



# Faculty Instruction Evaluation (Scantron)

## Spring 2008

Course: CS 260 Section: 001 - SEMINAR IN COMPUTER SCIENCE

Instructor: Neal E. Young

Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering

Tracking #: 538

Enrollment: 7  
 Respondents: 6  
 Response Rate: 86%

Enrollment: 959  
 Respondents: 449  
 Response Rate: 47%

Enrollment: 23604  
 Respondents: 16683  
 Response Rate: 71%

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	-	1	-	-	-	4.7	5.0	0.8	87	3.9	4.0	1.0	88	3.9	4.0	1.0
2 I attended class regularly	6	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.5	5.0	0.8	100	4.5	5.0	0.8
3 I put considerable effort into this course	2	4	-	-	-	-	4.3	4.0	0.5	60	4.2	4.0	0.8	63	4.2	4.0	0.8
4 I gained a good understanding of the course content	3	2	1	-	-	-	4.3	4.5	0.8	60	4.2	4.0	0.8	68	4.2	4.0	0.8
5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class	1	4	1	-	-	-	4.0	4.0	0.6	75	3.4	3.0	1.2	68	3.5	4.0	1.1
6 Instructor was prepared and organized	5	1	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.4	82	4.4	5.0	0.8	91	4.5	5.0	0.8
7 Instructor used class time effectively	4	2	-	-	-	-	4.7	5.0	0.5	82	4.4	5.0	0.9	88	4.4	5.0	0.8
8 Instructor was clear and understandable	5	1	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.4	92	4.4	5.0	0.8	92	4.4	5.0	0.9
9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching	5	1	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.4	80	4.3	5.0	0.9	90	4.5	5.0	0.8
10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress	5	1	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.4	92	4.2	4.0	1.0	91	4.5	5.0	0.8
11 Instructor was available and helpful	5	1	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.4	86	4.2	4.0	0.9	91	4.4	5.0	0.8
12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students	5	1	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.4	86	4.2	4.0	1.0	92	4.4	5.0	0.8
13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall	5	1	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.4	93	4.3	4.0	0.9	92	4.4	5.0	0.8
14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses	3	3	-	-	-	-	4.5	4.5	0.5	70	4.4	5.0	0.8	78	4.4	5.0	0.8
15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course	-	1	3	-	-	2	3.3	3.0	0.5	23	4.3	5.0	0.9	23	4.4	5.0	0.8
16 The required readings contributed to my learning	4	2	-	-	-	-	4.7	5.0	0.5	92	4.1	4.0	1.0	88	4.2	4.0	1.0
17 The assignments Contributed to my learning	4	2	-	-	-	-	4.7	5.0	0.5	82	4.3	4.0	0.9	85	4.3	5.0	0.9
18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative	4	-	2	-	-	-	4.3	5.0	1.0	69	4.1	4.0	0.9	71	4.2	4.0	0.9
19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent	4	1	-	-	-	1	4.8	5.0	0.4	92	4.2	4.0	0.9	92	4.3	5.0	0.9
20 Q1	-	-	-	-	-	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.9	4.5	1.6	n/a	4.4	5.0	0.9
21 Q2	-	-	-	-	-	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.8	4.5	1.8	n/a	4.5	5.0	0.9
22 Q3	-	-	-	-	-	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.5	4.5	2.0	n/a	4.4	5.0	0.9
23 Q4	-	-	-	-	-	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.3	4.0	1.9	n/a	4.5	5.0	0.9
24 Q5	-	-	-	-	-	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.5	4.5	2.0	n/a	4.5	5.0	0.9

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

UCR STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING FORM  
OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
Spring 2008

COMPUTER SCIENCE & ENGINEERING DEPARTMENTAL SUMMARY

ENROLLMENT: 959

FORMS COMPLETED: 449

PERCENT COMPLETED: 46.82

1. I had a strong desire to take this course

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	141	153	111	28	13	3
	MEAN: 3.9		MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: 1		

2. I attended class regularly

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	288	120	26	6	5	4
	MEAN: 4.5		MEDIAN: 5	STD. DEV: .8		

3. I put considerable effort into this course

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	168	213	49	13	3	3
	MEAN: 4.2		MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: .8		

4. I gained a good understanding of the course content

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	164	222	43	10	5	5
	MEAN: 4.2		MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: .8		

5. I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	85	136	115	75	33	5
	MEAN: 3.4		MEDIAN: 3	STD. DEV: 1.2		

6. Instructor was prepared and organized

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	248	157	26	8	7	3

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

7. Instructor used class time effectively

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	248	150	28	12	8	3

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

8. Instructor was clear and understandable

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	249	151	26	14	5	4

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

9. Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	241	136	49	9	9	5

MEAN: 4.3      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

10. Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	217	147	51	14	13	7

MEAN: 4.2      MEDIAN: 4      STD. DEV: 1

11. Instructor was available and helpful

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	206	154	64	13	8	4

MEAN: 4.2      MEDIAN: 4      STD. DEV: .9

12. Instructor was fair in evaluating students

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	216	160	42	16	12	3

MEAN: 4.2      MEDIAN: 4      STD. DEV: 1

13. Instructor was effective as a teacher overall

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	214	181	25	11	14	4

MEAN: 4.3      MEDIAN: 4      STD. DEV: .9

14. The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	238	153	40	8	5	5
		MEAN: 4.4	MEDIAN: 5	STD. DEV: .8		

15. The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	223	149	53	8	6	10
		MEAN: 4.3	MEDIAN: 5	STD. DEV: .9		

16. The required readings contributed to my learning

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	193	144	74	13	15	10
		MEAN: 4.1	MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: 1		

17. The assignments Contributed to my learning

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	213	155	52	11	6	12
		MEAN: 4.3	MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: .9		

18. Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	190	147	80	7	11	14
		MEAN: 4.1	MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: .9		

19. The course overall as a learning experience was excellent

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	195	169	52	10	13	10
		MEAN: 4.2	MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: .9		

20. Q1

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	5	3	0	0	2	439

MEAN: 3.9      MEDIAN: 4.5      STD. DEV: 1.6

21. Q2

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	4	2	0	0	2	441

MEAN: 3.8      MEDIAN: 4.5      STD. DEV: 1.8

22. Q3

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	3	1	0	0	2	443

MEAN: 3.5      MEDIAN: 4.5      STD. DEV: 2

23. Q4

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	2	2	0	0	2	443

MEAN: 3.3      MEDIAN: 4      STD. DEV: 1.9

24. Q5

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	3	1	0	0	2	443

MEAN: 3.5      MEDIAN: 4.5      STD. DEV: 2

UCR STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING FORM  
OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
Spring 2008

UCR CAMPUSWIDE SUMMARY

ENROLLMENT: 23604

FORMS COMPLETED: 16683

PERCENT COMPLETED: 70.68

1. I had a strong desire to take this course

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	5661	5804	3514	1088	509	107
	MEAN: 3.9		MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: 1		

2. I attended class regularly

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	10216	4949	939	317	137	125
	MEAN: 4.5		MEDIAN: 5	STD. DEV: .8		

3. I put considerable effort into this course

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	6691	7391	1900	404	145	152
	MEAN: 4.2		MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: .8		

4. I gained a good understanding of the course content

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	6561	7319	1916	451	171	265
	MEAN: 4.2		MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: .8		

5. I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	3781	4911	4626	2403	806	156
	MEAN: 3.5		MEDIAN: 4	STD. DEV: 1.1		

6. Instructor was prepared and organized

	High (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Low (1)	N/A (0)
NUMBER	9851	5249	1018	310	151	104

MEAN: 4.5      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

7. Instructor used class time effectively

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	9733	5112	1121	432	178	107

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

8. Instructor was clear and understandable

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	9606	4831	1333	542	246	125

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

9. Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	10887	4225	1049	258	137	127

MEAN: 4.5      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

10. Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	10024	4651	1367	304	200	137

MEAN: 4.5      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

11. Instructor was available and helpful

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	9308	4709	2090	275	167	134

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

12. Instructor was fair in evaluating students

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	9288	4926	1778	351	184	156

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

13. Instructor was effective as a teacher overall

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	9675	5063	1179	407	222	137

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

14. The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	9614	5320	1162	324	122	141

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

15. The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	8982	5266	1657	357	162	259

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .8

16. The required readings contributed to my learning

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	7820	5212	2533	597	308	213

MEAN: 4.2      MEDIAN: 4      STD. DEV: 1

17. The assignments Contributed to my learning

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	8215	5497	2120	351	210	290

MEAN: 4.3      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

18. Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	7876	4956	2720	370	250	511

MEAN: 4.2      MEDIAN: 4      STD. DEV: .9

19. The course overall as a learning experience was excellent

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	8365	5479	1763	484	260	332

MEAN: 4.3      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

20. Q1

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	239	97	34	7	11	16295



MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

21. Q2

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	197	70	33	3	6	16374

MEAN: 4.5      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

22. Q3

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	178	72	32	4	6	16391

MEAN: 4.4      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

23. Q4

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	183	64	29	3	6	16398

MEAN: 4.5      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

24. Q5

	High				Low	N/A
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
NUMBER	179	66	28	4	5	16401

MEAN: 4.5      MEDIAN: 5      STD. DEV: .9

UC RIVERSIDE Faculty Instruction Evaluation (Scantron)  
OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
SPRING QUARTER 2008

Instructor: Young, Neal E.  
Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering  
Enrollment: 7 (Excluding auditors and concurrently enrolled students)

Course: Computer Science 260  
SEMINAR IN COMPUTER SCIENCE

Number of Forms Returned: 6

Tracking Number: 538

Below are the comments submitted by the students enrolled in the above listed course. All comments have been typed exactly as they were written, including any misspelling, grammatical errors, or punctuation errors. All comments submitted by a given student are grouped in a single paragraph, with a space separating the comments of different students. The number of students writing comments may be less than the number of forms returned because some of the students choose not to make comments.

The comments have been ordered on the basis of student responses ( 5-Strongly Agree , followed by 4-Agree, etc...) to the following questions: Section 2 - 1A: I had a strong desire to take this course. Section 2 - 8B: Instructor was effective as a teacher overall Section 2 - 6C: The course overall as a learning experience was excellent The comments of students who did not respond to the questions were typed last. It is hoped this ordering system will provide a useful but unbiased grouping of comments.

1. Awesome Stuff. Especially guest lecture by monic.
2. As usual, Prof. Young created a comfortable learning environment and was very good at meeting the students on their/our level. I greatly enjoyed the class and had my mind blown on a regular basis.
3. Awesome stuff. Awesome teaching. Awesome guest lectures esp. by Peter.
4. I learned alot and wsa fascinated by the course.
5. I learned quite in this class about graph theory & proofs + Apps Apgs. I appreciate professor Neal extra time in helping, exposure to research problems, & the way he promotes group thinking. W/prof. Neal, no error is fatal; it is allowed to rethink the process. Overall, it was a very interesting class & informative as well.