MPI: Self Evaluation Report

Dan Cojocaru
Computer Science in English
2020
Email: `dan.cojocaru00@e-uvt.ro`

June 6, 2020

Summary

Self evaluation, total 9.0 points, as follows:

1. Report presentation: 1 p

2. Paper: 1.5 points, as follows:
   (a) Initial paper: 0.0 points,
   (b) EasyChair paper: 1.5 points,
   (c) Final paper: 0.0 points.

3. Evaluation reports for EasyChair papers: 2.8 points.

4. Presentation: 3.7 points, as follows:
   (a) scenario: 1.3 points,
   (b) presentation: 1.6 points,
   (c) presentation attendance: 0.8 points,

5. Computer Science map: 0.0 points.

1 Report presentation (1 p): „din oficiu"

2 Paper (1.5 p)

2.1 Initial paper (0 p)

I did not write the initial paper.

2.2 EasyChair paper (1.5 p - borderline)

According to the decision received on email via EasyChair, I have received 1.5 points for my EasyChair paper.

2.3 Final paper: (0 p)

I did not write the final paper.

3 Paper evaluation via EasyChair (2.8 p)

- Review for paper 42: 0.8 p
- Review for paper 69: 1.0 p
- Review for paper 88: 1.0 p

4 Presentation (3.7 p)

4.1 Presentation preparation - "the scenario" (1.3 p)

According to the comment received on Google Classroom, quoted below, I received 1.3 points for the scenario.

> Missing from the script: phases of presentation - motivation, learning, association.

4.2 Presentation (1.7 p)

A short report related to the presentation is attached to this one.

4.3 Presentation attendance (0.8 p)

I have attended 4 presentation sessions. I asked 2 questions for one presentation, and 1 question for 3 presentations. I have also written a short review for one presentation, attached to this report.

5 Computer Science map (0 p)

I did not create a Computer Science map.

Presentation Report

The presentation went overall well.

I did stutter for the first part, but I did get a hold of myself and finished the presentation smoothly.

It would seem that my goal of getting people more interested into viewing problems in a less *traditional* way, and in particular getting people interested into optimising for slow internet and chunking, has been reached.

There have been many interesting questions.

Presentation Review
Presentation of Dragoș Ursan

The introduction of each algorithm was comprehensive, making sure even the audience who is not familiar with them understood them at least on a very basic level, even though the introduction took about 6 minutes.

The process of comparing the algorithms was also explained in detail.

I have never heard of comb sort or shell sort before this presentation, so including them was certainly a good addition!

Reaching the conclusion that shell sort is better than quick sort on small arrays is a very interesting result.