

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2012/2013
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1
 Module: COMPUTER SECURITY PRACTICE - CS4238
 Activity Type: LECTURE
 Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate/ Contact Session/ Teaching Hour : 34 / 15 / 44.12% / 13 / 26

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.	4.467	0.133	4.061 (3.909)		4.010 (3.939)	
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.400	0.163	4.032 (3.923)		4.008 (3.938)	
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.400	0.163	4.085 (4.017)		4.072 (4.031)	
4	The teacher has helped me develop relevant research skills.*	4.286	0.194	3.943 (3.774)		3.885 (3.760)	
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.467	0.133	3.956 (3.773)		3.919 (3.813)	
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.467	0.133	4.081 (3.929)		4.041 (3.961)	
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.400	0.131	4.020 (3.820)		3.961 (3.823)	
	<u>Average of Qn 1-7</u>	4.413	0.136	4.036 (3.880)		3.998 (3.898)	
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.467	0.133	4.090 (3.897)		4.040 (3.913)	

* 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

ITEM\SCORE	Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)				
	5	4	3	2	1
Self	7 (46.67%)	8 (53.33%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Department	94 (23.15%)	215 (52.96%)	68 (16.75%)	19 (4.68%)	10 (2.46%)

Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same

Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Faculty		158 (22.87%)	373 (53.98%)	118 (17.08%)	26 (3.76%)	16 (2.32%)
---	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	------------	------------

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.

STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON FACULTY MEMBER

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI
Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2012/2013
Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1
Module: COMPUTER SECURITY PRACTICE - CS4238
Activity Type: LECTURE

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. Able to conceptualize what are the principals we should follow in the fast changing world of security practice.
2. I knew the teacher for a few years, and he is very approachable. He explains well, and he helps to pique the students' interest in security.
3. Friendly
4. Focuses on knowledge instead of grades and constantly reminds us about practice. I think this should be the mindset for other CS modules also.
5. Great teacher and very inspiring when he says to focus on fundamentals and be system independent. Doing a very good job!
6. Very helpful, patient in guiding us and explain very clearly and completely. Very open to students' inputs and share many important advice that would be useful in future.
7. He really understand about the topics and can convey the important things of the topic. The explanation is clear and the task given to ask is interesting.
8. The prof is brilliant
9. Explains concepts well and gives us practices to put the theory into practical use and experimentation.

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. Focus on more industry-used tools. network is not commonly used in the industry.
2. Can shorten some of the explanation for simple stuff as this module is level 4000.
3. NA
4. Give more motivation or interesting task for the group activity (maybe to start the activity). For some hands on, I think it is better to give some times for the student to do it first before explained by the TA.
5. Give more practice session examples.
6. Most of the theory stuff taught for the first few lectures are already covered in other modules. Hence there are some students feeling bored. Maybe more focus should be given on the practical part. I also hope there might be more interesting stuff added into the module such as capture the flag competitions.

STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2012/2013
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1
 Module: COMPUTER SECURITY PRACTICE - CS4238
 Activity Type: TUTORIAL
 Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate/ Contact Session/ Teaching Hour : 29 / 13 / 44.83% / 11 / 11

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.	4.462	0.144	4.050 (3.710)		4.035 (3.718)	
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.385	0.180	4.105 (3.774)		4.099 (3.779)	
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.385	0.180	4.148 (3.799)		4.144 (3.800)	
4	The teacher has helped me develop relevant research skills.*	4.500	0.151	3.752 (3.698)		3.733 (3.686)	
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.462	0.144	3.920 (3.639)		3.900 (3.641)	
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.462	0.144	4.036 (3.768)		4.012 (3.779)	
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.462	0.144	4.042 (3.665)		4.013 (3.674)	
	<u>Average of Qn 1-7</u>	4.444	0.151	4.047 (3.722)		4.031 (3.726)	
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.462	0.144	4.097 (3.742)		4.080 (3.746)	

* 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

ITEM\SCORE	Nos. of Respondents(% of Respondents)				
	5	4	3	2	1
Self	6 (46.15%)	7 (53.85%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	33 (21.29%)	72 (46.45%)	35 (22.58%)	7 (4.52%)	8 (5.16%)

Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty

	38 (20.99%)	84 (46.41%)	42 (23.20%)	9 (4.97%)	8 (4.42%)
--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-----------	-----------

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 4000) 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 4000) within the faculty.

STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON FACULTY MEMBER

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI
Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2012/2013
Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 1
Module: COMPUTER SECURITY PRACTICE - CS4238
Activity Type: TUTORIAL

Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?

1. NA
2. Helps us when we encounter any difficulties.

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. NA
2. Nil

STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member:	LIANG ZHENKAI	Academic Year:	2012/2013
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Semester:	1
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING		
Module Code:	CS4238	No of Nominations:	5

1. His passion in security is contagious. His modules are the only two security modules that are worth taking in School of Computing. We really need more security professors like himself. He's approachable and very helpful to the students.
2. He introduced a lot of useful things to me such as UNIX system, some practice on network, buffer overflow, etc. Also he always reminds us what are the important things in learning computer security.
3. Brilliant professor. Learnt a lot from him

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.