TO: All Faculty

FROM: David Wilson
Associate Dean (Education)

DATE: 25 January, 2005

SUBJECT: Teaching Feedback Spring 2004

Please find attached:

- Extracts from the 2004 Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) (national study).

  Each scale item is 'scored' in the range −100 to +100.

  Individual questions are shown as a percentage of students marking 4 or 5 on the five point CEQ rating scale (negatively phrased questions are shown as a percentage disagreement).

- Extracts from the Spring 2004 Subject Feedback Survey (SFS) (UTS study).

  The ratings shown are either the average of a 5 point Likert scale or percentages of responses against points on a 5 point Likert scale.

When reviewing the survey results, please note that CEQ surveys recent graduates, so these results relate to subjects/courses as per one or two years ago. The SFS surveys current students, so the results relate to current subjects/courses. Also, please note that this is the first time the Faculty has surveyed all subjects, both undergraduate and postgraduate, in a semester as part of the SFS (95 subjects in all).

SFS Comment

In the Spring 2004 SFS, the following subjects have been identified as producing outstanding results (overall satisfaction 4.0 or greater; no rating below 3.5; responses 20 or greater; percentage response greater than 50%):

Sub Code	Subject Name	Question							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
31443	Distributed Databases & Client/Server Computing	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.2
31487	Database Management Systems	4.5	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.3
31513	Networking 2	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0
32009	Advanced Routing Principles	4.5	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.8	4.0
32509	Interaction Design	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.3
32524	LANs and Routing	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.1
32532	Conducting Business Electronically	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.1

Congratulations to the relevant Subject Coordinators (and other lecturing and tutoring staff): Laurie Benkovic (31443), Julia Prior (31487), Qiang Wu (31513), Elaine Lawrence (32009), Toni Robertson (32509), Tarek El-Kiki/Elaine Lawrence (32524), and Jane Brennan (32532).

The following subjects have similar outstanding results but do not meet one or more of the criteria specified above:

Sub Code	Subject Name	Question							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
31004	Introduction to Game Programming	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.7
31034	Advanced Communication for IT	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.2
31049	Computer Vision and Image Processing	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.5	4.3
31470	Distributed Computing Architecture	3.9	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.1
32108	Applications of Artificial Intelligence	4.3	4.2	3.5	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.5	4.0
32109	Network Analysis and Troubleshooting	4.3	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.2
32541	Project Management	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.4
32604	Systems Integration	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.9	4.0

Congratulations to the relevant Subject Coordinators (and other lecturing and tutoring staff): Yusuf Pisan (31004), Deborah Nixon (ELSSA) (31034), Massimo Piccardi (31049), Wayne Brookes (31470), Paul Kennedy (32108), Sean He (32109), Rene Leveaux (32541), and George Feuerlicht (32604).

University of Technology, Sydney

Student Feedback Results : Spring 2004

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	06:00pm - 08/11/2004
Subject Code: 31004	No. Enrolled: 16
Subject Name: Game Progrmaming	No. of Responses: 7

Order No: 199

	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses			%
1. It was always easy to know the standard of work expected.	3.7 (0.8)	1	SA		14
		3	A		43
		3	N		43
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
2. The subject developed my problem solving skills.	4.0 (1.2)	3	SA		43
		2	A		29
		1	N		14
		1	D		14
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
3. The teaching staff on this subject motivated me to do my best work.	4.1 (0.9)	3	SA		43
		2	A		29
		2	N		29
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
4. The workload was too heavy.	3.3 (1.1)	0	SA		0
		4	A		57
		2	N		29
		0	D		0
		1	SD		14
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
5. The subject sharpened my analytic skills.	4.0 (1.2)	3	SA		43
		2	A		29
		1	N		14
		1	D		14
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
6. I usually had a clear idea of where I was going and what was expected of me in this subject.	4.5 (0.5)	3	SA		50
		3	A		50
		0	N		0
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		1	No Response		
7. Staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work.	3.1 (0.9)	0	SA		0
		3	A		43
		2	N		29
		2	D		29
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
8. To do well on this subject all you really needed was a good memory.	1.1 (0.4)	0	SA		0
		0	A		0
		0	N		0
		1	D		14
		6	SD		86
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
9. The subject helped me to develop my ability to work as a team member.	2.0 (1.0)	0	SA		0
		0	A		0
		1	N		33
		1	D		33
		1	SD		33
		4	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results : Spring 2004

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	06:00pm - 08/11/2004
Subject Code: 31004	No. Enrolled: 16
Subject Name: Game Progrmaming	No. of Responses: 7

Order No: 199

Question	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses	Scale	%
10. As a result of my subject, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems.	4.0 (0.8)	2	SA	29
		3	A	43
		2	N	29
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
11. The subject improved my skills in written communication.	2.2 (0.8)	0	SA	0
		0	A	0
		2	N	40
		2	D	40
		1	SD	20
		2	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
12. Staff seemed more interested in testing what I had memorised than what I had understood.	1.1 (0.4)	0	SA	0
		0	A	0
		0	N	0
		1	D	14
		6	SD	86
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
13. It was often hard to discover what was expected of me in this subject.	1.9 (0.7)	0	SA	0
		0	A	0
		1	N	14
		4	D	57
		2	SD	29
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
14. I was generally given enough time to understand the things I had to learn.	3.1 (0.7)	0	SA	0
		2	A	29
		4	N	57
		1	D	14
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
15. The staff made a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work.	3.9 (0.7)	1	SA	14
		4	A	57
		2	N	29
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
16. The assessment methods employed in this subject required an in-depth understanding.	3.7 (1.0)	1	SA	14
		4	A	57
		1	N	14
		1	D	14
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
17. Teaching staff normally gave me helpful feedback on how I was going.	3.9 (0.7)	1	SA	14
		4	A	57
		2	N	29
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
18. My lecturer(s) were extremely good at explaining things.	3.1 (1.2)	1	SA	14
		2	A	29
		1	N	14
		3	D	43
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results : Spring 2004

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	06:00pm - 08/11/2004
Subject Code: 31004	No. Enrolled: 16
Subject Name: Game Progrmaming	No. of Responses: 7

Order No: 199

	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses			%
19. Too many questions asked were just about facts.	1.3 (0.5)	0 0 0 2 5 0 0	SA A N D SD Not Applicable No Response		0 0 0 29 71
20. Teaching staff worked hard to make this subject interesting.	3.9 (0.7)	1 4 2 0 0 0 0	SA A N D SD Not Applicable No Response		14 57 29 0 0
21. There was a lot of pressure on me as a student in this subject.	4.0 (0.6)	1 5 1 0 0 0 0	SA A N D SD Not Applicable No Response		14 71 14 0 0
22. This subject helped me to develop my ability to plan my own work.	3.7 (1.3)	2 3 0 2 0 0 0	SA A N D SD Not Applicable No Response		29 43 0 29 0
23. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this subject meant that it couldn't all be thoroughly comprehended.	3.5 (1.4)	2 1 1 2 0 0 1	SA A N D SD Not Applicable No Response		33 17 17 33 0
24. The staff made it clear from the start what was expected of students.	4.1 (0.9)	3 2 2 0 0 0 0	SA A N D SD Not Applicable No Response		43 29 29 0 0
25. Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject.	4.0 (0.8)	2 3 2 0 0 0 0	SA A N D SD Not Applicable No Response		29 43 29 0 0

Scale:	SD Strongly Disagree (1)	D Disagree (2)	N Neutral (3)	A Agree (4)	SA Strongly Agree (5)

University of Technology, Sydney

Student Feedback Results : Spring 2004

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	06:00pm - 08/11/2004
Subject Code: 31004	No. Enrolled: 16
Subject Name: Game Progrmaming	No. of Responses: 7

Order No: 199

	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses			%
26. All things considered, how would you rate the teaching of this lecturer in this subject?	5.6 (1.1)	2	E		29
		1	VG		14
		3	G		43
		1	S		14
		0	NQS		0
		0	P		0
		0	VP		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		

University of Technology, Sydney

Student Feedback Results : Spring 2004

Subject Coordinator's Name: Yusuf Pisan
Subject Code: 31004
Subject Name: Introduction to Game Programming

00:00am - 01/01/2004
No. Enrolled: 15
No. of Responses: 11

Order No: 951

	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses			%
1. This subject was relevant to me.	4.5 (0.7)	6	SA		55
		4	A		36
		1	N		9
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
2. The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives.	4.4 (0.5)	4	SA		36
		7	A		64
		0	N		0
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
3. I had a clear idea of what was expected of me in this subject.	4.3 (0.6)	4	SA		36
		6	A		55
		1	N		9
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
4. My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking.	4.7 (0.6)	9	SA		82
		1	A		9
		1	N		9
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
5. I found the assessment fair and reasonable.	4.4 (0.7)	5	SA		45
		5	A		45
		1	N		9
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
6. There were appropriate resources available to support the subject.	4.0 (0.6)	2	SA		18
		7	A		64
		2	N		18
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
7. I received constructive feedback when needed.	4.2 (0.6)	3	SA		27
		7	A		64
		1	N		9
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		
8. Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject.	4.7 (0.5)	8	SA		73
		3	A		27
		0	N		0
		0	D		0
		0	SD		0
		0	Not Applicable		
		0	No Response		

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results : Spring 2004

Subject Coordinator's Name: Various	No. of Classes: 97
Subject Code: Various	No. Enrolled: 5266
Subject Name: Various	No. of Responses: 2770

Spring 2004 - Information Technology	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses			%
1. This subject was relevant to me.	3.8 (1.0)	606	SA		22
		1271	A		47
		545	N		20
		185	D		7
		97	SD		4
		9	Not Applicable		
		57	No Response		
2. The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives.	3.6 (0.9)	367	SA		14
		1337	A		50
		687	N		25
		224	D		8
		83	SD		3
		8	Not Applicable		
		64	No Response		
3. I had a clear idea of what was expected of me in this subject.	3.5 (1.0)	337	SA		12
		1202	A		45
		692	N		26
		314	D		12
		153	SD		6
		7	Not Applicable		
		65	No Response		
4. My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking.	3.5 (1.1)	449	SA		17
		1087	A		40
		731	N		27
		280	D		10
		142	SD		5
		11	Not Applicable		
		70	No Response		
5. I found the assessment fair and reasonable.	3.4 (1.0)	321	SA		12
		1139	A		43
		762	N		29
		304	D		11
		147	SD		5
		30	Not Applicable		
		67	No Response		
6. There were appropriate resources available to support the subject.	3.4 (1.0)	319	SA		12
		1126	A		42
		747	N		28
		347	D		13
		159	SD		6
		11	Not Applicable		
		61	No Response		
7. I received constructive feedback when needed.	3.4 (1.0)	344	SA		13
		1062	A		40
		841	N		32
		293	D		11
		129	SD		5
		26	Not Applicable		
		75	No Response		
8. Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject.	3.5 (1.0)	331	SA		13
		1221	A		46
		688	N		26
		258	D		10
		136	SD		5
		5	Not Applicable		
		131	No Response		

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

University of Technology, Sydney

Student Feedback Results : Spring 2004

Subject Coordinator's Name: Various	No. of Classes: Various
Subject Code: Various	No. Enrolled: Various
Subject Name: Various	No. of Responses: Various

Spring 2004 - All Faculties — Mean (SD) — Number of Responses — %

1. This subject was relevant to me.

Mean 4.0 (0.9)

Number of Responses		%
9322	SA	30
14746	A	48
4610	N	15
1377	D	4
667	SD	2
60	Not Applicable	
715	No Response	
****	Total	

No. of Classes: 1414

2. The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives.

Mean 3.8 (0.9)

Number of Responses		%
6160	SA	20
15950	A	52
6219	N	20
1702	D	6
680	SD	2
52	Not Applicable	
734	No Response	
****	Total	

No. of Classes: 1414

3. I had a clear idea of what was expected of me in this subject.

Mean 3.6 (1.0)

Number of Responses		%
5219	SA	17
14074	A	46
7095	N	23
2987	D	10
1202	SD	4
41	Not Applicable	
879	No Response	
****	Total	

No. of Classes: 1414

4. My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking.

Mean 3.7 (1.0)

Number of Responses		%
6843	SA	22
13304	A	44
6815	N	22
2484	D	8
1106	SD	4
40	Not Applicable	
905	No Response	
****	Total	

No. of Classes: 1414

5. I found the assessment fair and reasonable.

Mean 3.7 (1.0)

Number of Responses		%
5376	SA	18
14322	A	47
7036	N	23
2401	D	8
1086	SD	4
363	Not Applicable	
913	No Response	
****	Total	

No. of Classes: 1414

6. There were appropriate resources available to support the subject.

Mean 3.6 (1.0)

Number of Responses		%
4805	SA	16
13929	A	46
7760	N	25
2953	D	10
1089	SD	4
96	Not Applicable	
865	No Response	
****	Total	

No. of Classes: 1414

7. I received constructive feedback when needed.

Mean 3.7 (1.0)

Number of Responses		%
5842	SA	19
12882	A	42
7949	N	26
2588	D	9
1101	SD	4
285	Not Applicable	
850	No Response	
****	Total	

No. of Classes: 1414

8. Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject.

Mean 3.7 (1.0)

Number of Responses		%
5789	SA	19
14803	A	49
6260	N	21
2351	D	8
1055	SD	3
34	Not Applicable	
1217	No Response	
****	Total	

No. of Classes: 1415

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)