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

Course: CS 215 Section: 001 - THEORY OF COMPUTATION
Instructor: Neal E. Young
Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering

Enrollment: 17    Respondents: 15    Response Rate: 88%

Enrollment: 2327    Respondents: 1864    Response Rate: 80%

Enrollment: 68886    Respondents: 54850    Response Rate: 80%

| Questions | 5 High | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 Low | N/A | Mean | Med | SD | Dept % tile | Dept Mean | Dept Med | Dept SD | Campus % tile | Campus Mean | Campus Med | Campus SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 I had a strong desire to take this course | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 71 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 72 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| 2 I attended class regularly | 13 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 4.8 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 86 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 89 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.9 |
| 3 I put considerable effort into this course | 10 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 82 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 81 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 4 I gained a good understanding of the course content | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 60 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 68 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class | 8 | 6 | 1 | - | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 85 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 83 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.1 |
| 6 Instructor was prepared and organized | 10 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 71 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 83 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 7 Instructor used class time effectively | 10 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 71 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 79 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.9 |
| 8 Instructor was clear and understandable | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 69 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 79 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| 9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching | 10 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 67 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 76 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress | 13 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 4.9 | 5.0 | 0.4 | 93 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 96 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 11 Instructor was available and helpful | 13 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 4.9 | 5.0 | 0.4 | 93 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 96 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students | 10 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 77 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 78 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 67 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 81 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses | 8 | 7 | - | - | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 75 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 81 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 71 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 77 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 16 The required readings contributed to my learning | 9 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 4.3 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 62 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 71 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 17 The assignments contributed to my learning | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 85 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 87 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, demonstrations, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative | 7 | 4 | 4 | - | - | - | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 58 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 60 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 60 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 74 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 20 Q1 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 5.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 100 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 21 Q2 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 5.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 100 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 22 Q3 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 5.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 100 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 23 Q4 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 5.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 100 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 24 Q5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 5.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 100 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 |

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

**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.

- He was a caring, extremely hardworking and respectable teacher.

- I think this class is really amazing. Very interesting topics and I wish I could learn much much more from Dr. Young about these topics. Even though it was really interesting, I still found the content to be pretty difficult to wrap my head around. I feel like I gained a good understanding of the content, but I still really need to work on coming up with ideas and proving them in a formal and clear manner. However, Dr. Young explains as much as he can in a clear and concise way and it really helps a lot.

- The instructor is patient and willing to help. And he has good understanding about his area.

- I believe Prof. Young works with the class he is presented with, and it was unfortunate that much of the class appears not to have taken undergraduate level Theory. As such, the class moved very slowly; I would have preferred the class began with NP-reductions, and moved on quickly from there. At the same time, I suppose I underperformed on homeworks (unless redos are expected...) so it is a little bit hubristic of me to wish the class moved faster. On that note, I also got the opinion Prof. Young wished the class moved faster. I was initially turned off by his at times unemotive and dry lecturing style, but this was quickly compensated for by the robust commentary he gives on homeworks and quizzes, his personal interactions with students (personal emails, etc), as well as the (incredibly!) quick turnaround he gives on them. Because of this commentary, I definitely feel I learned a lot about topics I already 'knew;' still, the class felt at times like a very rich and slow-paced review. His teaching style picks up notably any time he begins to talk about the philosophical implications of the subject, or begins to talk about more advanced material. He visibly becomes more animated and excited. I regret that the class never had a chance to move into that material; I may even send Prof. Young an email at some point asking if he ever plans to teach a seminar or something similar on that material, thereby unwisely exposing who I, the reviewer, am!

- Professor Neal is very fast in lecturing. His lectures were not well documented and messy. It's hard to follow his lecture continuously. But he is well prepared and very considerate with the progress of students. He knows very well about each student and capability of every pupil.

- The instructor presented the materials clearly and guided students understand the proof ideas. Hope the writing on white board can be improved (write bigger). I think that could help me understand better when I did not follow closely. Thanks for the lectures.

- I really appreciated the sincerity I felt at the instructor's willingness to ensure the class understood the course material. The course material was much harder than I had originally anticipated so I would have appreciated more external resources recommended by the professor but I was able to find plenty of textbooks or youtube videos online to supplement the material. The grading, homework, and exams were very fair. I would definitely take a class with this instructor again, great job Professor!

- I learned a lot in this class, and I am really impressed by the quick turnaround speed of all our homework and exams!