

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2005/2006
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2
 Module: CRITICAL SYSTEMS AND THEIR VERIFICATION - CS4271
 Activity Type: LECTURE
 Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate : 54 / 47 / 87.04%

Qn	Items Evaluated	Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score		Fac. Avg Score	
				(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	4.234	0.633	3.790 (3.865)		3.787 (3.873)	
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.255	0.642	3.784 (3.965)		3.807 (3.977)	
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.319	0.629	3.852 (3.972)		3.864 (4.034)	
4	The teacher has helped me advance my research (if applicable).	4.174	0.717	3.586 (3.819)		3.623 (3.846)	
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.979	0.766	3.637 (3.857)		3.662 (3.850)	
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.170	0.637	3.811 (3.915)		3.840 (3.925)	
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.191	0.647	3.741 (3.811)		3.745 (3.824)	
	<u>Average of Qn 1-7</u>	4.190	0.666	3.754 (3.890)		3.770 (3.907)	
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.234	0.633	3.841 (3.934)		3.857 (3.964)	

Frequency Distribution of responses for Qn 8

Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)

ITEM\SCORE	5	4	3	2	1
Self	16 (34.04%)	26 (55.32%)	5 (10.64%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Department	60 (23.17%)	138 (53.28%)	47 (18.15%)	12 (4.63%)	2 (.77%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Faculty	87 (22.54%)	218 (56.48%)	63 (16.32%)	16 (4.15%)	2 (.52%)

Note:

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. **Fac. Member Avg Score:** The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. **Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev:** A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average Score differs from all the scores in the faculty member's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. **Dept Avg Score :**
 - (a) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture) within the department.
 - (b) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture), at the same module level (level 4000) within the department.
5. **Fac. Avg Score :**
 - (c) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture) within the faculty.
 - (d) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture), at the same module level (level 4000) within the faculty.

Faculty Member:	ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY	Academic Year:	2005/2006
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Semester:	2
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING		
Module:	CRITICAL SYSTEMS AND THEIR VERIFICATION - CS4271		
Activity Type:	LECTURE		

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. He is a very good teacher. He is able to explain complex notions very well using examples. He doesn't go on to the next part until he makes sure that the students have understood what was already presented.
2. He explains very well and he is organized. Moreover, he proposes interesting exercises which stimulate the students.
3. Presentation, Explanation, Knowledge, Research
4. very good teach who takes a lot of effort very approachable also
5. friendly, approachable, humorous, explain concepts well, patient
6. Patient in explaining concepts, tries to get everyone on board before going on to further concepts. Understanding in our problems, and accomodates us where necessary.
7. Clear teaching
8. Too many to list, overall he has surpassed everything that is expected of a good, professional lecturer as compared to so many other lecturers I've encountered in the past. He is dedicated to his teaching and does not neglect any areas. He offers really constructive feedback and it can be seen from his efforts that he's working hard to ensure that students understand the concepts and its applications well.
9. He is very patient and often repeats himself to enforce the ideas.
10. Can explain concepts well. Eager for students to raise questions and stimulates students' thinking.
11. Great teacher. Tries his best and succeeds at making a module that I wasn't too interested in, interesting. Always succeeds in grabbing the attention of his students. Very humourous and passionate. It was not an easy thing to grab our attention considering that our lessons were 3 hrs long.
12. Dedicated
13. Explain main concepts clearly. Conducts revision classes according to the pace of the class
14. He spends time to explain difficult concepts and to answer students' questions during class. Also, he goes neither too fast nor too slow through the overall module material. This gives us time to assimilate. I think that the revision hour, in which we go through examples, are very very useful. It helps to understand better, and the examples are also a kind of recap of materials covered so far. Dr Abhik has patience and the ability to teach :)
15. clear explanation
16. Highly engaging and entertaining lecturing. Clear in conveying his objectives and patient with us when we are not too sure of the topics
17. humourous. very detailed explanation of topics. Gets the class involved. strong interpersonal skills.

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. None.
2. None, I think he was great.
3. None.
4. little more lenient in marking
5. None! Thank you for a great time.
6. Nil
7. Having tutorial sessions would be a good idea to assist us in the exam questions.
8. nil
9. NA
10. Gives us more tutorial questions
11. I think Dr Abhik should give us a proper guideline of what he expects for the project. i.e. state clearly

what he expects for the deliverables at each stage of the project. That way, there won't be ambiguities, like I believe happened this semester. Some of us were not sure about the deliverables; and we ended up doing less work than required; This kind of stresses us unnecessarily. Also, I think a rough description of the marking criteria for the final deliverable would be very useful. That way, we know what to look out for and improve. I am not sure if this is supposed to be like this for level-4000 modules (i.e. give marking criteria only after marking is done -- This also happened in another level-4000 module I took and which had a 30% term paper), but I would prefer to know the marking scheme in advance :)

12. go slow a little bit
13. None.

STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

Academic Year: 2005/2006

Semester: 2

Module Code: CS4271

No of Nominations: 17

1. He is a very good teacher, he knows how to present complex notions in such a way that everyone can achieve an in-depth understanding. He helps the students with their projects.
2. He explains very well and he is organized. Moreover, he proposes interesting exercises which stimulate the students.
3. very approachable professor. very friendly as well.
4. Very kind and helpful lecturer
5. He is a role model for all NUS Lecturers, because: 1. He is very well-versed in the subject he's teaching. You can be sure that you're learning from the best, and he instils the confidence in you that he knows his stuffs well and you're learning from the best. 2. He is dedicated to teaching: ENSURING that you understand the basic underlying concepts before proceeding further. This is very crucial in learning - most lecturers proceed on according to the lesson plan without seeing the need to ENSURE students understand. 3. He is very approachable: He entertains all questions from the easiest to the most difficult, and does not dismiss any queries as being "stupid". It shows his dedication to helping all students advance in their learning, regardless of whether you're a slow & weak student or a fast and strong one. This fairness shown is admirable. If he's not a lecturer of excellent teaching, I have no idea who else would be.
6. Unlike most other lecturers who are unable to bring across their ideas well in lectures, Dr. Abhik has been an excellent teacher. He is patient to repeat himself to clear up difficult concept. And to top that up, he is very interested in teaching as his enthusiasm is contagious enough to prevent the class from dozing off.
7. Conducts entertaining and gripping lessons. Very concerned about the level of understanding we have about the concepts taught. The prof promotes class discussion. This is amazing. I've not attended any other lectures that had so much discussions. (other than lessons in an overseas university) Very approachable for consultation and helpful in suggesting resources.
8. He is very dedicated. Spend lot of time to make sure that the class is grasping the main concept. Explain at the pace that student can follow. Gives us lot of examples in class
9. good and dedicated teacher
10. that he is very enthusiastic in his lecture which positively influences us to learn in a proactive manner. He provides very good motivation for us to accomplish our tasks and further our understanding of the modules.
11. He's able to conduct the lecture in an interesting way and has always try to get the attention of students. His lectures are enjoyable too.
12. outstanding educator who not only teaches well but also displays strong interpersonal skills when dealing with students. easily one of the best lecturers around in SOC

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2005/2006
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1
 Module: AUTOMATED SOFTWARE VALIDATION - CS6214
 Activity Type: LECTURE
 Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate : 8 / 7 / 87.5%

Qn	Items Evaluated	Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score		Fac. Avg Score	
				(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	4.286	0.756	3.793 (4.304)		3.780 (4.390)	
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.143	0.690	3.767 (4.261)		3.784 (4.268)	
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.286	0.756	3.804 (4.261)		3.822 (4.317)	
4	The teacher has helped me advance my research (if applicable).	4.571	0.535	3.600 (4.333)		3.606 (4.243)	
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.286	0.756	3.643 (4.261)		3.653 (4.244)	
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.286	0.756	3.814 (4.391)		3.834 (4.463)	
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.429	0.535	3.725 (4.304)		3.728 (4.366)	
	<u>Average of Qn 1-7</u>	4.327	0.658	3.744 (4.302)		3.753 (4.329)	
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.429	0.787	3.840 (4.348)		3.847 (4.439)	

Frequency Distribution of responses for Qn 8

ITEM\SCORE	Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)				
	5	4	3	2	1
Self	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Department	11 (47.83%)	9 (39.13%)	3 (13.04%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Faculty	21 (51.22%)	17 (41.46%)	3 (7.32%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)

Note:

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. **Fac. Member Avg Score:** The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. **Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev:** A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average Score differs from all the scores in the faculty member's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. **Dept Avg Score :**
 - (a) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture) within the department.
 - (b) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture), at the same module level (level 6000) within the department.
5. **Fac. Avg Score :**
 - (c) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture) within the faculty.
 - (d) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture), at the same module level (level 6000) within the faculty.

STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2005/2006
Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1
Module: AUTOMATED SOFTWARE VALIDATION - CS6214
Activity Type: LECTURE

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. Very nice and patient. encourages us to ask questions and always provides satisfying answers.

STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

Academic Year: 2005/2006

Semester: 1

Module Code: CS6214

No of Nominations: 2

1. He's really nice and encouraging. Not only teaches me knowledge, but also gives me confidence in study. In his course, I've gradually learned the right attitude for future research.

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2004/2005
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2
 Module: CRITICAL SYSTEMS AND THEIR VERIFICATION - CS4271
 Activity Type: LECTURE
 Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate : 45 / 43 / 95.56%

Qn	Items Evaluated	Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score		Fac. Avg Score	
				(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	4.070	0.593	3.747 (3.993)		3.736 (3.958)	
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.023	0.636	3.764 (3.987)		3.762 (3.962)	
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.093	0.684	3.820 (4.043)		3.800 (4.036)	
4	The teacher has helped me advance my research (if applicable).	3.880	0.726	3.599 (3.903)		3.583 (3.877)	
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.907	0.811	3.593 (3.888)		3.608 (3.860)	
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.000	0.655	3.760 (4.003)		3.778 (3.970)	
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.047	0.754	3.687 (3.934)		3.684 (3.887)	
	<u>Average of Qn 1-7</u>	4.011	0.692	3.717 (3.968)		3.715 (3.939)	
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.140	0.675	3.787 (4.020)		3.786 (3.968)	

Frequency Distribution of responses for Qn 8

ITEM\SCORE	Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)				
	5	4	3	2	1
Self	12 (27.91%)	26 (60.47%)	4 (9.30%)	1 (2.33%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Department	88 (29.04%)	148 (48.84%)	57 (18.81%)	5 (1.65%)	5 (1.65%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Faculty	116 (24.63%)	242 (51.38%)	100 (21.23%)	8 (1.70%)	5 (1.06%)

Note:

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. **Fac. Member Avg Score:** The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. **Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev:** A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average Score differs from all the scores in the faculty member's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. **Dept Avg Score :**
 - (a) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture) within the department.
 - (b) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture), at the same module level (level 4000) within the department.
5. **Fac. Avg Score :**
 - (c) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture) within the faculty.
 - (d) the mean score of same activity type (Lecture), at the same module level (level 4000) within the faculty.

Faculty Member:	ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY		
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Academic Year:	2004/2005
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING	Semester:	2
Module:	CRITICAL SYSTEMS AND THEIR VERIFICATION - CS4271		
Activity Type:	LECTURE		

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. Teaches extremely well, bothers to repeat his points until all of us understands. Very helpful about queries from students. Shd be nominated for some teaching award.
2. humorous in his own way :) able to explain concepts well approachable and kind to students geat lecturer thanks dr. abhik!
3. Very clear, precise explanations.
4. Takes the time to explain difficult concepts so that the weaker students can catch up with the lessons.
5. He explains the difficult concepts in the course clearly.
6. Presents the topic well. Ensures we understand the concepts.
7. Friendly approachable care for the well being of students.
8. focused in lecture.
9. Nil
10. He is friendly.
11. care to explain difficult stuff when requested. But would get irritated when requested too many times.
12. humourous, intersting
13. na

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. None needed.
2. No comment.
3. Have more examples to illustrate points.
4. none.
5. -nil-
6. Nil
7. Explain more in lecture and tutorial.
8. Write additional stuff using the tablet screen instead of the white board which is too small. Most of the time, we need to copy the additional stuff written not because we only just want the answers and do not care about understanding them. On the contrary, it's because it is sometimes quite difficult for us to understand certain concepts at one go. So copying these answers are actually for us to better digest what is taught after class.
9. nil
10. na

STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

Academic Year: 2004/2005

Semester: 2

Module Code: CS4271

No of Nominations: 16

1. He is full of energy to tell students all he knows about the course, and he is kind to help students solve problems.
2. effective lecturer
3. good at explaining and approachable for guidance
4. Dr. Abhik is extremely precise about the concepts he teaches which makes the course material easy to follow. He is humourous yet able to keep the class engaged throughout his lecture. To date, this is the only module with a 3-hour lecture I have attended and managed to stay focused for the entire duration. I believe all students taking this module have benefited substantially because of Dr. Abhik. Hence, I feel that he is extremely deserving of the Teaching Excellence Award.
5. very enthusiastic about the module.
6. Dedication to teaching is evident
7. efficient, humourous
8. He is approachable and concerned for students. Encourages students not to give up and i think that is crucial for being a good teacher.
9. nil

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING
 Module: AUTOMATED SOFTWARE VALIDATION - CS6214
 Activity Type: LECTURE
 Academic Year: 2004/2005
 Semester: 1
 Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate : 10 / 9 / 90%

Qn	Items Evaluated	Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score (All Fac. Members)	Fac. Avg Score (All Fac. Members)
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	3.889	0.928	3.808	3.761
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.000	0.707	3.790	3.760
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.333	0.500	3.823	3.798
4	The teacher has helped me advance my research (if applicable).	4.000	0.926	3.585	3.554
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.889	0.928	3.656	3.620
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.222	0.667	3.815	3.791
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.000	0.866	3.736	3.691
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.000	0.866	3.860	3.817
	Average of Qn 1-7	4.048	0.777	3.755	3.720

Note:

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. Fac. Member Avg Score: The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev: A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average Score differs from all the scores in the faculty member's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. Dept Avg Score (All Fac. Members): The mean of all the scores of the activity type for each question for all modules offered by the department.
5. Fac. Avg Score (All Fac. Members): The mean of all the scores of the activity type for each question for all modules offered by the faculty.

Frequency Distribution on Overall Effectiveness of Teacher - Qn 8

ITEM\SCORE	Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)				
	5	4	3	2	1
Self	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching Module at the Same Level (Dept)	21 (32.31%)	32 (49.23%)	9 (13.85%)	2 (3.08%)	1 (1.54%)
Teachers teaching Module at the Same Level (Fac)	40 (40.00%)	46 (46.00%)	11 (11.00%)	2 (2.00%)	1 (1.00%)

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2004/2005
Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1
Module: AUTOMATED SOFTWARE VALIDATION - CS6214
Activity Type: LECTURE

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. Ability to understand student depth and act accordingly. Wonderful vocabulary on the subject matter.
2. He is very strong conceptually.
3. Friendly, attentive to students, presents topics well and in an organized manner, good 'troubleshooting' (in answering questions).
4. He is a fast thinker. He has the passion and patience in teaching.

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. should provide a break in between the lecture.
2. His lecture slides need improvement and better organization. Because the flow too much follows his intuition, people with different mindset/ way of thought, can hardly catch up with his material.

STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

Academic Year: 2004/2005

Semester: 1

Module Code: CS6214

No of Nominations: 4

1. Attentive to students, presents topics with a clear focus and in a well-planned, organized manner, good question-addressing skill.

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2003/2004
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2
 Module: CRITICAL SYSTEMS & THEIR VERIFICATION - CS4271
 Activity Type: LECTURE
 No. of Respondents: 30

Qn	Items Evaluated	Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score (All Fac. Members)	Fac. Avg Score (All Fac. Members)
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	3.767	0.935	3.820	3.758
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	3.833	0.950	3.800	3.766
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	3.833	0.950	3.847	3.802
4	The teacher has helped me advance my research (if applicable).	3.625	0.770	3.652	3.594
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.700	0.952	3.692	3.644
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	3.933	0.785	3.820	3.795
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	3.933	0.907	3.769	3.712
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	3.900	0.845	3.856	3.805
	Average of Qn 1-7	3.809	0.892	3.778	3.731

Note:

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. Fac. Member Avg Score: The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev: A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average Score differs from all the scores in the faculty member's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. Dept Avg Score (All Fac. Members): The mean of all the scores of the activity type for each question for all modules offered by the department.
5. Fac. Avg Score (All Fac. Members): The mean of all the scores of the activity type for each question for all modules offered by the faculty.

Frequency Distribution on Overall Effectiveness of Teacher - Qn 8

ITEM\SCORE	Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)				
	5	4	3	2	1
Self	8 (26.67%)	12 (40.00%)	9 (30.00%)	1 (3.33%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching Module at the Same Level (Dept)	231 (28.10%)	406 (49.39%)	167 (20.32%)	15 (1.82%)	3 (.36%)
Teachers teaching Module at the Same Level (Fac)	262 (24.90%)	506 (48.10%)	244 (23.19%)	32 (3.04%)	8 (.76%)

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2003/2004
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2
 Module: CRITICAL SYSTEMS & THEIR VERIFICATION - CS4271
 Activity Type: LECTURE

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. Patient and understanding, willing to go to great depths to help students understand difficult concepts
2. Patient and willing to help. Able to cater to the needs of weaker students.
3. Gives good overview of lecture and explains concepts sufficiently well.
4. attentive
5. Presents lectures in a clear and detailed manner. Takes the effort to explain difficult concepts patiently and also to hold extra tutorial sessions.
6. Tried his best to get students involved and willing to give extra lessons when he saw the class not catching up.
7. gives good explanations and examples. always puts in effort to go through potentially problematic areas. holding extra classes on sat for students is also very commendable. good system where he always asks for feedback.
8. He can speak very clearly and loudly during lectures and encourage students to ask him more questions so that he can better explain his point and enhance our understanding and thinking ability.
9. He loves to talk.
10. The teacher is very passionate about the topic and is always able to be on time. The teaching process is quite well planned, good communication with the students. And the teaching process is effective.
11. Excellent lecturer! Delivers the lecture in a very attention-grabbing fashion and ensures that he emphasises on key concepts repetitively until the students have understood. Very patient and always approachable.

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. However, sometimes reiterates a bit too much and polls too much for questions and this disrupts the flow of the lecture. Should have more confidence with his explanations, because I felt they were explained quite well. Tone down on 'nagging' and seemingly 'sarcastic' remarks about people, e.g. about being slightly late (probably they could have came from another class, not everyone can be on time), nagging people not to hand up homework at the end of class (now, what's the big difference with handing up at the start of class?), pointing at people for questions and giving them unwanted attention (sorry, but I do not wear a question mark on my face), etc. It is these little things that some of us will treat as personal attacks and leave a negative impression.
2. Lecture notes ported from PDF should not be left as graphics in powerpoint. Rather, it will be better if they are converted to text.
3. Perhaps being less harsh and more patient with students will encourage more students to approach him for help when required.
4. sometimes tends to put down certain questions from students Its a bit discouraging in that students might not get the nerve to ask a second question....
5. Not any that I can think of.
6. Don't call students to answer as they may not know the answers.
7. Be more accurate when setting questions and correcting answers for homeworks and exams.
8. NA

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2003/2004
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2
 Module: CRITICAL SYSTEMS & THEIR VERIFICATION - CS4271
 Activity Type: TUTORIAL
 No. of Respondents: 27

Qn	Items Evaluated	Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score (All Fac. Members)	Fac. Avg Score (All Fac. Members)
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	3.852	0.907	3.904	3.894
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	3.926	0.958	3.905	3.925
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	3.963	0.940	3.967	3.992
4	The teacher has helped me advance my research (if applicable).	3.667	0.913	3.721	3.720
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.778	0.934	3.762	3.752
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	3.926	0.829	3.892	3.893
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	3.963	0.854	3.902	3.886
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	3.889	0.892	3.960	3.961
	Average of Qn 1-7	3.874	0.896	3.872	3.873

Note:

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. Fac. Member Avg Score: The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev: A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average Score differs from all the scores in the faculty member's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. Dept Avg Score (All Fac. Members): The mean of all the scores of the activity type for each question for all modules offered by the department.
5. Fac. Avg Score (All Fac. Members): The mean of all the scores of the activity type for each question for all modules offered by the faculty.

Frequency Distribution on Overall Effectiveness of Teacher - Qn 8

ITEM\SCORE	Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)				
	5	4	3	2	1
Self	7 (25.93%)	12 (44.44%)	6 (22.22%)	2 (7.41%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching Module at the Same Level (Dept)	231 (28.10%)	406 (49.39%)	167 (20.32%)	15 (1.82%)	3 (.36%)
Teachers teaching Module at the Same Level (Fac)	262 (24.90%)	506 (48.10%)	244 (23.19%)	32 (3.04%)	8 (.76%)

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2003/2004
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2
 Module: CRITICAL SYSTEMS & THEIR VERIFICATION - CS4271
 Activity Type: TUTORIAL

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. Accommodated a tutorial session for students to review lecture material.
2. The effort to hold extra tutorial sessions is commendable.
3. He can speak very clearly and loudly during lectures and encourage students to ask him more questions so that he can better explain his point and enhance our understanding and thinking ability.
4. Talk a lot.
5. same as above
6. Very good tutor! Delivers the lecture in a very attention-grabbing fashion and ensures that he emphasises on key concepts repetitively until the students have understood. Very patient and always approachable.

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. But I did not understand why some of the lecture material was brought forward to the tutorial session. Some of us are not available on a Sat morning. Please try to ensure lectures materials are kept to the one official lecture per week and the tutorial session is strictly optional material.
2. None
3. Not any that I can think of.
4. Try not to conduct lessons on Sat early morning.
5. It will be better if the tutorials are not on Saturdays.
6. Perhaps provide more lab examples and give more questions for students to practice.

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE
Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

Academic Year: 2003/2004
Semester: 2

Module Code: CS4271

No of Nominations: 5

1. The lectures are interesting and useful.
2. Extremely patient and helpful. Waste no time to explain important concepts. Highlights the key issues of the topic with great enthusiasm.
3. He is able keep his lessons easy to understand by taking the time to explain difficult concepts repeatedly.
4. Excellent lecturer and one of the very few lecturers who delivers lectures in a very interesting manner. Great command of the language and a very good approach of lecturing - First describes the overview of the content, gradually goes deeper into each section and keeps on emphasising on important points and also adds a lighter touch to all his material making things interesting

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING
 Module: AUTOMATED SOFTWARE VALIDATION - CS6214
 Activity Type: LECTURE
 No. of Respondents: 18

Academic Year: 2003/2004
 Semester: 1

Qn	Items Evaluated	Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score (All Fac. Members)	Fac. Avg Score (All Fac. Members)
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	4.000	0.594	3.718	3.689
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.056	0.639	3.703	3.686
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.111	0.676	3.772	3.749
4	The teacher has helped me advance my research (if applicable).	3.882	0.600	3.547	3.526
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.000	0.594	3.578	3.563
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.056	0.539	3.753	3.742
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.000	0.594	3.658	3.628
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.111	0.471	3.773	3.752
	Average of Qn 1-7	4.016	0.595	3.682	3.661

Note:

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. Fac. Member Avg Score: The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev: A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average Score differs from all the scores in the faculty member's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. Dept Avg Score (All Fac. Members): The mean of all the scores of the activity type for each question for all modules offered by the department.
5. Fac. Avg Score (All Fac. Members): The mean of all the scores of the activity type for each question for all modules offered by the faculty.

Overall Effectiveness of Teacher (Qn 8) : Frequency Distribution

Scores	5	4	3	2	1
Fac. Member	3 (16.67%)	14 (77.78%)	1 (5.56%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Dept (All Fac. Members, All Activity Types, Same Level)	27 (36.49%)	43 (58.11%)	4 (5.41%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Fac.(All Fac. Members, All Activity Types, Same Level)	46 (42.59%)	56 (51.85%)	6 (5.56%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)

Module: AUTOMATED SOFTWARE VALIDATION - CS6214

Students' Expected Grades on Module : Frequency Distribution

Grades	A	B	C	D	F
Module	6 (33.33%)	10 (55.56%)	2 (11.11%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Dept(All Modules,Same Level)	28 (45.90%)	26 (42.62%)	7 (11.48%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Fac.(All Modules,Same Level)	44 (48.89%)	39 (43.33%)	7 (7.78%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)

Students' Perceived Level of Difficulty on Module : Frequency Distribution

Grades	5	4	3	2	1
Module	3 (16.67%)	6 (33.33%)	9 (50.00%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Dept(All Modules,Same Level)	11 (18.03%)	24 (39.34%)	26 (42.62%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Fac.(All Modules,Same Level)	15 (16.67%)	43 (47.78%)	32 (35.56%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)

Note: The higher the perceived level of difficulty, the higher the score.

Students' Overall Opinion on Module : Frequency Distribution

Grades	5	4	3	2	1
Module	1 (5.56%)	13 (72.22%)	4 (22.22%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Dept(All Modules, Same Level)	13 (21.31%)	37 (60.66%)	11 (18.03%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Fac.(All Modules,Same Level)	24 (26.67%)	53 (58.89%)	13 (14.44%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)

STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON FACULTY MEMBER

Faculty Member:	ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY		
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Academic Year:	2003/2004
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING	Semester:	1
Module:	AUTOMATED SOFTWARE VALIDATION - CS6214		
Activity Type:	LECTURE		

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. good at explanation
2. Good rapport with students. Personal attention to each student. Very systematic, encouraging and motivating teacher.
3. Good communication skill. Dedicated. Effective teaching style.
4. Good knowlegde in the field.
5. He is enthusiastic and patient.
6. He is very helpful and approachable. His cheerfulness makes the class more lively.
7. Explain things well.
8. good teaching

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. Perhaps reduce the level of abstraction for some topics with more orientation towards practical side.
2. To use more examples and analogies in explaining difficult concepts. And to clearly define/review the basic definitions with examples before moving into more complex topics.
3. speak too fast

STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member: ABHIK ROYCHOUDHURY

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

Academic Year: 2003/2004

Semester: 1

Module Code: CS6214

No of Nominations: 2

1. Very motivating teacher. Approachable for consultation and takes every possible care to drill the concepts. Each student receives personal attention. Students are encouraged to ask questions in the class and discussions in class are most welcome.