



UNIVERSITY OF
MICHIGAN

Winter 2019 Instructor Report With Comments of EECS 281-005: Data Struct&Algor for Kevin Angstadt

Project Title: **Winter 2019 Teaching Evaluation**

Course Audience: **48**
Responses Received: **9**
Response Ratio: **18.8%**

Report Comments

This report is a summary that tabulates all quantitative ratings on a single page. Results from the open-ended questions appear at the end of this report. Ratings are from the Winter 2019 teaching evaluations of EECS 281-005: Data Struct&Algor.

Prepared by: **Office of the Registrar**
Creation Date: **Monday, May 6, 2019**

Responses to the University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter. (Q1631)	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.5	4.3
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course. (Q1632)	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.2	3.9
I knew what was expected of me in this course.(Q1633)	8	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	4.5	4.2
Overall, this was an excellent course.(Q1)	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.2	4.0
I had a strong desire to take this course.(Q4)	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.0	3.7
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA=Much Lighter to SD=Much Heavier)	0	0	2	3	3	0	1.8	3.0	2.8

Responses to the University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Kevin Angstadt was an excellent teacher.	4	2	0	0	0	2	4.8	4.5	4.3
Kevin Angstadt seemed well prepared for class meetings.	5	1	0	0	0	2	4.9	4.8	4.6
Kevin Angstadt explained material clearly.	5	1	0	0	0	2	4.9	4.6	4.4
Kevin Angstadt treated students with respect.	4	2	0	0	0	2	4.8	4.8	4.7

Responses to additional questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Prerequisites provided adequate preparation for this course. (Q61)	6	2	0	0	0	0	4.8	4.3
The laboratory was a valuable part of this course. (Q331)	5	1	2	0	0	0	4.7	4.4
Laboratory assignments required a reasonable amount of time and effort. (Q336)	4	2	1	1	0	0	4.5	4.1
Laboratory assignments were relevant to what was presented in class. (Q337)	6	0	1	0	0	0	4.9	4.3
The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course. (Q340)	1	0	2	1	2	2	2.5	3.6
I developed confidence in my abilities as an engineer.	4	3	0	0	0	0	4.6	4.0
I developed the ability to solve real world engineering problems.	4	4	0	0	0	0	4.5	4.0

The medians are calculated from Winter 2019 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are lower division with enrollment of 16 to 74 in College of Engineering.

Written Comments

What were the strengths of the course ? (Q953)

Comments
Projects and labs
Instruction was very good, especially in lecture.
The projects are lit
The projects really helped me understand how to implement functions like Prim's algorithm and how to utilize a stack and queue in different ways. The labs were somewhat helpful, but the chance to hear the material a second time because of the labs was extremely helpful. The best part about this course was the immense amount of help that was offered. Proffice hours, regular office hours, lab, lecture, and Piazza gave us students a lot of opportunities to get help. In addition, the professors are really helpful. They want to see us succeed, and it makes the class a great collaborative environment where professors and students are working together to solve complex problems in order to make everyone a better programmer.
The project format was very helpful for giving students experience building code from the ground up.
Breadth.

What suggestions would you make for improving the course ? (Q955)

Comments
NONE
A little more structure for lab. Sometimes it was extremely valuable, others it seemed like a waste of time.
Maybe make the projects harder conceptually but less annoying. Sometimes it felt that all the different outputs were just to make the projects more work. Project 3 and 4 I think were better at this than 1 and 2. 2 was pretty annoying. Yet, I am just a computer science noob that doesn't really know anything
Some of the submission processes were artificially difficult. I experienced problems getting all of my code to the autograder.
I would put graphs earlier in the course.

Comment on the quality of instruction in this class.

Comments
GReat
Very good, no complaints.
Great
Kevin Angstadt is amazing. I loved going to his lectures. Kevin was always extremely prepared, and he was always pushing for student participation. He went through plenty of examples for us, and he was always asking if we had any questions. He even brought in little nodes that he 3D printed himself to help us understand how an AVL rotates. He seems to love teaching, and his enthusiasm helps me stay focused and learn better. Finally, his jokes are extremely corny but extremely hilarious and it's a big reason I keep going back to his lectures. Overall, Professor Angstadt is the best professor I've had so far.
Good.

Among the courses you have already taken, which proved the most (or least) effective in preparing you for this course, and why? (Q1098)

Comments
EECS 280 it had a lot of topics carry over
280 proved effective, although the lack of starter code does cause some issues at the beginning.
280 and 203 obviously
ENGR 101 and EECS 280 are obviously the most helpful for this class. The skills I developed through those classes were necessary for the large workload we would be receiving for this class. Also, taking EECS 376 at the same time as 281 was very helpful. Knowing a bit about graphs and dynamic programming was useful knowledge.
EECS 280. Because it teaches C++.