

TEACHER REPORT

Name of Teacher	JAVIER PHON ZHEE KAI
Module	CS2103T-Software Engineering (TUTORIAL)
Academic Year/Sem	2022/2023 - SEM 2
Department	COMPUTER SCIENCE
Faculty	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

Raters	Student
Responded	33
Invited	40
Response Ratio	82%

Note:

Class Size = Invited; Response Size = Responded; Response Rate = Response Ratio

A. GUIDELINES FOR INTERPRETING THE REPORT

The teacher evaluation report is for developmental purposes and is meant to help identify strengths and areas for improvement. Please consider the following recommendations that will aid in interpreting the results:

1. Examine the report by taking note of patterns in order to consider how best to act on the feedback your students have taken the time to provide. Use the reflection section at the end to reflect upon how you might act on the feedback.
2. These evaluations stem from student perception and thus constitute one source of evidence among others as to the quality of your teaching. Any response to the feedback should be based on the most representative results rather than on outlying responses.
3. Upon getting a general sense as to what has gone well, and which areas may require attention and improvement, it is important to drill down to the related questions. These questions can help guide future action if feedback from students suggest areas for improvement.
4. Keep both the likert scale and written comments in mind while reading through the report. High scores (4+) suggest student consensus indicating a strength. On the other hand, low scores (2-) should be considered as an area that requires immediate developmental focus based on student feedback.

B. NOMINATION FOR TEACHING AWARDS

	Response Count
I would like to nominate JAVIER PHON ZHEE KAI for teaching awards	1

Comment
- He highlighted what was important and responded to questions attentively.


C. STUDENT FEEDBACK SCORES

(i) Rating Score

Question	Average Score (TEACHER)		Department Average (COMPUTER SCIENCE)		Faculty Average (SCHOOL OF COMPUTING)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Overall, the teacher is effective.	4.2	0.8	4.2	0.8	4.1	0.8

Question	Average Score (TEACHER)	Dept Average by Activity & Level (COMPUTER SCIENCE-TUTORIAL (Level 2000))	Fac Average by Activity & Level (SCHOOL OF COMPUTING-TUTORIAL (Level 2000))	Dept Average by Activity (COMPUTER SCIENCE-TUTORIAL)	Fac Average by Activity (SCHOOL OF COMPUTING-TUTORIAL)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Overall, the teacher is effective.	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2

Overall, the teacher is effective



Question	Average Score (TEACHER)		Department Average (COMPUTER SCIENCE)		Faculty Average (SCHOOL OF COMPUTING)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	4.1	0.7	4.2	0.8	4.2	0.8
The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.	4.1	0.8	4.2	0.8	4.1	0.8
The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.1	0.7	4.2	0.8	4.1	0.9
Average of Q1-Q3	4.1	0.7	4.2	-	4.1	-

Question	Average Score (TEACHER)	Dept Average by Activity & Level (COMPUTER SCIENCE-TUTORIAL (Level 2000))	Fac Average by Activity & Level (SCHOOL OF COMPUTING-TUTORIAL (Level 2000))	Dept Average by Activity (COMPUTER SCIENCE-TUTORIAL)	Fac Average by Activity (SCHOOL OF COMPUTING-TUTORIAL)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1
Average of Q1-Q3	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2





Department Specific Questions

Question	Average Score (TEACHER)		Department Average (COMPUTER SCIENCE)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
The teacher engaged me in useful interactions that have enhanced my learning.	4.3	0.6	4.2	0.8


Question	Average Score (TEACHER)		Department Average (COMPUTER SCIENCE)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
The teacher's attitude and approach encouraged me to think and work in a creative and independent way.	4.2	0.8	4.2	0.8

Question	Average Score (TEACHER)		Department Average (COMPUTER SCIENCE)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
The teacher cares about student development and learning.	4.3	0.7	4.2	0.8


(ii) Distribution of Responses and Additional Statistics




The teacher engaged me in useful interactions that have enhanced my learning.




The teacher's attitude and approach encouraged me to think and work in a creative and independent way.




The teacher cares about student development and learning.




(iii) Scale Distribution of Responses




The teacher engaged me in useful interactions that have enhanced my learning.



The teacher's attitude and approach encouraged me to think and work in a creative and independent way.



The teacher cares about student development and learning.



(iv) Rating Scores vs. Gender

Question	M	F	Overall
The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	4.2	4.0	4.1
The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.	4.2	4.0	4.1
The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.2	4.0	4.1

D. STRENGTHS

What are JAVIER PHON ZHEE KAI's strengths?

Comments
NA
Straightforward explanations that are easy to understand and he draws upon his own experiences
Punctual and responsible
He can explain concepts and deliver well.
N/A
Friendly

E. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

What improvements would you suggest to JAVIER PHON ZHEE KAI?

Comments
NA
–NIL–
Don't just be a standard answer–follower. The tutor does not demonstrate critical thinking, but just explains things based on prescribed standard answers. There is nothing wrong here, but just does not make one educator/teacher stand out among the crowd. Note that this is not a negative comment, but just a personal observation.
N.A.
– i would suggest showing a bit more energy, but i understand that it's very hard to be energetic when you have to teach UML
He could engage students more.
N/A

F. SELF-REFLECTION

1. When comparing these results to the previous year's results, what areas have shown improvement?
2. What areas remain to be improved and what are the necessary steps / actions to do so?
3. Are there colleagues who could potentially guide me?
4. Are there issues that require departmental or institutional support?