



UC RIVERSIDE - Faculty Instruction Evaluation (iEval)

Fall 2011

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

Enrollment: 47
 Respondents: 40
 Response Rate: 85%

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 | 25 | 7 | 5 | 3 | - | - | 4.4 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 80 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 77 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.1 |
| 2 I attended class regularly | 32 | 4 | - | 3 | 1 | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 75 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 71 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 3 I put considerable effort into this course | 24 | 9 | 5 | 2 | - | - | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 69 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 71 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 4 I gained a good understanding of the course content | 16 | 13 | 10 | 1 | - | - | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 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 | 22 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | 4.3 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 100 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 77 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 1.1 |
| 6 Instructor was prepared and organized | 25 | 12 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 77 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 81 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 7 Instructor used class time effectively | 24 | 9 | 3 | 4 | - | - | 4.3 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 62 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 74 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.9 |
| 8 Instructor was clear and understandable | 23 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | 4.3 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 50 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 77 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| 9 Instructor exhibited enthusiasm for subject and teaching | 25 | 12 | 3 | - | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 70 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 83 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 10 Instructor respected students; sensitive to and concerned with their progress | 28 | 10 | - | 1 | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 78 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 86 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0.9 |
| 11 Instructor was available and helpful | 31 | 8 | - | 1 | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 80 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 87 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 12 Instructor was fair in evaluating students | 25 | 13 | 2 | - | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 82 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 83 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 13 Instructor was effective as a teacher overall | 26 | 8 | 6 | - | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 75 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 81 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 14 The syllabus clearly explained the structure of the courses | 25 | 11 | 4 | - | - | - | 4.5 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 73 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 80 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 |
| 15 The examinations reflected the materials covered during the course | 31 | 6 | 3 | - | - | - | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 92 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 87 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 16 The required readings contributed to my learning | 23 | 12 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 71 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 73 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 17 The assignments contributed to my learning | 28 | 7 | 4 | 1 | - | - | 4.6 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 85 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 82 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 18 Supplementary materials (e.g. films, slides, videos, demonstrations, guest lectures, iLearn, web pages, etc) were informative | 19 | 13 | 8 | - | - | - | 4.3 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 67 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 68 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 19 The course overall as a learning experience was excellent | 24 | 9 | 5 | 2 | - | - | 4.4 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 82 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 78 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| 20 Q1 | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 36 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 60 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 21 Q2 | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 40 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 55 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 22 Q3 | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 44 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 60 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 23 Q4 | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 36 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 57 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 24 Q5 | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 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: CS 218 Section: 001 - DESIGN & ANALYSIS OF ALGORITHMS
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.

- One of my favorite professor in CS department, explain course material very well, I love this course
- The way this class is taught and organized is perfect and inspiring. The instructor was very organized. He went through the material and explained it carefully, logically and in a very comprehensive fashion. The assignments were very helpful and to the point. They helped understand the material covered and were also interesting and challenging. They were also given on a weekly basis and this helped always being up to date and preparing for the exams. We had a study group held every week to help understanding the material better. This was a really nice initiative from the professor to help us understand the content better. I really had a great time attending this class and gained great knowledge about algorithms. My expectations were met and highly surpassed. I wish all classes were taught this way. As a closing note, I would like to thank Dr. Young for his excellent work and his great efforts to teach us and help us understand the material.
- Good!!
- very good instructor, learned lots of difficult material
- A little too burdened...
- very content rich. perfect understanding needed for subject.
- Though there are lots of homework to do every week, but I think I get a lot in this class.
- The classes were very informative. But, the content that was covered in each class was huge. As a result, in many cases, i did fail to keep pace with the instructor. We have 9 assignment, one mid term and one final term for this course. In most of the assignments, we have to answer a large number of questions. So, i think the grading scheme is not right. More weight should be given in the assignments.
- Overall the performance of the instructor was good. But not only me but everyone had a problem of the fact that, the instructor used to put on a huge amount of topics in each class, so it was hard to keep concentration till the end. And he was so fast in the whiteboard that students could not concentrate while writing and vice versa. The scoring of the exams was not always seemed good to me. For small mistakes such as failing to express the logic 100% accurately was considered serious and marks were deducted. For example in some problems my logic was right but my choice of a sentence was not as per the grader he gave me poor marks. in one question he did not like my sentence and gave me only 20% marks. And others also told me similar stories. Overall the instructor was very helpful, the course content was related to the course, the teaching was good, only putting on a lot of contents in each class made the problem for me.
- This course was extremely telling on my time. While the assignments were very good and useful, they were very time-consuming. Not sure if there is a middle ground though.
- The instructor was very helpful. But I found some problems in the grading system of this course. Sometimes it seemed to be too harsh grading, which may demotivate a student in spite of his / her hard work in trying to understand and learn the course materials. The system of evaluation (in exams and assignments) should be done in a way so that the student does not get discouraged from studying an important course like Algorithms.
- I appreciated the study group and the time to ask specific questions. The more time I spend with other discussing the topics improved my understanding. Also found the extra material besides the book, to be very helpful in learning about algorithms. The PDF books and other material on iLearn.
- I was hoping the class would discuss more current research topics in algorithms. After taking the course, I still have no idea what type of work is actively being done in this area, or what the professor does. I realize there is no room to go into details, but occasional asides would have been

helpful. Instructor spoke very softly, so it was difficult to hear if I had to sit in the back of class. Writing on the board was not the best, but was usually tolerable. He frequently went over the allotted time for class.

- It was a very good class overall, but sometimes it was too stressful, because of the long weekly assignments. If the assignments were shorter, to give us time for studying the subjects and not only having to solve them, it would be better for the understanding of the class.
- Professor Neil Young is a really committed professor. He cares about his students a lot and he is seriously concerned with the progress of his students. One thing I really appreciate about him is that he tries to help his students himself and doesn't rely a lot on his TA. His study group really helps.
- The most helpful part of the class is having solutions to proofs posted on the class website. I have a much easier time understanding proofs by understanding a lot of different examples. I feel that if more examples were provided, the class would have been more straightforward.
- He tried to provide us useful information during the class hours. He took group study class as a bonus. But the subject is very tough to understand. I did not do well in the homework and the midterm. But I am trying to do well in the finals.
- Professor explains the material very well. I have no constructive criticism to add; I appreciate his effort in this class.