Peter Johnson Candidate Talk

1. What was one thing you learned that you didn't know before?
   - The begining of the lecture covered topics I learned in CS 301 last semester
   - Refreshed me on Rice's Theorem
   - Explains the Heartbleed vulnerability
2. What were the main points of the talk? How clearly were they made?

   - intro to theory of computation with some research at the end
   - builds up to Rice's theorem, and relates it to computer security
   - Eventually argues that to improve computer security all computer interface protocols should be implemented using interpreters generated from a grammar configuration. If the interpreter generators can be proven to produce secure code, and the grammars can be proven to be correct, then the resulting functionality will be secure. Furthermore he suggests that available compiler compilers are too complicated to facilitate for widespread adoption, and that a new, simpler one might spur greater usage.
3. Describe the organization of the presentation. Was there a clear progression of information telling a story or making an argument? Could you tell where you were in the presentation without looking at the clock?

   - Introduction
   - Series of examples, defining terms, explaining concepts
   - You could tell where you were in the presentation, he is clearly building towards something
   - I lost track of where he was going a little more than halfway through his talk.
4. How did the presenter make use of visual aids? Was there a lot of text that you had to read/got read at you? Did the presentation include images and diagrams that augmented/supported what the presenter was saying, or was there an abundance of clip art or meaningless diagrams? How would the removal of the visual aids affected the presentation?
   - blackboard presentation
   - drew illustrations for his first few points, but not for recursively enumerable and turing machine.
   - He lost my attention when he stopped using blackboard illustrations
5. Describe the style of the presenter. Did he or she engage your interest? make eye contact? interact with the audience? speak clearly and fluidly?
   - did a casual and down to earth intro
   - articulate metaphors and examples
   - He seemed healthily aware of the audience, but I think if he had been gentler with his teaching style he would have connected better.
6. List 2-3 strengths of the presentation.
   - good signposting in the begining
   - Relatively interesting topic when covered fast enough
   - intuitive explanations

7. List 2-3 weaknesses of the presentation.
8. intrinsic to his presentation style, more lecture oriented than research talk oriented
   - some small mistakes
     - board technique could be improved
     - mistakenly called a student wrong
     - could have used more precise language
     - He was very self-aware, and could have moved a bit quicker and used less emphasis in some places
   - He didn't present the material in any novel way other than by injecting his personality.
   - I did not feel the illusion of his mastery of the topic. This could be a good thing depending on how you look at it.
9. Any general feedback? Would you take a class from this presenter? Was the topic relevant/interesting to you or to CS students in general?
   - I would not take another class with this professor. Although he taught the material relatively well, I did not feel put at ease by his confidence with the material. I also feel that I would not stand to learn many philosophical lessons from him.