STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member:	LIANG ZHENKAI		
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Academic Year:	2011/2012
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING	Semester:	2
Module:	SYSTEMS SECURITY - CS5231		
Activity Type:	LECTURE		

Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate/ Contact Session/ Teaching Hour : 82 / 34 / 41.46% / 13 / 26

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.	4.559	0.096	4.157 (4.308)	4.073 (4.286)
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.382	0.120	4.164 (4.297)	4.094 (4.231)
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.500	0.106	4.229 (4.423)	4.167 (4.314)
4	The teacher has helped me develop relevant research skills.*	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.471	0.105	4.080 (4.214)	4.004 (4.170)
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.500	0.106	4.174 (4.319)	4.113 (4.274)
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.412	0.120	4.124 (4.209)	4.038 (4.119)
	Average of Qn 1-7	4.471	0.095	4.151 (4.295)	4.078 (4.232)
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.588	0.104	4.190 (4.363)	4.110 (4.292)

* 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	22 (64.71%)	10 (29.41%)	2 (5.88%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Department	89 (48.90%)	73 (40.11%)	17 (9.34%)	3 (1.65%)	0 (.00%)

| Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Faculty | \| | 141 (42.86%) | 149 (45.29%) | 33 (10.03%) | 6 (1.82%) | 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 5000) 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 5000) within the faculty.

<div align="center">STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON FACULTY MEMBER</div>

Faculty Member:	LIANG ZHENKAI		
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Academic Year:	2011/2012
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING	Semester:	2
Module:	SYSTEMS SECURITY - CS5231		
Activity Type:	LECTURE		

Q9   What are the teacher's strengths?

1. Dr Liang takes effort to explain key concepts and application. Time management was good. Delivery of topic content was clear in speech, presentation slides were simple and concise. I appreciate the friendly classroom environment he created, encouraging students participation and reflections. Given some of the topics are not the everyday tools and environment most people or I work on, (kernel, binaries, assembling codes), think Dr Liang has done great to give sufficient treatment in line with learning objectives.

2. good

3. He gave us a good practical exposure to systems security. The projects also helped us in understanding the topics better.

4. Approachable.

5. Highly motivated and has a profound understanding of the taught subjects. Tries to motivate people to individually gain insight about system components.

6. Good vision for the course beyond the grades.. Teacher motivates students to work for greater purpose in life..

7. wide and deep knowledge in system security background. skilled in problem solving and programming

8. Excellent way of communicating the concepts and also repeated explanation of difficult concepts.

9. His friendliness & his approach towards the subject of security.

10. very approachable and the lecture was taught very clearly.

11. He let me realize the current system security background, and this makes me very interesting in this area. And the practices in this module and the help from him led me to look into operating system and help me to understand a lot of system details. The knowledge and skills I learned form him is a asset for me.

12. Professor has good technical skills related to the subject. He covers all the topics in detail and wherever there is a doubt with any student in understanding, the Professor gives his best to explain the respective topics in the class. He has good communication skills and is always readily available to approach anytime for any queries. Professor also helps the students to get the topics intuitively whenever required which helps a lot in better understanding of the topics. The Professor has very deep knowledge about the subject. The methodology followed by professor to teach various types of attacks and understand them and how to think intuitively to create defense against them was very useful to me as a student. The assignments and projects chosen by the professor are very helpful to get the actual practical understanding of the attacks and concepts behind them.

13. Places emphasis on learning and not on evaluation. It is not a result oriented module. He encourages students to read and learn more.

14. Good module and good teacher. The instructions of assignments are also very detailed to follow, I like it.

15. Prof Liang has enthusiastic on system security and can bring interesting thing to students. Also, prof

Liang is good at researching methodology and like to share it with students generously.

16. Very approachable and always willing to help when obstacles are met.

17. Gives real-life security scenarios or happenings.

18. Humorous Clear in logic

Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

1. Can't think of any. Except maybe the timeline for lab3 that I have already elaborated. Thank you.

2. good

3. No improvement required.

4. Presentation during class was not always smooth. A slight improvement could be done here.

5. Put more technical guides for students and allow/encourage discussions among students to solve problems in CAs.. discussions may be restricted not to give straight forward answers, but hints/tips should be allowed .. This would greatly helps students in need and improves their understanding..

6. n.a

7. NA

8. Perfect module, No Change required.

9. Reduce assignments appropriately

10. N/A

11. -

12. Speak louder. The firewalls assignment is more of a project than an assignment. It was too heavy.

13. I feel the assignments are too many. The three individual assignments are already enough, without the group project. Additionally, I learned more in the firewall (3rd) assignment, than in group project.

14. To the final project, it's better to have some time in class to discuss during groups and teachers. For example, groups can exchange their ideas, solutions and problems.

15. Nil =)

STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE   Academic Year: 2011/2012

Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING   Semester: 2

Module Code: CS5231   No of Nominations: 9

1. good
2. He's a great lecturer. Very passionate about his work and really helps his students. I had a great time learning from him.
3. His approach toward the subject is excellent. I will highly recommend this module to others.
4. He is able to motivate us to learn deeply on a difficult subject.
5. Kind and efficient teacher. Teach us the way of thinking. Helpful homework.
6. Motivate students to explore further through his teaching.