



UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval)

Fall 2017

Course: CS 218 Section: 001 - DESIGN&ANALYSIS OF ALGORITHMS
 Instructor: Neal E. Young
 Home Dept.: Computer Science & Engineering

Enrollment: 29
 Respondents: 18
 Response Rate: 62%

Enrollment: 3861
 Respondents: 2333
 Response Rate: 60%

Enrollment: 78633
 Respondents: 50737
 Response Rate: 65%

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	13	4	1	-	-	-	4.67	5.0	0.6	93.64	3.95	4.0	1.1	94.57	3.87	4.0	1.1
2 I attended class regularly	14	4	-	-	-	-	4.78	5.0	0.4	89.62	4.23	5.0	1.0	89.12	4.47	5.0	0.8
3 I put considerable effort into this course	15	3	-	-	-	-	4.83	5.0	0.4	97.00	4.22	4.0	0.9	96.88	4.31	4.0	0.8
4 I gained a good understanding of the course content	12	6	-	-	-	-	4.67	5.0	0.5	95.37	4.13	4.0	0.9	90.21	4.17	4.0	0.9
5 I normally spent at least two hours preparing for each hour of class	14	3	1	-	-	-	4.72	5.0	0.6	93.64	3.68	4.0	1.2	97.88	3.76	4.0	1.1
6 Instructor was prepared and organized	17	1	-	-	-	-	4.94	5.0	0.2	97.22	4.35	5.0	0.8	98.76	4.39	5.0	0.8
7 Instructor used class time effectively	16	2	-	-	-	-	4.89	5.0	0.3	97.27	4.28	4.0	0.9	96.67	4.34	5.0	0.9
8 Instructor was clear and understandable	16	2	-	-	-	-	4.89	5.0	0.3	95.19	4.26	4.0	0.9	96.67	4.23	5.0	1.0
9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching	15	3	-	-	-	-	4.83	5.0	0.4	91.35	4.44	5.0	0.8	90.33	4.47	5.0	0.8
10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress	17	1	-	-	-	-	4.94	5.0	0.2	97.32	4.42	5.0	0.8	99.11	4.43	5.0	0.8
11 Instructor was available and helpful	17	1	-	-	-	-	4.94	5.0	0.2	97.17	4.34	5.0	0.8	98.57	4.36	5.0	0.8
12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students	15	3	-	-	-	-	4.83	5.0	0.4	95.10	4.37	5.0	0.8	94.90	4.34	5.0	0.8
13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall	16	2	-	-	-	-	4.89	5.0	0.3	97.17	4.30	5.0	0.9	96.74	4.31	5.0	0.9
14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses	17	1	-	-	-	-	4.94	5.0	0.2	97.27	4.32	5.0	0.8	99.33	4.40	5.0	0.8
15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course	17	1	-	-	-	-	4.94	5.0	0.2	97.06	4.31	4.0	0.8	99.38	4.30	5.0	0.9
16 The required readings contributed to my learning	17	1	-	-	-	-	4.94	5.0	0.2	97.17	4.20	4.0	0.9	99.38	4.16	4.0	0.9
17 The assignments contributed to my learning	17	1	-	-	-	-	4.94	5.0	0.2	97.32	4.29	4.0	0.9	99.54	4.27	4.0	0.9
18 Supplementary materials were informative (e.g. films, slides, videos, demonstrations, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc)	15	2	1	-	-	-	4.78	5.0	0.5	97.22	4.24	4.0	0.9	94.50	4.26	4.0	0.9
19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent	17	1	-	-	-	-	4.94	5.0	0.2	97.27	4.20	4.0	0.9	99.39	4.21	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 2017

Course: CS 218 Section: 001 - DESIGN&ANALYSIS OF ALGORITHMS
Instructor: Neal E. Young

Question # 20: 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.

- pretty good
- The professor tries to cover each and every important concept, which I appreciate. The only suggestion I have is for the course-offering schedulers. I guess this course suffers even if it loses one day for some holiday. This is because of its vast content. So it could be beneficial to Prof Young and the students if the meeting times were decided in a way to maximize the number of classes.
- The instructor was extremely approachable and the class structure was very good for asking questions.
- After the dynamic programming, the difficulty went up a lot, as in there is a lot of homework and the questions are a lot more challenging. My only complaint is that there is a lot of work after the midterm and that the expected workload wasn't well established early on. I think more time should've been spent on the material after the midterm, such as randomized algorithms. Other than that, I really enjoyed the course and am glad that Neal taught it.
- The assignments for this class take far too long to complete. Despite attending every lecture and the study sessions after class, the assignments are difficult and time consuming. A typical assignment takes numerous hours do yet their overall value are minuscule for what they are worth in our grades. The percentage of our grade that is based on our assignments should be much greater given the amount of work that goes into each one. Making the final exam worth approximately half of the entire grade also diminishes the value of the effort put into these assignments grade-wise. Furthermore, the entrance exam was arguably unnecessary and only set a stressful tone at the start of the quarter. Professor Young's teachings during lecture was clear and the midterm was fair. A reevaluation of the course's grading structure would justify the burdensome assignments (or keep the same grading structure but lighten the assignment work load).
- He is always available and very patient. Best professor in UCR so far. I think the course content should be decreased
- Dr. Young gives a considerable amount of his time to helping his students outside of normal class hours. Study groups and availability of feedback online (i.e. through Piazza) are very helpful.
- na
- I very much liked the structure and overall philosophy of this course. While I feel a few more concert examples of some of the more computational aspects of the course would be beneficial, I think the course as a whole is in good shape.