notes (electronic version)
    - Instructor was very helpful and respectful towards students. He made the material/content of the course very practical
    - It's two difficult for students who don't have ground in Graph Theory, which will become great bounes for those smart guys who have it
    - Best: He's interested in this area and always try very hard to explain the most difficult part
    - Many clever ideas
    - Have a good week
    - Good
    - Knows what he is doing
    - Office hours, tutorials, ready materials
    - Some example of how a certain Algorithm works in real life will be great before we talk about it
    - Excellent professor, great spoken English and very clear. Excellent course material, very thorough and in-depth, yet possible to follow along. Very interesting assignments that seemed very practical and relevant. Kept the class interesting with the right amount of commentary and humour. Some more course reference material would have been nice, but not necessary

- The course material was very interesting and enjoyable. My only complaint would be that assignments should relate more to lecture material. Basically, more practical application for all topics covered
- So nice, so helpful. Explanations however, are all over the place. Better preparation would be nice. I often don't understand why we do certain things (ie: photometric stereo)
- Sees like a nice guy, but a very poor educator. Lectures involved almost exclusively handwriting explanations which left me very uncomfortable with the material. Significant details where discarded at the instructor's whim
- During class, much of the course material was introduced as "hand-waving arguments" with fragmented notes in between
- Fuller notes would greatly benefit future lectures
- I enjoyed Brian's "thinking on his feet" lecturing style. Sometimes I had trouble grasping the math as fast as he was explaining it though
- Strongest – Professor Funt cares about his students, makes himself available on weekends and does his best to help students understand the material. Thank-you!! Awesome Prof!! ☺
- I think this course would benefit from pre-made lecture slides with "fill in the blank" sections for notes. The reason I say this is due to the lack of textbook and everything being so reliant on the lectures given
- Strongest – Excellent attitude, peaceful tone. Available in communication
- Weakest – Not enough in details of assignments
- He can explain the contents clearly
- Assignments are too difficult
- Very organic teaching style and responsive to difficulties. Lectures appeared dynamically paced. Good

2. **What do you consider to be the strongest and weakest features of the course?**
- In addition to poor communication skills, it felt like the instructor put very little effort into preparing lectures and assignments.
- This course was a major disappointment

- There was a large disconnect between theory taught in lecture and application expected in assignments and exams
- Strongest – Assignment interviews were creative as an idea and I enjoyed it
- I like the assignments but maybe having them be relevant to course content will aid in students' success in the class
- Hard to tell initially how the material would be present on the midterm
- Very fair attitude towards students in dealing with grades and recognizing that we all make mistakes
- Strongest – Useful content
- Weakest – Too hard coding
- Colossal assignments, simple concept, nightmare implementation

3. **Any other comments or suggestions?**
   - A tutorial/lab component would have been extremely helpful
   - Great course, great prof
   - Exam questions should be weighted based on difficulty, not by number of questions
   - Loved the course, dreaded the grade I would get