



Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Borkowski, Michael Humes
CSE 130 - Program Lang: Princpl & Paradigm (A)
Winter Quarter 2023

Number of Students Enrolled: 82
Number of Evaluations Submitted: 69

PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

1. Your class level is

1 (1.4%):	Freshman
0 (0.0%):	Sophomore
3 (4.3%):	Junior
63 (91.3%):	Senior
0 (0.0%):	Graduate
2 (2.9%):	Extension
0 (0.0%):	Visitor

2. Your reason for taking this class is

61 (91.0%):	Major
0 (0.0%):	Minor
0 (0.0%):	Gen. Ed.
4 (6.0%):	Elective
2 (3.0%):	Interest
2:	[No Response]

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

27 (39.7%):	A
25 (36.8%):	B
15 (22.1%):	C
0 (0.0%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
1 (1.5%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP
1:	[No Response]

GENERAL QUESTIONS

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

4 (6.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
11 (16.4%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
35 (52.2%):	Agree
17 (25.4%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

1 (1.5%):	0-1
6 (9.0%):	2-3
7 (10.4%):	4-5
18 (26.9%):	6-7
12 (17.9%):	8-9
12 (17.9%):	10-11
7 (10.4%):	12-13
1 (1.5%):	14-15
0 (0.0%):	16-17
1 (1.5%):	18-19
2 (3.0%):	20 or more
2:	[No Response]

6. How often do you attend this course?

10 (14.9%):	Very Rarely
30 (44.8%):	Some of the Time
27 (40.3%):	Most of the Time
2:	[No Response]

COURSE MATERIAL CSE 130

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

2 (3.0%):	Strongly Disagree
5 (7.5%):	Disagree
9 (13.4%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
32 (47.8%):	Agree
18 (26.9%):	Strongly Agree
1 (1.5%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

8. Assignments promote learning.

2 (3.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (1.5%):	Disagree
8 (11.9%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
34 (50.7%):	Agree
21 (31.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (1.5%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

9. Required reading is useful.

2 (3.0%):	Strongly Disagree
2 (3.0%):	Disagree
17 (25.4%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 (6.0%):	Agree
6 (9.0%):	Strongly Agree
36 (53.7%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

10. This course is difficult relative to others.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
5 (7.5%):	Disagree
16 (23.9%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
27 (40.3%):	Agree
18 (26.9%):	Strongly Agree
1 (1.5%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

11. Exams are representative of the course material.

3 (4.5%):	Strongly Disagree
3 (4.5%):	Disagree
15 (22.4%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
30 (44.8%):	Agree
15 (22.4%):	Strongly Agree
1 (1.5%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

12. Do you recommend this course overall?

52 (76.5%):	Yes
16 (23.5%):	No
1:	[No Response]

13. Course CSE 130:

- The content of the course seems to vary a fair bit from professor to professor. Overall the material is interesting and challenging to wrap your head around.
- great course. useful for programming language design
- Very hard course
- This course covered multiple topics starting with lambda calculus, then haskell, then Nano 1/2 language. Even though these topics are conceptually related to each other, they felt like they were distinct from each other as I learned them. I sort of felt like I had to learn each topic from scratch, instead of building on top of what I learned from the previous topic.
- Though a bit confusing and honestly mind boggling (a number is represented as a function and somehow that makes sense??) at times, the class material is super interesting and I really enjoyed learning about the building blocks of a programming language from a theoretical perspective.

- Great course
- super difficult course which will not be helpful at all
- Most of my frustration came from the Haskell language, something which is basically the entire point of the class. I think this class was just not for me.
- Sometimes I wonder why we are learning all of this, so it would be nice if there are more big picture connections sprinkled in here and there, like how what we are learning RIGHT NOW applies to which language in what way, etc. I'm sure the staff can think of more examples than I do.
- This is overall a good course, well designed and interesting, but it's completely different from the listing in the UCSD CSE catalog: the catalog states that this course is an "Introduction to programming languages and paradigms, the components that comprise them, and the principles of language design, all through the analysis and comparison of a variety of languages (e.g., Pascal, Ada, C++, PROLOG, ML.) Will involve programming in most languages studied." In practice, the first half of this class deals with studying lambda calculus and functional programming via Haskell (Note that Haskell and a derivative of it, Nano, are the only languages studied in this course - we never worked with Pascal, Ada, C++, PROLOG, or ML.) The second half does study programming language implementation through the creation of an interpreter and a program that can type inference Nano code, as well proving theorems regarding these languages. However, we never deeply examined any other paradigms besides functional. It is more appropriate in my opinion to call this class Functional Programming Languages: Principles and Implementations.
- Old school course that does not help you in any possible way in 21st century. I wonder why this is still being taught at UCSD. material is not that hard but does not make sense at all. maybe if I didn't know how to code then this course would have been easier for me! I cannot relate to this course at all and there is nothing interesting about it. nothing motivates me to go and study for it. no text book is provided. no online resource are available!
- Class is hard. Concepts are just difficult.
- The course is a bit too theory-based for my taste. I guess what I was looking for was something along the line of CSE 131, but nevertheless this course has taught me a lot of important concepts.
- Course is challenging but really good for being able to understand types and programming languages on a fundamental level
- I want to learn about programming paradigms. Most of the class was just fighting with Haskell, which is very unenjoyable. At the end of this quarter, I don't feel that I have learned anything from this class. We don't get any feedback on homework, so I have just been writing garbage code as it's autograded. And this punishes me on tests as I don't know what the concise implementation that is expected is.

14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:

- Exams are fair and representative of the material learned in class and homeworks.
- It was hard
- Pretty basic as far as computer science classes go. Nothing I haven't seen many times before.
- There are two midterms, one written and another a take-home programming assignment. The

homeworks are relevant to the studied material and are built well, and are very helpful to practice the material.

- Both exams were very different and each was challenging. They accurately represent course material in my opinion.
- The programming assignments are hard and take time.
- Exams were fair because there were 2 types of midterms and a final, with homework weighted not too much and not too little
- Homeworks were not helpful in learning.
- Exams feel much harder than what was taught
- Maybe this is just me, but I do feel like the Exams are more difficult than the practice exams/homework in that it requires techniques we have not practiced before (hence the low average so far). This is something I am willing to accept if the professor take into consideration of it and adjust the grading scale accordingly, since I do love a timed challenge but would hate for it to ruin my grade. The homeworks are of medium workload; while some debugging could be challenging, the ideas are in general a nice extension from lectures and we get just the right amount of guidance to implement it.
- very relative with course
- Very fair. Good drop policies.
- Great exams. Fair

15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:

- Didn't do the reading
- Textbooks and outside references are not very helpful, as the course syntax and materials are pretty specific.
- I would prefer that there are more reading materials that keep close to the stuffs taught in lecture.
- There was no required reading.
- I didn't do the reading for the class
- it was not helpful to understand material

INSTRUCTOR Michael Borkowski

16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.

1 (1.5%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (1.5%):	Disagree
4 (6.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
29 (43.9%):	Agree
30 (45.5%):	Strongly Agree
1 (1.5%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (1.5%):	Disagree
7 (10.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
26 (39.4%):	Agree
31 (47.0%):	Strongly Agree
1 (1.5%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
2 (3.0%):	Disagree
10 (15.2%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
27 (40.9%):	Agree
25 (37.9%):	Strongly Agree
2 (3.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

19. Instructor explains the course material well.

3 (4.5%):	Strongly Disagree
10 (15.2%):	Disagree
13 (19.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
21 (31.8%):	Agree
18 (27.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (1.5%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

20. Lectures hold your attention.

8 (12.1%):	Strongly Disagree
15 (22.7%):	Disagree
20 (30.3%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
10 (15.2%):	Agree
11 (16.7%):	Strongly Agree
2 (3.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.

3 (4.5%):	Strongly Disagree
7 (10.6%):	Disagree
16 (24.2%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
22 (33.3%):	Agree
14 (21.2%):	Strongly Agree
4 (6.1%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.

1 (1.5%):	Strongly Disagree
3 (4.5%):	Disagree
8 (12.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
31 (47.0%):	Agree
21 (31.8%):	Strongly Agree
2 (3.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.

1 (1.5%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
9 (13.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
24 (36.4%):	Agree
31 (47.0%):	Strongly Agree
1 (1.5%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.

1 (1.5%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
12 (18.2%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
24 (36.4%):	Agree
24 (36.4%):	Strongly Agree
5 (7.6%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.

1 (1.5%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
7 (10.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
21 (31.8%):	Agree
35 (53.0%):	Strongly Agree
2 (3.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.

1 (1.5%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
10 (15.2%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
26 (39.4%):	Agree
25 (37.9%):	Strongly Agree
4 (6.1%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.

1 (1.5%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (1.5%):	Disagree
11 (16.9%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
22 (33.8%):	Agree
22 (33.8%):	Strongly Agree
8 (12.3%):	Not Applicable
4:	[No Response]

28. Instructor Michael Borkowski:

- Great prof. I slacked this quarter but he was a really good teacher although a little slow when lecturing.
- I cannot pay attention to his lectures. His speech is very monotone which makes lectures very difficult to follow.
- Decent instructor,, but not able to keep the attention of the class
- Super knowledgeable and good about adjusting material and deadlines to not overwhelm students.
- He was unable to teach the material in a way which is understandable for students. Also he had really boring lectures
- The professor may not have the most engaging voice, but he does put effort into making lecture more engaging with various methods of class interaction.
- Not enough examples. You are too smart, which makes things harder to understand. In comparison to Tristan, your lectures aren't very interesting.
- Professor was very supportive and helpful when I needed an accommodation.
- Excellent and very patient
- He's very cool. He taught the course very well and I feel like I learned a lot from him.
- I think the instructor did well. I do think though that the lectures could be more engaging. Also, the way of explaining material I think could be improved. When lecturing the professor normally just goes logically, like "do this... then this...etc", which is not bad, but I think lecture would be more engaging and I would be able to understand the bigger picture better if the professor connected what we were talking about to the bigger picture and why it is important. Having a better understanding of how each thing we learn fits into the bigger picture I think would help.
- I really like the mini quiz questions he holds during lecture, it helps break up monotony and gets everyone thinking. However, I feel like he explains topics in some of the most convoluted possible ways and his articulation of later topics from Nano forward suffers heavily from this. I even struggled understanding what he was talking about while watching recordings.
- Sometimes boring lecturer
- he's kind and teaches well
- Lectures aren't particularly engaging but the material is presented accurately.

- the most boring professor in the worst location ever at ucsd(Pcynh). the lectures are super boring. all of them made me sleepy! I wish I had time before graduating so i could take another class instead of cse130!
- Great. Learned a lot.
- I really liked the way Borkowski presented the materials, and the in-class quizzes really helped me concentrate even when I'm watching the recordings. While I think he explains the concepts well, I think the pace is a little slow and the lecturing voice is a little monotonic such that I can't hold my attention to his voice very well.
- great teacher. interesting lectures.
- Instructor Borkowski was very clear when he taught the material and he tends to speak slower than most professors, which is good for CSE 130 because the material was difficult enough to understand as it is. A slow explanation of the material is better for CSE 130. However, when I attend his lectures in person, I tend to get lost pretty quickly because there is so much code/information on most of the slides. I can't read the entire slide and pay attention to what he is saying at the same time, so I get overwhelmed and confused early on in the lectures. Therefore, I usually tend to guess on the quiz questions in class because I haven't fully understood the material. Even when watching the podcast recording, I have to pause the video a lot and replay sections to keep up with the lecture. Some of the programming assignments were also very difficult. This might not be entirely Instructor Borkowski's fault though. It also might just be the nature of CSE 130 and the material that needs to get covered.
- Professor Borkowski is clearly a professional in this field and explains the material well.

29. Do you recommend this professor overall?

54 (80.6%): Yes
 13 (19.4%): No
 2: [No Response]

Custom Question 5

30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.

- Asked the class if they had questions. Great.
- The main thing was just lectures being hard to follow and boring because they were monotone.
- When there are difficulties, he makes sure everyone has equal chance to do the assignments
- He is super bad in communicating and making the class attractive enough for student to follow up with lectures. As the class started the class was full and as we were approaching end of the quarter the class was getting less crowded and only a few people were attending his classes.
- The professor was really accommodating for all the terrible events I happened to encounter this quarter, for that I am truly grateful. It helped me actually learn the material instead of piecing together something off the internet and turn it in in a rush. He is helpful during office hours and gives clear answers to my questions.
- Did not show forms of learning other than the command line and lecture slides

- He didn't support students by having boring lectures which was making everyone sleepy
- Not enough examples gone over. Made it very hard to jump to homework from the class lectures.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Computer Science and Engineering, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.