

**Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016**

Responses: 105/130 (80.77%)

**A. Please comment on the following areas and be as specific as possible:**

1. What are the instructor's teaching strengths?

- - understands topic(s) very well - willing to explain things (repeatedly) for students to understand - accessible - responsive and willing to compromise/change plans
- Accommodating to students
- A lot of interesting information presented in lectures.
- answers questions very thoroughly
- clear explanations
- Creates a good learning environment - students are encouraged to ask questions and he always makes sure there is a strong understanding of the material before moving on.
- Detail oriented, excellent lecturing.
- Explaining concept
- Explaining in detail concepts. Genuinely wants students to understand the material
- Explains information thoroughly and answers student questions
- Extremely helpful and really cares for the students.
- Friendly and willing to help students.
- funny(in a nerdy way). Very passionate about subject. Sympathetic and very understanding towards student. Encouraging to students who are not strong in the field but wish to achieve a good grade! Provided many resources for students to understand the contents fully.
- Gives clear explanations, helpful to students, willing to go into detail if students desire.
- Goes over lectures in detail
- good
- Great at making sure the students KNOW the material. Willing to sacrifice future lectures in order to get everyone familiar with material. Really wants us all to learn!
- Great speaking voice, clear and loud. Keeps the class attentive by taking small breaks and showing us short videos and stories that are related to what we are learning.
- He's passionate about the subject. He really cares whether or not the students learn. He also provides resources for students who are interested in knowing more.
- He's very clear and fair on his quizzes. He's also very nice and shows using relevant videos and articles on AI.
- He's very detailed-oriented. He is flexible with his deadlines and is reasonable with his workload. He sends emails of other students asking him questions, so every student is caught up. Exams are fair. Provides solutions to all previous exams and quizzes.
- He's very detailed in answering students' questions. I like how he could adapt easily to changes, and always notifies us whenever there's a change in something (such as announcements, homework). He's one of the best professors I've had. He stays on a topic until we all understand it.
- He's very passionate about AI and it's really exciting watching the videos that he shows us.
- He explains concepts clearly. He also answers his questions very thoroughly. Walking through some examples helped a lot
- He has good enthusiasm for the subject and a great knowledgeable background. Professor Lathrop is kind and approachable. He will slow down and clarify the lectures if he is moving too fast, which is surprisingly refreshing.

## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

- He is enthusiastic, speaks loud and clear, and helps in any way he can
- He is really generous on students, and make sure everyone understand his teaching
- He is very accommodating to the needs of the students
- He is very enthusiastic about the learning materials.
- He is very knowledgeable on the subject. Overall a very nice teacher. Goes over anything someone doesn't understand. Very helpful
- He is very nice and knows his material. He engages in student frequently too.
- He knows the material very well. He also seems very caring toward his students. He welcomes questions and is always willing to answer them.
- Helps students right away
- He really knows the material he teaches. He has no problem with explaining things again. Big plus.
- He shows his interest and passion in the subject everyday. He also knows how to keep the course organized and is always considerate of his students and their needs.
- He takes the time to go into a necessary amount of depth for each problem, and sets aside time to go over difficult topics more thoroughly.
- He understands AI very well. Very friendly guy, felt welcomed to go to office hours
- He was able to clearly explain the concepts.
- His lectures explain the material well
- His slides are accessible and clear so that working on the project and studying for the quiz was more doable. Also, giving the students access to quizzes and exams from previous years helps a lot when studying the material (not just for the quizzes). Going through examples helps reinforces the topics. He also is understanding when it comes to mishaps in the project or when students need extra time on quizzes.
- in depth detailed
- Informative, supportive, lenient, really wants his students to succeed.
- Interesting discussions about cultural interests.
- Is willing to slowdown to make sure everyone understands material
- knowledgeable, easy to understand, clear
- Knowledge of the course material
- Knows the subject well
- n
- N/A
- Nice explanations of very complex material. Good office hours explanations as well.
- Okay
- patient
- Professor Lathrop is an excellent professor. He does an excellent job at teaching students the concepts and also inspiring students to learn more. Often, the professor provides relevant examples of artificial intelligence being used. Being in his class this quarter has been a delightful experience.
- Provides extensive lecture material online, so you can return to things you did not understand. Very adaptable and receptive to students needs. Not only did he respond if there were comments, he went out of his way to make sure that things were reasonable. Clearly enthusiastic about the material, providing outside examples of applied artificial intelligence to stimulate interest

- really clear explanation on the subject.
- Rich website of information (although cluttered) Good exams that tests students on knowledge
- seems passionate about topic
- sharing a lot of interesting topics related to the course
- Shows general interest in students' well being and took extra time to make sure students'. Likes to keep students' up to date with current events in AI and shows real enthusiasm towards the subject.
- Spends a lot of time explaining concepts, gives lots of examples
- Takes the time to go over slides in depth. Keeps workload manageable by extending deadlines.
- The instructor definitely has clarity of information as priority. He spends time to ensure that we, the students, understand the topic, what will be on the midterms and quizzes, what is expected of us to learn and know.
- The instructor is very interested and passionate about the subject he teaches. This makes his understanding of the course material very thorough, and he is able to explain all of the concepts in depth and answer any questions.
- Theories and examples are very well explained.
- The professor goes through course material very carefully and slowly as needed, helping students understand difficult details better.
- The professor is not afraid to go into more depth if a student needs help; he is able to elaborate well.
- Truly cares about his students and is very fair with testing
- Understands subject and shows applications of concepts very well
- Very approachable and always willing to slow down and explain things thoroughly until everyone understands
- Very approachable and very thorough. I can tell he cares for his students. Gives extremely detailed responses about previous exam solutions. I enjoyed the little cultural asides as a break between halves of the lecture. That helped perk up my attention when it was waning.
- Very detailed lectures with examples
- Very helpful, and keeps his students engaged in his lecture. Not a dull moment in class
- Very nice
- Very passionate about course topics. Answers all students' questions thoroughly and makes sure everyone understands before moving on. Is very responsive with emails and is extremely fair with grading and assigning homework.
- Willing to go over material multiple times for students who ask.
- 30 blank answer(s).

### 2. How can this instructor improve as a teacher?

- - can sometimes be a bit difficult to hear what he's saying - sometimes he does examples on the white board (on the left side of the class), which is hard to see from many seats in the lecture room
- At some points I feel like the teacher spends too much time on one subject and therefore gets behind in schedule. Also some of the assignments descriptions were confusing and unclear, especially the given testing shell.
- Better formatted projects. It was a new project for them and was messy but handled fairly for the students.

## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

- Class is a bit dry but the professor probably can't change much about that since tone of voice is hard to change. Lectures were informative but were very detailed oriented and covered a large amount of topics per day. Lowering the amount of stuff covered would make it easier on the students but then the class wouldn't cover as much information. There isn't a clear answer to making it easier for the students without limiting the amount of knowledge to be learned.
- Continue listening to his students. From what he and his past students have said, his class has improved over the years thanks to student feedback like this.
- Could talk more confidently Pacing is sometimes too slow, sometimes too fast
- cut down on some of the lecture slides and understand what he wants for the project in ai. We don't have a clear outline on what he wants us to do
- Does not stimulate a lot of interest for the subject, most of the class either didn't pay attention to the lecturer or weren't there, needs to prepare the project material and instructions beforehand and be prepared to deal with different cases
- Don't make bad jokes. His Jokes aren't funny
- Don't provide any prewritten code if there are bugs in them since they cause confusion.
- For the project if he had not given us a shell, it would have put more pressure on me and I would have been forced to study much more than I did.
- Give clearer assignment descriptions so we know exactly what is expected of us in each submission
- give more coding practice, coding HW probably.
- Give more examples in class.
- good enough
- Have more Concrete deadlines
- He can be more organized when it comes to the website and project.
- He moves quite quickly through the slides, and I often couldn't keep up. I eventually stopped taking notes in class because it became too much of a hassle (thought I am a slow writer so maybe that's just me) More clear organization of the class website. It was very difficult to find things, and often links would be broken randomly only to come back a day later. Not so much to do with the professor, but make sure the reader and grader of our projects are on top of things. Because we did not get a good evaluation of our heuristic functions until week 9 we did not have much time to figure out whether or not our implementation was correct, and if not there wasn't much time to fix it.
- I think as a teacher you are doing totally fine!!
- I think he does a good job.
- I think more/multiple examples within the slides of the material and breaking things down piece by piece would be welcome.
- It is very easy to get lost during the lecture. If you miss one detail then the whole example can be come confusing. Maybe try to add step by step details
- It might be nice if in the lecture, he could always give some brief definitions of terms when he first mentions them. It's also a bit hard to focus on simulations of code in a PPT. Maybe hand simulate some of the important ones on the board? Also, I don't really care whether or not the project is split up into parts, because I can keep track of time, but if you do choose to split it up again in the next class – give us a little more time at the beginning. We need more time to work on the architecture (unless, of course, all the shells are done by then) – then the rest of it will come easy.
- know the homework he is giving. the teacher and reader didnt know how to code, the ta was the only one. the project was not explained well. there was always problems with it.
- Lecture gets a bit monotone

## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

- Lectures are very boring and monotone. Slides are very confusing without lectures. Because the schedule was all over the place, wasn't sure what to study for quizzes/exams
- Lectures felt kind of slow. Although the concepts were explained in details, it felt like we spent too much time on a specific topic without moving on to the next slide to see how that topic applies to what we are working on.
- lectures slides were good, project was disorganized
- Make the class more interactive, ask questions. He can also improve by sending less wordy emails, I found myself not reading most of the emails. Sudoku was a little boring for me, I would've rather had the connect k project.
- Material is interesting but maybe talk faster and louder so that won't make students feel sleepy. And I would recommend prof to use Piazza so that it is easier for students to discuss course materials. And additionally, professor does not need to send too many emails to students. I hope professor could make project more clear and organized.
- Maybe assist more advanced students in pushing their limits
- More organization in terms of course structure/deadlines/assignments
- more working assignments to truly understand the theorem
- n
- N/A
- n/a
- N/A
- No improvements needed
- None
- None
- None. Keep it up
- none that i can think of
- offer more support on the programming assignment
- Organization of homework - there were a few times throughout the quarter where what was expected changed quite abruptly. I didn't feel like I was being treated unfairly, but I also would have preferred a more structured approach to our assignments.
- Organization skills. Making sure the course is planned out in its entirety from the beginning.
- Organize the material. I believe we should not learn CSP before Search, since Search Algorithms are more basic.
- Please use the board instead of slides. Example as hard to grab concept: Alpha/Beta pruning ...
- Professor Lathrop is kind to a fault. While it is great to see a professor care so greatly about his students, I personally believe that he should let them struggle and continue his planned course. While I'm not saying that the professor shouldn't take feedback from students, I just believe that when given the opportunity, students will take advantage of making the course easier.
- Project wasn't very organized
- Provide example problems regarding the subject he teaches in lecture
- Sometimes, the assignment specifications were a bit disorganized.
- sometimes gets sidetracked in explanations
- Sometimes it seems like he is just reading directly from the slides, which can make class seem a bit dull.

- Sometimes monotone. Needs to respond to emails more
- Sometimes the lectures can be boring and hard to follow
- Sometimes the lectures could be a bit boring but I'm not sure how he could make some of the material more interesting. The project and course website seemed a bit disorganized.
- Sometimes the quiz time extensions get a little annoying. I don't mind if he extends the quiz by 2-5 minutes, but I don't want him to extend it multiple times even if there's a couple of students not done yet.
- sometimes too clear, becomes redundant
- Sorry but the youtube videos don't help me learn or pay attention to the actual learning material. Something else needs to be done to make the the lectures more interesting, its not complex packed slides
- spice things up
- Stick more to schedule
- Stop wasting time
- The lectures can get a bit boring at times, perhaps due to the style of teaching.
- The project is really confusing. Since the shell was released for the first time, there were so many confusion and errors in the code. Also there was no structured description and test shell provided. I wish there was more emphasis on the coding part in this class
- The project portion of the course seemed to be put together as we worked on it. That may have caused a little confusion with some students, but I didn't find it much of a negative.
- There is only one minor thing I have for the class. See Q3
- The website took a bit to be updated. A lot of the dates were off for a long time.
- Use Pizza, instead of message board Be more ordered with projects, requirements changed a lot which confused students
- 37 blank answer(s).

### 3. Any other comments about this course?

- - quite challenging but I think the TA/Reader/Prof do a good job at tweaking requirements to accommodate different skill levels
- A little dry in terms of course material, but
- Although it would be more work, I feel that it would be more beneficial to our learning to give us an easier assignment that we code from scratch by ourselves. It's difficult to understand the coding shell provided, but personally I am forced to use it because I don't have the time to code my own for the assignment given.
- Don't feel as if I was supplied any help with programming the project. We're just given high level concepts like heres how backtrack theoretically works, okay now do it. Java shell is waaay too complicated for this.
- Entertaining course, programming assignment can be very heavy. Shame that there were a lot of problems this quarter, not sure why the switch from tic tac toe to Sudoku.
- Excellent , interested ...
- fun and challenging
- I enjoyed going to this class more than my others, due to material and the professors teaching style.
- I enjoyed the course thus far. I think there should be more depth within ongoing AI research.
- I like the current format of having the class project split into multiple submissions throughout the quarter. Although I had trouble with some of the deadlines myself, I know I am a lot less stressed out than my roommates who took this course last quarter.

## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

- In regards to the project portion, its a bit messy. Too many bugs and alot of confusion occurring this quarter with them. Percentage of the students didn't even bother working on projects because of this. On the otherhand, the material covered in class is solid! Everyone is doing great or average!!
- I really enjoyed how we broke out of the lecture near the middle to watch a video or two concerning AI topics that were relevant to the information we were learning; it really helped refresh my mind in order to continue focusing on the remaining part of the lecture. I wish all of my lectures that were over an hour long would do this. As another note, the quarter-long project that was assigned to us seemed to have many issues and setbacks. I do believe the way it was set-up this time was better than how they were in previous quarters (having heard that students had free range over deciding when to make progress on their code in the past, which resulted in procrastination); however, this is still an area that seems to be in need of improvement.
- I really enjoyed the optional videos and the course in general.
- It was very interesting and I'm glad that I had Professor Lathrop.
- I wish there were more projects in this course. We spent an entire quarter working on a project that covered the first 2 weeks of material. There should be more smaller projects that cover more material in order to give practice on other material. It's feasible since we were given the java shell.
- Make a C++ shell. This class is very biased towards students that know and like using Java. While yes, I was given the option to use the provided Java shell, I prefer C++ as I don't know Java. If C++ is an option, please make it a viable option as doing it in C++ was very painful. Everybody I knew said that doing the assignments in the Java shell took about 3 hours while my partner and I spent well over 60 hours on the C++ version for every assignment.
- n
- N/A
- n/a
- N/A
- No
- no
- No
- None
- none
- none that i can think of
- Nope.
- Overall I felt like I learned valuable knowledge about AI
- Overall I learned a lot in this course and I think it is great
- Please have the TAs correctly specify what exactly is expected from the students on the project because it was definitely not structured properly this quarter. Although leniency helped, it could have been a much better learning experience if the project was more organized.
- Professor really seems to care about the course, and it shows - makes sure that everything is fair and that students aren't "screwed over" by accidental mishaps either by an external force or on the teaching staff's behalf.
- Thank you for providing me this experience! :) I appreciate the fast email replies and that both the TA and the professor are very responsive. Please do something about that website however... I had troubles navigating through that site since day 1.
- The course overall was really fun and interesting. I enjoyed being able to apply what we learned in class right away in our projects.

## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

- the lecture material was fine but the project was unnecessarily complicated because there was no preparation from the TA's/lecturer
- The programming project is very unfair as the course favored students who has knowledge in Java. I guess the project is only a test run for this quarter, but it's incredibly difficult for students starting from scratch (students in Java gets a free shell). In the past, there are many students who speak up on the course being "too easy", and so the professor upped the difficulties to meet those students, while the "normal" students fall behind.
- The project could have been handled better from the beginning. There seemed to be a lot of chaos in regards to how the project was organized.
- The project only covers the first three weeks of class, maybe we can have more focus on the rest of quarter.
- The project was disorganized to the point where it was difficult to understand what was actually required of the project and what was needed to be outputted
- The stories were weird and the jokes were bad.
- The website is EXTREMELY hard to read and navigate. Because everything is put all in one page, everything is hard to access. There is a table of contents at the top of the page, but a "go to top" button would help, or separating the sections into separate pages. Trying to find a link to a PDF or a specifications document is difficult while trying to scroll up and down the entire page.
- This course might be even more useful if the course project doesn't solely focus on a single topic (CSP for this quarter). Why not have many smaller projects that cover more topics like logic and learning?
- This is a very interesting and I can see a lot of its applications in my future
- very fun course which has fostered my interest in artificial intelligence
- very interesting course, I hope everyone(outside CS major) can learn AI.
- Very interesting material overall. Made me excited to learn more about AI.
- While the project is challenging and very fun to work on, I wish there was some sort of way to incorporate the other topics we learn in the class, like Logic, knowledge base, etc, though I understand that it will affect the complexity, length, workload, and difficulty of the project.
- 59 blank answer(s).

### B. Please choose the appropriate rating:

If you have no opinion on the question asked or if it does not apply, please select "Not Applicable."

4. The course instructor shows enthusiasm for and is interested in the subject.

<b>62</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>24</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>10</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>4</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>0</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>1</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>1</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>0</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>0</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>0</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>8.34</b>	Mean	
<b>9.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.07</b>	Std Dev	



## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

5. The course instructor stimulates your interest in the subject.

<b>37</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>17</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>17</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>23</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>2</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>2</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>3</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>1</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>0</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>0</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>7.40</b>	Mean	
<b>8.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.63</b>	Std Dev	

6. The course instructor meets stated objectives of the course.

<b>45</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>24</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>17</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>10</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>2</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>0</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>1</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>0</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>0</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>1</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>1</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>7.89</b>	Mean	
<b>8.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.44</b>	Std Dev	

7. The course instructor is accessible and responsive.

<b>55</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>19</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>12</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>7</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>3</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>1</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>0</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>0</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>0</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>3</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>8.16</b>	Mean	
<b>9.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.18</b>	Std Dev	

8. The course instructor creates an open and fair learning environment.

## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

<b>51</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>25</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>13</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>9</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>2</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>1</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>1</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>0</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>0</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>0</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>8.05</b>	Mean	
<b>8.50</b>	Median	
<b>1.25</b>	Std Dev	

9. The course instructor encourages students to think in this course.

<b>37</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>25</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>20</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>14</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>3</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>1</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>1</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>1</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>0</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>0</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>7.66</b>	Mean	
<b>8.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.42</b>	Std Dev	

10. The course instructor's presentations and explanations of concepts were clear.

<b>31</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>26</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>22</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>14</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>2</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>1</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>1</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>3</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>2</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>0</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>7.35</b>	Mean	
<b>8.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.80</b>	Std Dev	

11. Assignments and exams covered important aspects of the course.

## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

<b>43</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>27</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>18</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>7</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>5</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>0</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>2</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>0</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>0</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>0</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>7.86</b>	Mean	
<b>8.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.34</b>	Std Dev	

12. What overall evaluation would you give this instructor?

<b>34</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>38</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>15</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>9</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>2</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>1</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>0</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>2</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>0</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>1</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>7.79</b>	Mean	
<b>8.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.36</b>	Std Dev	

13. What overall evaluation would you give this course?

<b>31</b>	9 (Excellent)	Value: 9
<b>31</b>	8	Value: 8
<b>23</b>	7	Value: 7
<b>13</b>	6 (Good)	Value: 6
<b>1</b>	5	Value: 5
<b>0</b>	4	Value: 4
<b>1</b>	3 (Fair)	Value: 3
<b>1</b>	2	Value: 2
<b>1</b>	1 (Barely Satisfactory)	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	0 (Unsatisfactory)	Value: 0
<b>0</b>	Not Applicable	No Value
<b>7.62</b>	Mean	
<b>8.00</b>	Median	
<b>1.44</b>	Std Dev	

### C. Please answer:

14. Based on completed assignments thus far, what is your current course grade or approximate standing?

## UCI EEE Evaluations

Final Evaluation (CTEF Numeric) for Lathrop, Richard COMPSCI 171 LEC A (34290), Winter Qtr 2016

---

<b>42</b>	A	Value: 4
<b>38</b>	B	Value: 3
<b>14</b>	C	Value: 2
<b>1</b>	D	Value: 1
<b>0</b>	F	Value: 0
<b>7</b>	NA	No Value
<b>3.27</b>	Mean	
<b>3.00</b>	Median	
<b>0.75</b>	Std Dev	

15. How much academic dishonesty seemed to occur in this course? If applicable, please describe the type of academic dishonesty that occurred (not the particular students involved).

1.
  - 1** A lot
  - 3** Some
  - 5** A little
  - 92** None I could discern

2. Examples:

- 105 blank answer(s).

16. How helpful were the textbooks and/or readings to your overall learning experience?

- 15** Very
- 38** Adequately
- 28** Somewhat
- 20** Not at all

17. How challenging was this course?

- 11** Very
- 66** Adequately
- 21** Somewhat
- 3** Not at all