



# UC RIVERSIDE - Student Evaluation of Instructor, Faculty Evaluation Courses - Spring 2007

Course: CS 145 Section: 001 - COMBINATORIAL  
OPTIMZTN ALGORITHM  
Instructor: Neal E. Young  
Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering

Enrollment: 16  
Respondents: 12  
Response Rate: 75%

Enrollment: 44  
Respondents: 33  
Response Rate: 75%

Enrollment: 19216  
Respondents: 8813  
Response Rate: 46%

Questions	Course							Department				Campus					
	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>N/A</u>	Mean	Med	SD	% tile	Mean	Med	SD	% tile	Mean	Med	SD
	High				Low												
1 I had a strong desire to take this course	5	4	2	1	-	-	4.1	4.0	1.0	67	4.0	4.0	1.1	63	4.0	4.0	1.1
2 I attended class regularly	11	1	-	-	-	-	4.9	5.0	0.3	100	4.8	5.0	0.7	94	4.4	5.0	0.9
3 I put considerable effort into this course	6	3	3	-	-	-	4.3	4.5	0.9	100	4.0	4.0	0.9	61	4.3	4.0	0.9
4 I gained a good understanding of the course content	4	3	4	-	-	1	4.0	4.0	0.9	67	4.0	4.0	0.9	55	4.1	4.0	1.0
5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class	3	4	3	2	-	-	3.7	4.0	1.1	100	3.2	3.0	1.0	48	3.6	4.0	1.2
6 Instructor was prepared and organized	7	4	1	-	-	-	4.5	5.0	0.7	67	4.3	5.0	1.0	77	4.4	5.0	0.9
7 Instructor used class time effectively	5	4	3	-	-	-	4.2	4.0	0.8	67	4.2	5.0	1.1	68	4.3	5.0	1.0
8 Instructor was clear and understandable	6	2	3	1	-	-	4.1	4.5	1.1	33	4.4	5.0	1.0	67	4.3	5.0	1.1
9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching	9	3	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.5	100	4.7	5.0	0.8	91	4.4	5.0	1.0
10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress	9	2	1	-	-	-	4.7	5.0	0.7	67	4.6	5.0	0.8	87	4.3	5.0	1.0
11 Instructor was available and helpful	9	1	2	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.8	100	4.4	5.0	0.9	82	4.3	5.0	1.0
12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students	8	-	4	-	-	-	4.3	5.0	1.0	67	4.4	5.0	1.0	70	4.3	5.0	1.0
13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall	8	2	2	-	-	-	4.5	5.0	0.8	67	4.5	5.0	0.9	80	4.3	5.0	1.0
14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses	1	6	4	1	-	-	3.6	4.0	0.8	33	4.0	4.0	1.0	36	4.4	5.0	0.9
15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course	8	4	-	-	-	-	4.7	5.0	0.5	100	4.3	5.0	1.0	86	4.3	5.0	1.0
16 The required readings contributed to my learning	4	3	3	1	1	-	3.7	4.0	1.3	33	4.2	5.0	1.2	43	4.2	5.0	1.0
17 The assignments Contributed to my learning	6	4	1	1	-	-	4.3	4.5	1.0	67	4.3	5.0	1.0	67	4.3	5.0	1.0
18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative	4	1	6	-	-	1	3.8	3.0	1.0	67	4.1	5.0	1.1	50	4.2	5.0	1.0
19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent	6	2	3	1	-	-	4.1	4.5	1.1	50	4.3	5.0	1.0	67	4.1	5.0	1.1
20 Q1	1	-	-	-	-	11	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.0	4.0	1.4	100	4.3	5.0	1.1
21 Q2	1	-	-	-	-	11	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.0	4.0	1.4	100	4.2	5.0	1.1
22 Q3	1	-	-	-	-	11	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.0	4.0	1.4	100	4.2	5.0	1.1
23 Q4	1	-	-	-	-	11	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.0	4.0	1.4	100	4.3	5.0	1.1
24 Q5	1	-	-	-	-	11	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.0	4.0	1.4	100	4.2	5.0	1.1

\* The number of N/A is not included in the Mean, Median, and S.D. calculation.



## UC RIVERSIDE - Student Comments of Instructor, Faculty Evaluation Courses - Spring 2007

Course: CS 145 Section: 001 - COMBINATORIAL OPTIMZTN ALGORITHM  
Instructor: Neal E. Young

**Question # 25:** Please comment on how the instructor's teaching helped your learning of the material in this course. Please give serious thought to your comments. Your comments will be studied by the professor after the grade and performance evaluation of your work have been submitted and may be used in changing future offerings of the course. In addition, these comments are placed in the instructor's file and maybe used for purposes of evaluating the instructor's teaching. The information collected will remain anonymous

- One of the best teachers I have had here at UCR. I feel group discussions, in lecture, were productive and also helped break up a fairly long class. Seeing a few more practical applications, such as being forced to use a LP solver, would have been interesting. Over all, I was very satisfied with the course though.
- Prof. Young did an excellent job teaching this course given that it is the first time being offered. In the future it would be preferable to have a week-by-week (or as close as possible) course breakdown in the syllabus to let students plan their time accordingly.
- The class covered things a little too quickly. For intance, the section on reductions did not go into enough detail on some of the problem descriptions.
- The class I think is great. You get a taste of some of the advanced stuff eventhough you are an undergrad. What I had the most difficulty with were reductions. But that is just a hard concept in general. The grading of the homework I though was quite harsh at times. I worked for about 2 days on homework 3 and could not finsh. I got a zero for the work I did turn in. I also worked for quite a bit of time on the 4th homework and I got below average.
- The class was harder than expected. The information was too high-level and too conceptual so it was hard to relate to the information.
- Class was fun and straight forward. Can get lost in lecture at times.
- The class could have used a bit more direction/organization. It might have also been helpful to have been given additional, small-sized, but specific homework or reading assignments just to keep us thinking about some of the topics covered in class while outside of class. Dr. Young's deep understanding and enthusiasm for the course material was clearly apparent and, at least for me, did much to help me become more interested in the subject matter. Dr. Young also regularly called for students to work in groups, which was productive and engaging (and generally fun too), and he was always very approachable for questions or discussion. It was a privilege to be in Dr. Young's class and I would be very eager to take another of his classes if I ever had the opportunity in the future.
- Have more information on the material because the book does not help