

Instructor: B FUNT
 Course: CMPT 822
 Semester: 14-3

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

BACKGROUND	Frequency Distribution					Valid Responses	No Resp.			
	Weight:	4	3	2	1			0		
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		5 83%	1 17%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3.67	6	2	
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		0 0%	5 83%	1 17%	0 0%	0 0%		6	2	
GENERAL										
3. How often did you attend the lectures/seminars?	always	8 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	hardly ever	4.00	8	0
4. The course prerequisites were	essential	2 25%	2 25%	0 0%	1 13%	3 38%	not essential	1.88	8	0
5. The overall level of difficulty for the course was	too easy	1 13%	0 0%	4 50%	2 25%	1 13%	too difficult	1.75	8	0
6. The amount of work required for the course was	too little	1 13%	0 0%	2 25%	5 63%	0 0%	too much	1.62	8	0
7. How valuable was the course content?	very	4 50%	3 38%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%	not very	3.38	8	0
8. The course text or supplementary material was	relevant	8 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	irrelevant	4.00	8	0
A B C D F										
9. I would rate this course as		7 88%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%		3.88	8	0

Instructor: B FUNT
 Course: CMPT 822
 Semester: 14-3

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

COURSE GRADING	Frequency Distribution					Mean	Valid Responses	No Resp.
	Weight:	4	3	2	1			
10. The assignments and lecture/seminar were well related	8 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4.00	8	0
11. The exams and assignments were on the whole fair	6 86%	1 14%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3.86	7	1
12. The marking scheme was on the whole fair	6 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4.00	6	2
INSTRUCTOR AND LECTURES/SEMINARS								
13. How informative were the lectures/seminars?	8 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4.00	8	0
14. The instructor's organization and preparation were excellent	7 88%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3.88	8	0
15. The instructor's ability to communicate material was excellent	8 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4.00	8	0
16. The instructor's interest in the course content appeared to be high	8 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4.00	8	0
17. The instructor's feedback on my work was adequate	7 88%	0 0%	0 0%	1 13%	0 0%	3.62	8	0
18. Questions during class were encouraged	8 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4.00	8	0
19. Was the instructor reasonably accessible for extra help?	7 88%	1 13%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3.88	8	0
20. Was the instructor responsive to suggestions or complaints?	6 75%	2 25%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3.75	8	0
21. Overall, the instructor's attitude towards students was excellent	6 75%	2 25%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3.75	8	0
	A	B	C	D	F			
22. I would rate the instructor's teaching ability as	8 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4.00	8	0

Simon Fraser University

School of Computing Science – Burnaby Campus

Instructor Evaluation

Instructor's Name: Brian Funt

Course: CMPT 822 – Fall Semester (1147)

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

- Discussion is very much encouraged making the class quite enjoyable
- Strongest – excellent ability to keep the class engaged for 3 hours
- Learned so much in this course about computer vision. The benefits of seminar-like courses is that one can learn so many things from different classmates' perspectives gradually, which cannot be possible for lecture-style courses
- Strong – encourages participation and involvement from students
- Weak – difficult to approach
- Strong – communication and support for students – I enjoyed learning from him

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

- Would perhaps be nice to get more qualitative feedback if discussion and notes are satisfactory in the middle of the semester
- Strongest – I liked the class discussions. We understood the papers really well after the discussions
- Weakest – some of the papers assumed some prerequisites I was not familiar with

- Strong – develops critique ability
- Weak – at times the course seemed difficult
- Too dependent on student participation. I didn't feel many students put time/effort into preparing

3. Any other comments or suggestions?

- Overall, very enjoyable and interesting class
- As the evaluation depends on the discussion, I suggest to give an evaluation in the mid of term and the end
- Can you reduce the paper load a bit so as to allow more research on a paper. More depth than more width
- I don't like the idea of an exam, but for each paper include 1-2 questions to help generate thought