# UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval)
# Spring 2016

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

|  | Enrollment | Respondents | Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | 18 | 12 | 67% |
|  | 2312 | 1857 | 80% |
|  | 63441 | 49460 | 78% |

| Questions | 5 High | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 Low | N/A | Mean | Med | SD | % tile | Mean | Med | SD | % tile | Mean | Med | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Course** | | | | | | | | | **Department** | | | | **Campus** | | | |
| 1 I had a strong desire to take this course | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 50 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 59 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| 2 I attended class regularly | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 62 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 72 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.9 |
| 3 I put considerable effort into this course | 3 | 6 | 1 | - | - | - | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.6 | 45 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 60 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 4 I gained a good understanding of the course content | 4 | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 77 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 70 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class | 2 | 4 | 4 | - | - | - | 3.8 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 45 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 60 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.1 |
| 6 Instructor was prepared and organized | 7 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 91 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 88 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 7 Instructor used class time effectively | 6 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 86 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 85 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 8 Instructor was clear and understandable | 7 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 86 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 90 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching | 6 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 67 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 82 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress | 7 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 85 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 88 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.9 |
| 11 Instructor was available and helpful | 7 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 85 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 86 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students | 6 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 80 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 83 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall | 6 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 79 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 83 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses | 5 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 4.4 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 67 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 74 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 83 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 77 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 16 The required readings contributed to my learning | 5 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 4.4 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 77 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 73 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 17 The assignments contributed to my learning | 7 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 100 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 86 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, demonstrations, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative | 5 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 4.3 | 4.5 | 0.8 | 67 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 65 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 81 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 81 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 20 Q1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 50 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 58 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 21 Q2 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 55 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 58 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 22 Q3 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 55 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 60 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 23 Q4 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 45 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 58 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 24 Q5 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 50 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 58 | 4.1 | 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) Spring 2016

Course:  CS 145 Section:  001 - COMBINATRIAL OPTMZTN 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 may be used for purposes of evaluating the instructor's teaching. The information collected will remain anonymous.

- Very much enjoyed this thought provoking and interactive class compared to the other upper divs

- Great Professor.

- NA

- He was very serious about the material and gave help when needed.

- You were great at teaching, but I had a hard time competently completing the assignments. It was much easier to follow along in lecture than when alone. I don't think it was so much that the material was overly tough, but instead I was inept at forming proofs from my thoughts. Math is hard yo. The peer evaluations were effective at getting me to think about the problems for a longer time frame, but it was really hard to evaluate others since I wasn't very sure of my ability to find errors.

- Turning things into Piazza to get quick feedback was very helpful.