



UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval)

Fall 2011

Course: ENGR 101G Section: 001 - COMPUTER
ENGINEERING
Instructor: Neal E. Young
Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering

Enrollment: 27
Respondents: 25
Response Rate: 93%

Enrollment: 2304
Respondents: 1834
Response Rate: 80%

Enrollment: 62885
Respondents: 50185
Response Rate: 80%

Questions	Course							Department				Campus					
	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low	N/A	Mean	Med	SD	% tile	Mean	Med	SD	% tile	Mean	Med	SD
1 I had a strong desire to take this course	8	7	7	1	1	-	3.8	4.0	1.1	40	3.8	4.0	1.1	54	3.9	4.0	1.1
2 I attended class regularly	9	8	6	2	-	-	4.0	4.0	1.0	25	4.4	5.0	0.9	29	4.5	5.0	0.8
3 I put considerable effort into this course	7	7	7	3	1	-	3.6	4.0	1.2	8	4.2	4.0	0.9	33	4.3	4.0	0.8
4 I gained a good understanding of the course content	9	10	6	-	-	-	4.1	4.0	0.8	54	4.1	4.0	0.9	59	4.1	4.0	0.9
5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class	6	6	6	4	3	-	3.3	3.0	1.3	31	3.6	4.0	1.2	43	3.8	4.0	1.1
6 Instructor was prepared and organized	11	10	4	-	-	-	4.3	4.0	0.7	62	4.4	5.0	0.8	73	4.4	5.0	0.8
7 Instructor used class time effectively	12	9	4	-	-	-	4.3	4.0	0.7	62	4.3	4.0	0.9	74	4.3	5.0	0.9
8 Instructor was clear and understandable	13	9	3	-	-	-	4.4	5.0	0.7	58	4.3	5.0	0.8	80	4.2	4.0	1.0
9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching	15	8	2	-	-	-	4.5	5.0	0.7	60	4.4	5.0	0.9	79	4.4	5.0	0.8
10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress	14	8	3	-	-	-	4.4	5.0	0.7	44	4.4	5.0	0.8	73	4.3	5.0	0.9
11 Instructor was available and helpful	11	10	4	-	-	-	4.3	4.0	0.7	40	4.3	4.0	0.8	70	4.3	4.0	0.9
12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students	13	9	2	-	-	-	4.5	5.0	0.7	73	4.3	4.0	0.8	78	4.3	4.0	0.9
13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall	12	10	3	-	-	-	4.4	4.0	0.7	67	4.3	4.0	0.8	77	4.3	4.0	0.9
14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses	11	10	4	-	-	-	4.3	4.0	0.7	55	4.3	4.0	0.8	72	4.4	5.0	0.8
15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course	9	9	7	-	-	-	4.1	4.0	0.8	54	4.3	4.0	0.9	61	4.3	4.0	0.9
16 The required readings contributed to my learning	9	10	6	-	-	-	4.1	4.0	0.8	50	4.1	4.0	0.9	59	4.2	4.0	0.9
17 The assignments contributed to my learning	11	8	6	-	-	-	4.2	4.0	0.8	54	4.2	4.0	0.9	64	4.3	4.0	0.9
18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, demonstrations, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative	12	10	3	-	-	-	4.4	4.0	0.7	75	4.2	4.0	0.9	73	4.2	4.0	0.9
19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent	10	11	3	-	1	-	4.2	4.0	0.9	64	4.2	4.0	0.9	70	4.2	4.0	1.0
20 Q1	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.0	4.0	0.0	36	4.2	4.0	0.8	60	4.2	4.0	0.9
21 Q2	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.0	4.0	0.0	40	4.2	4.0	0.8	55	4.2	4.0	0.9
22 Q3	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.0	4.0	0.0	44	4.2	4.0	0.8	60	4.2	4.0	0.9
23 Q4	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.0	4.0	0.0	36	4.2	4.0	0.8	57	4.2	4.0	0.9
24 Q5	-	1	-	-	-	-	4.0	4.0	0.0	40	4.2	4.0	0.8	58	4.2	4.0	0.9

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



UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval)

Fall 2011

Course: ENGR 1011 Section: 001 - COMPUTER SCIENCE
 Instructor: Neal E. Young
 Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering

Enrollment: 33
 Respondents: 26
 Response Rate: 79%

Enrollment: 2304
 Respondents: 1834
 Response Rate: 80%

Enrollment: 62885
 Respondents: 50185
 Response Rate: 80%

Questions	Course							Department				Campus					
	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low	N/A	Mean	Med	SD	% tile	Mean	Med	SD	% tile	Mean	Med	SD
1 I had a strong desire to take this course	9	4	10	3	-	-	3.7	3.5	1.1	33	3.8	4.0	1.1	50	3.9	4.0	1.1
2 I attended class regularly	11	5	7	3	-	-	3.9	4.0	1.1	17	4.4	5.0	0.9	21	4.5	5.0	0.8
3 I put considerable effort into this course	10	6	8	2	-	-	3.9	4.0	1.0	31	4.2	4.0	0.9	48	4.3	4.0	0.8
4 I gained a good understanding of the course content	11	8	5	2	-	-	4.1	4.0	1.0	54	4.1	4.0	0.9	59	4.1	4.0	0.9
5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class	9	4	8	3	2	-	3.6	3.5	1.3	46	3.6	4.0	1.2	53	3.8	4.0	1.1
6 Instructor was prepared and organized	15	7	4	-	-	-	4.4	5.0	0.8	69	4.4	5.0	0.8	77	4.4	5.0	0.8
7 Instructor used class time effectively	14	7	5	-	-	-	4.3	5.0	0.8	62	4.3	4.0	0.9	74	4.3	5.0	0.9
8 Instructor was clear and understandable	15	8	3	-	-	-	4.5	5.0	0.7	67	4.3	5.0	0.8	83	4.2	4.0	1.0
9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching	15	7	4	-	-	-	4.4	5.0	0.8	50	4.4	5.0	0.9	75	4.4	5.0	0.8
10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress	14	9	3	-	-	-	4.4	5.0	0.7	44	4.4	5.0	0.8	73	4.3	5.0	0.9
11 Instructor was available and helpful	14	8	4	-	-	-	4.4	5.0	0.8	50	4.3	4.0	0.8	74	4.3	4.0	0.9
12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students	14	9	3	-	-	-	4.4	5.0	0.7	64	4.3	4.0	0.8	74	4.3	4.0	0.9
13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall	14	9	3	-	-	-	4.4	5.0	0.7	67	4.3	4.0	0.8	77	4.3	4.0	0.9
14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses	14	6	4	2	-	-	4.2	5.0	1.0	45	4.3	4.0	0.8	68	4.4	5.0	0.8
15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course	9	8	9	-	-	-	4.0	4.0	0.8	46	4.3	4.0	0.9	57	4.3	4.0	0.9
16 The required readings contributed to my learning	10	7	8	1	-	-	4.0	4.0	0.9	43	4.1	4.0	0.9	55	4.2	4.0	0.9
17 The assignments contributed to my learning	12	9	5	-	-	-	4.3	4.0	0.8	62	4.2	4.0	0.9	68	4.3	4.0	0.9
18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, demonstrations, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative	13	8	4	1	-	-	4.3	4.5	0.9	67	4.2	4.0	0.9	68	4.2	4.0	0.9
19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent	13	8	3	1	-	-	4.3	5.0	0.9	73	4.2	4.0	0.9	74	4.2	4.0	1.0
20 Q1	2	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.2	4.0	0.8	100	4.2	4.0	0.9
21 Q2	2	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.2	4.0	0.8	100	4.2	4.0	0.9
22 Q3	2	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.2	4.0	0.8	100	4.2	4.0	0.9
23 Q4	2	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.2	4.0	0.8	100	4.2	4.0	0.9
24 Q5	2	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	5.0	0.0	100	4.2	4.0	0.8	100	4.2	4.0	0.9

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



UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval)

Fall 2011

Course: ENGR 101M Section: 001 - INFORMATION SYSTEMS
 Instructor: Neal E. Young
 Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering

Enrollment: 11
 Respondents: 9
 Response Rate: 82%

Enrollment: 2304
 Respondents: 1834
 Response Rate: 80%

Enrollment: 62885
 Respondents: 50185
 Response Rate: 80%

Questions	Course							Department				Campus					
	5 High	4	3	2	1 Low	N/A	Mean	Med	SD	% tile	Mean	Med	SD	% tile	Mean	Med	SD
1 I had a strong desire to take this course	5	1	2	-	1	-	4.0	5.0	1.4	53	3.8	4.0	1.1	62	3.9	4.0	1.1
2 I attended class regularly	6	1	1	-	1	-	4.2	5.0	1.4	42	4.4	5.0	0.9	43	4.5	5.0	0.8
3 I put considerable effort into this course	5	1	3	-	-	-	4.2	5.0	1.0	54	4.2	4.0	0.9	62	4.3	4.0	0.8
4 I gained a good understanding of the course content	4	4	1	-	-	-	4.3	4.0	0.7	69	4.1	4.0	0.9	68	4.1	4.0	0.9
5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class	3	-	3	1	2	-	3.1	3.0	1.6	15	3.6	4.0	1.2	37	3.8	4.0	1.1
6 Instructor was prepared and organized	6	1	1	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.7	85	4.4	5.0	0.8	85	4.4	5.0	0.8
7 Instructor used class time effectively	5	2	1	-	-	-	4.5	5.0	0.8	77	4.3	4.0	0.9	81	4.3	5.0	0.9
8 Instructor was clear and understandable	6	2	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.5	92	4.3	5.0	0.8	93	4.2	4.0	1.0
9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching	5	2	1	-	-	-	4.5	5.0	0.8	60	4.4	5.0	0.9	79	4.4	5.0	0.8
10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress	6	2	-	-	-	-	4.8	5.0	0.5	89	4.4	5.0	0.8	91	4.3	5.0	0.9
11 Instructor was available and helpful	4	1	3	-	-	-	4.1	4.5	1.0	20	4.3	4.0	0.8	61	4.3	4.0	0.9
12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students	6	1	1	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.7	82	4.3	4.0	0.8	83	4.3	4.0	0.9
13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall	4	3	1	-	-	-	4.4	4.5	0.7	67	4.3	4.0	0.8	77	4.3	4.0	0.9
14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses	4	3	1	-	-	-	4.4	4.5	0.7	64	4.3	4.0	0.8	76	4.4	5.0	0.8
15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course	2	-	5	-	-	-	3.6	3.0	1.0	15	4.3	4.0	0.9	39	4.3	4.0	0.9
16 The required readings contributed to my learning	2	1	5	-	-	-	3.6	3.0	0.9	14	4.1	4.0	0.9	36	4.2	4.0	0.9
17 The assignments contributed to my learning	4	2	2	-	-	-	4.3	4.5	0.9	62	4.2	4.0	0.9	68	4.3	4.0	0.9
18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, demonstrations, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative	6	1	1	-	-	-	4.6	5.0	0.7	92	4.2	4.0	0.9	82	4.2	4.0	0.9
19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent	4	3	1	-	-	-	4.4	4.5	0.7	82	4.2	4.0	0.9	78	4.2	4.0	1.0

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



UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval)

Fall 2011

Course: ENGR 101G Section: 001 - COMPUTER ENGINEERING
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.

- Neil Young was a good professor even though he didn't teach much since this was an advising class. He did bring in good guest speakers that talk about a variety of things. And good grading the few assignments that we had.
- A nice course for getting different perspectives on what types of fields exist and how we can get involved in them from this point in our careers.
- felt a little tedious, but helpful.
- I enjoyed the the various guest speakers that the professor would present. This course was very helpful and enlightening.
- Enthusiastic about the material he coverd and was nice and answered any questions if there was any.
- The professor was very clear about what was going to happen every meeting, and communicated goals and objectives very well. He was prompt to reply to any emails and gave clear and thoughtful responses. I was very satisfied with the professor and the course, and have really benefited from several of the meetings and assignments.
- I do not know how to express my disappointment in this class, except by the analogy of the Hoover Dam. The Hoover Dam was a drop in a very large bucket. Just like giving a nickel to a man who needs to pay a multi million dollar debt. It is inconsequential, and feels pretty much like a waste of time. But the man thanks you for the nickel anyway, maybe to be polite or because he feels obligated to, even though you just are not helpful. I feel like this class could've been easily summed up in a mailing list entitled, "My Life as a UCR Alumni." While it is kind of useful, it is also not developing myself professionally much. Only a very little bit...



UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval)

Fall 2011

Course: ENGR 101I Section: 001 - COMPUTER SCIENCE
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.

- He was good for this class. All of the speakers were interesting that he had come down so I'm happy with the class in general.
- I liked the speakers, and I liked the course. I also narrowed what I would like to do and what I would not like to do in the future. I originally wanted to be a System Administrator. However, after the System Administrator at BCOE went to speak, I decided not to become one. I find that Neal Young goes above the call of duty for his students. Some students might be too shy to take advantage of his knowledge and connections.
- Going in I didn't know what to expect but I did like the way he had a different person presenting each week giving advice to take advantage of our education.
- Dr. Young's course was very helpful in exploring options after obtaining an undergraduate degree. I liked the optional attendance aspect of the course, since it allowed me the freedom to learn more about careers and grad school options I was truly interested in. Additionally, I felt that the course overall really allowed me to gain a better perspective on what to expect after graduating. I have no criticisms on how to improve the class, since I think it is very effective as is.
- This class is very useful but only to Juniors. I wasn't able to take this class in Junior year and taking it now in Senior year was a little bit of a waste of time. This class needs to be available more than once a year or more than one class a quarter so that all CS Juniors can take it.
- Great class had tons of fun



UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval) Fall 2011

Course: ENGR 101M Section: 001 - INFORMATION SYSTEMS
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.

- Class where people just came into talk about their jobs/life. Nothing much to say

- The course gave me great insight into what I want to do with my life