Teacher Assessment Report

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member:	LAI XIAONI	
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Academic Year: 2010/2011
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING	Semester: 1
Module:	PROGRAMMING METHODOLOGY - CS1010	
Activity Type:	TUTORIAL	

Class Size/Response Size/Response Rate/Contact Session/Teaching Hour : 14 / 9 / 64.29% / 10 / 20

Qn	Items Evaluated	Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score (a) (b)	Fac. Avg Score (c) (d)
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.	3.444	0.242	3.927 (3.984)	3.942 (3.973)
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	3.556	0.242	3.972 (4.039)	4.003 (4.043)
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.000	0.167	4.063 (4.135)	4.087 (4.130)
4	The teacher has helped me develop relevant research skills.*	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.333	0.236	3.791 (3.844)	3.813 (3.844)
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	3.556	0.176	3.916 (3.978)	3.946 (3.989)
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	3.444	0.242	3.908 (3.972)	3.923 (3.962)
	Average of Qn 1-7**	3.556	0.180	3.928 (3.992)	3.951 (3.990)
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	3.333	0.236	3.975 (4.053)	4.003 (4.052)

* This includes skills in research methodology, research problems/questions, literature search/evaluation, oral presentation and manuscript preparation.

** If Qn 4 is NA, it will not be included in the computation of average score (Average of Qn 1-7).

Frequency Distribution of responses for Qn 8

Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)

ITEM\SCORE		5	4	3	2	1

Self	0 (.00%)	4 (44.44%)	4 (44.44%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	443 (29.16%)	794 (52.27%)	225 (14.81%)	34 (2.24%)	23 (1.51%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty	649 (27.70%)	1274 (54.37%)	338 (14.43%)	56 (2.39%)	26 (1.11%)

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 (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.

<p align="center">STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON TEACHER</p>

Faculty Member: LAI XIAONI
Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE   Academic Year: 2010/2011
Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING   Semester: 1
Module: PROGRAMMING METHODOLOGY - CS1010
Activity Type: TUTORIAL

Q9   What are the teacher's strengths?

1. Preparation always done. Ready with all relevant materials.
2. Able to go through the questions step by step. She is well-prepared for lessons, eg. Prepare powerpoint slides, etc.
3. She knows the concept well, and always prepared for the tutorial.
4. Approachable for help when needed.
5. He is very efficient in his teaching methods and replying emails for consultations. He explains complex concepts in a way that is easy to understand.
6. she is very good in her programming skills.
7. She has alot of preparation, eg. slides and questions.

Q10   What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. Maybe to be a little more engaging during the discussion session. The classroom is drop-dead quiet during discussion, and little to no interaction occurs between students and discussion leader. Mostly a one-way conversation.
2. Keep up the good work.
3. She could explain the discussion question in a more interesting way.
4. Excellent! Keep up the good attitude!
5. to better engage the class instead of speaking to herself.
6. She could try to speak louder and make sure she's heard by the whole class. She should also use a visualiser, as using a mouse to draw/write is not only time-consuming but quite messy too.
7. Should try to make discussion sessions more interesting, than just going through the discussion questions plainly.