



UC RIVERSIDE - Student Evaluation of Instructor, Faculty Evaluation Courses - Fall 2007

Course: CS 141 Section: 001 - INTERMED DATA STRUCS
& ALGORITHM
Instructor: Neal E. Young
Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering

Enrollment: 27
Respondents: 14
Response Rate: 52%

Enrollment: 210
Respondents: 132
Response Rate: 63%

Enrollment: 17252
Respondents: 8490
Response Rate: 49%

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	7	6	-	1	-	-	4.4	4.5	0.8	83	3.8	4.0	1.1	78	3.9	4.0	1.1
2 I attended class regularly	10	3	1	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.6	80	4.0	4.0	1.1	76	4.5	5.0	0.8
3 I put considerable effort into this course	5	7	2	-	-	-	4.2	4.0	0.7	67	3.9	4.0	0.9	58	4.3	5.0	0.8
4 I gained a good understanding of the course content	2	6	6	-	-	-	3.7	4.0	0.7	17	4.1	4.0	0.9	43	4.2	4.0	1.0
5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class	5	1	7	1	-	-	3.7	3.0	1.1	100	3.1	3.0	1.3	52	3.6	4.0	1.2
6 Instructor was prepared and organized	13	-	1	-	-	-	4.9	5.0	0.5	100	4.5	5.0	0.8	95	4.5	5.0	0.8
7 Instructor used class time effectively	12	1	1	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.6	83	4.4	5.0	0.9	91	4.4	5.0	0.9
8 Instructor was clear and understandable	7	4	1	2	-	-	4.1	4.5	1.1	40	4.4	5.0	0.8	64	4.3	5.0	1.0
9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching	9	4	-	-	-	1	4.7	5.0	0.5	67	4.6	5.0	0.7	86	4.5	5.0	0.9
10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress	10	3	1	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.6	67	4.6	5.0	0.7	81	4.4	5.0	1.0
11 Instructor was available and helpful	11	2	-	1	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.8	67	4.5	5.0	0.8	81	4.4	5.0	0.9
12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students	11	1	2	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.7	67	4.6	5.0	0.8	81	4.4	5.0	0.9
13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall	10	2	1	1	-	-	4.5	5.0	0.9	75	4.5	5.0	0.8	79	4.3	5.0	1.0
14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses	7	5	2	-	-	-	4.4	4.5	0.7	100	4.2	4.0	0.8	73	4.5	5.0	0.8
15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course	8	6	-	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.5	83	4.1	4.0	0.9	84	4.3	5.0	1.0
16 The required readings contributed to my learning	6	7	1	-	-	-	4.4	4.0	0.6	100	4.1	4.0	0.9	75	4.2	5.0	1.0
17 The assignments Contributed to my learning	8	6	-	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.5	100	4.2	4.0	0.9	83	4.3	5.0	1.0
18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative	6	5	1	2	-	-	4.1	4.0	1.1	50	4.2	4.0	0.8	64	4.2	5.0	1.0
19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent	5	6	2	-	-	1	4.2	4.0	0.7	67	4.1	4.0	0.9	70	4.2	5.0	1.0
20 Q1	-	-	-	-	-	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.0	4.0	1.1	n/a	4.3	5.0	1.1
21 Q2	-	-	-	-	-	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.9	4.5	1.2	n/a	4.3	5.0	1.1
22 Q3	-	-	-	-	-	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.1	4.5	1.1	n/a	4.3	5.0	1.0
23 Q4	-	-	-	-	-	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.1	4.5	1.1	n/a	4.3	5.0	1.0
24 Q5	-	-	-	-	-	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.0	4.0	1.1	n/a	4.3	5.0	1.0

* 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 - Fall 2007

Course: CS 141 Section: 001 - INTERMED DATA STRUCS & 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

- His teaching is very clear and reasonable, easy to understand. Pretty Good.
- The instructor had good intentions, however, sometimes things we talked about did not relate to quizzes. Went over tons of new material quickly and was hard to understand. In a study group before the quiz, he will not go over what we might need to know. The class would do poorly on a homework and then have a quiz based on this homework, however, he would never go over the homework to prep us for the quiz, which is where all the points are.
- The book is absolutely useless. It doesn't provide enough examples to get from the input data to the output.
- The professor was very fast in speaking and sometimes fast in explaining. He should have worked out at least one or two excersize problems in the class in each chapter/topic.