

P.remk {font-size: 10pt}td,th {font-size: 10pt} @media print {p.page-break {page-break-before:always}  
.not-to-be-printed {display: none}}

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

---

Faculty Member: DING SEN

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2014/2015

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1

Module: PROGRAMMING METHODOLOGY - CS1010E

Activity Type: TUTORIAL

Class Size/Response Size/Response Rate : 70 / 32 / 45.71%

Contact Session/Teaching Hour : 33 / 33

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.	4.156	0.120	4.180 (4.236)		4.158 (4.194)	
2	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.938	0.127	4.053 (4.084)		4.031 (4.043)	
3	The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.	4.000	0.135	4.208 (4.287)		4.198 (4.250)	
4	The teacher has enhanced my ability to communicate the subject material.	3.969	0.105	4.095 (4.156)		NA (NA)	
5	The teacher's attitude and approach encouraged me to think and work in a creative and independent way.	4.063	0.127	4.104 (4.176)		NA (NA)	
6	The teacher cares about student development and learning.	4.156	0.136	4.167 (4.252)		NA (NA)	
	Average Q1 to Q6	4.047	0.103	4.134 (4.198)		NA (NA)	
	Computed Overall Effectiveness of the Teacher.	4.104	0.105	4.203 (4.256)		4.184 (4.216)	

Notes:

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 (Tutorial) within the department.
  - (b) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial), at the same module level ( level 1000 ) within the department.
5. **Fac. Avg Score :**
  - (c) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial) within the faculty.
  - (d) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial), at the same module level ( level 1000 ) within the faculty.

Faculty Member: DING SEN

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2014/2015

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1

Module: PROGRAMMING METHODOLOGY - CS1010E

**Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 1: The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.)**

Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)					
ITEM\SCORE	5	4	3	2	1
Self	10 (31.25%)	17 (53.12%)	5 (15.62%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	458 (39.97%)	539 (47.03%)	122 (10.65%)	16 (1.40%)	11 (.96%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty	532 (37.54%)	677 (47.78%)	172 (12.14%)	23 (1.62%)	13 (.92%)

**Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 2: The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.)**

Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)

ITEM\SCORE	5	4	3	2	1
Self	7 (21.88%)	16 (50.00%)	9 (28.12%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	411 (35.86%)	481 (41.97%)	208 (18.15%)	31 (2.71%)	15 (1.31%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty	474 (33.47%)	604 (42.66%)	281 (19.84%)	39 (2.75%)	18 (1.27%)

**Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 3: The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.)**

**Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)**

ITEM\SCORE	5	4	3	2	1
Self	8 (25.00%)	17 (53.12%)	6 (18.75%)	1 (3.12%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	514 (45.05%)	471 (41.28%)	130 (11.39%)	21 (1.84%)	5 (.44%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty	592 (41.90%)	617 (43.67%)	175 (12.38%)	23 (1.63%)	6 (.42%)

STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: DING SEN

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2014/2015

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1

Module: PROGRAMMING METHODOLOGY - CS1010E

Activity Type: TUTORIAL

### **What are the teacher's strengths? (14 comments)**

#### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Ding Sen tries very hard to engage with the students (though we are usually unresponsive). I think the google spreadsheet to help coordinate student presentations in class was a good idea.
2. Explains clearly and sends out emails regularly to encourage students to study hard for the subject.
3. He has prepared much before his formal tutorial classes. Also, he is really active in answering our questions and giving us the correct answers of the questions which are done by himself. He is an effective tutor.
4. He is very knowledgeable, and he is able to explain knowledge and concepts effectively.
5. Kind and helpful
6. The teacher has increased my interest in the subject. The teacher provided timely and useful feedback. The teacher has enhanced my ability to communicate the subject material.

#### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 4.0 and less than 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. -
2. He teaches the tutorial well.
3. He tries his best to ensure that the class participates in the discussion. He also makes us motivated in his emails. Provides answers for our doubts.
4. The tutor is friendly as he attempt to illustrate the approaches to the questions.
5. clear
6. excellent programming skills

#### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 3.5 and less than 4.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Clear with his explanation on most questions. He will always ask feedback from students on whether we have understood his explanation. Patient with explanation.

#### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 3.0 and less than 3.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. He is caring and answers our queries quickly

**What improvements would you suggest to the teacher? (9 comments)**

**Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 3.0 and less than 3.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. NIL

**Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 3.5 and less than 4.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. No improvements to suggest

**Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 4.0 and less than 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. -

2. -

3. Be punctual.

4. please be punctual

**Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. nil

2. presentation skills.

3. very good, keep on!

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

---

Faculty Member: DING SEN

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2014/2015

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1

Module: FOUNDATIONS FOR ECONOMETRICS - EC2303

Activity Type: TUTORIAL

Class Size/Response Size/Response Rate : 19 / 11 / 57.89%

Contact Session/Teaching Hour : 10 / 10

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.	3.727	0.237	4.060 (4.175)		4.146 (4.133)	
2	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.364	0.244	3.892 (3.987)		4.045 (4.018)	
3	The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.	3.818	0.325	4.083 (4.227)		4.160 (4.159)	
	Average Q1 to Q3	3.636	0.244	4.011 (4.129)		NA (NA)	
	Computed Overall Effectiveness of the Teacher.	3.694	0.237	4.069 (4.184)		4.174 (4.159)	

Notes:

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 (Tutorial) within the department.
  - (b) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial), at the same module level ( level 2000 ) within the department.
5. **Fac. Avg Score :**
  - (c) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial) within the faculty.
  - (d) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial), at the same module level ( level 2000 ) within the faculty.

#### FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ON TEACHER

Faculty Member:	DING SEN		
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Academic Year:	2014/2015
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING	Semester:	1
Module:	FOUNDATIONS FOR ECONOMETRICS - EC2303		

**Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 1: The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.)**

**Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)**



ITEM\SCORE	5	4	3	2	1
Self	1 (9.09%)	7 (63.64%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	254 (37.63%)	310 (45.93%)	89 (13.19%)	19 (2.81%)	3 (.44%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty	1959 (33.14%)	3012 (50.96%)	757 (12.81%)	135 (2.28%)	48 (.81%)

**Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 2: The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.)**

**Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)**

ITEM\SCORE	5	4	3	2	1
Self	0 (.00%)	6 (54.55%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	189 (27.96%)	328 (48.52%)	124 (18.34%)	31 (4.59%)	4 (.59%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty	1761 (29.80%)	2817 (47.67%)	1073 (18.16%)	194 (3.28%)	64 (1.08%)

**Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 3: The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.)**

**Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)**

ITEM\SCORE	5	4	3	2	1
Self	4 (36.36%)	2 (18.18%)	4 (36.36%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	266 (39.64%)	310 (46.20%)	79 (11.77%)	13 (1.94%)	3 (.45%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty	2104 (35.76%)	2834 (48.17%)	771 (13.11%)	122 (2.07%)	52 (.88%)

STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: DING SEN

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2014/2015

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1

Module: FOUNDATIONS FOR ECONOMETRICS - EC2303

Activity Type: TUTORIAL

## **What are the teacher's strengths? (10 comments)**

### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. He summarizes the concepts taught in lecture, thereby reinforcing them. It's easier to understand the tutorial discussion after that.

### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 4.0 and less than 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Detailed and clear explanations

2. He is very approachable and will reply to email asap. This allows the student to be able to receive timely feedback which indirectly ensures greater efficiency.

3. He is well prepared for tutorials and he summarises the concepts learnt in a very clear and easy way for us to understand.

4. Helped to clear doubts, helpful

### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 3.5 and less than 4.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Gives everyone an equal opportunity to present and tries his best to clarify their doubts or answer their questions

2. Revision and summary of key concepts for topics learnt are useful

### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 3.0 and less than 3.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Excellent grasp of concepts and knowledge. Tried to make the lessons more interactive and would always check to see if we understood the concepts taught.

2. cares about our progress, will send us emails with links to solutions and extra readings

### **Comments from students who gave an average score less than 3.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. The tutor starts off each tutorial by recapping key concepts

## **What improvements would you suggest to the teacher? (7 comments)**

### **Comments from students who gave an average score less than 3.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Maybe should utilise all the white boards in the class instead of just writing on one. Also should not rub off what you write on the white board as students might need time to digest it.

2. NA

### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 3.0 and less than 3.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. maybe more preparation before the class is needed as the tutor pauses sometimes during his explanation, unclear of the solution. more confidence during teaching would be good, sometimes unable to answer questions about my own solutions.

### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 3.5 and less than 4.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Should not be overly late for tutorial. Seems to be somewhat unsure when clarifying answers sometimes, based on his tone and demeanour.

### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal 4.0 and less than 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Go at a faster pace

2. Perhaps, more clear on his explanation during tutorial. Certain questions maybe a little ambiguous but he does make up for it through sending us emails of explanations.

### **Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher**

1. Spend more time on selected questions instead of going through all questions.

The National University of Singapore has used reasonable endeavours to ensure that the information posted on this Web-site is correct at the time of posting. However, the University gives no warranty and accepts no liability for the accuracy or the completeness of the information provided.

In providing such student feedback, the University does not in any way, expressly or implicitly, endorse the views expressed or the contents thereof.