

## STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI  
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2009/2010  
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2  
 Module: INTRODUCTION TO COMPUTER SECURITY - CS3235  
 Activity Type: LECTURE  
 Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate/ Contact Session/ Teaching Hour : 73 / 49 / 67.12% / 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.	3.980	0.629	3.987 ( 4.169)		3.929 ( 3.911)	
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.122	0.484	3.988 ( 4.221)		3.960 ( 4.001)	
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.319	0.556	4.062 ( 4.273)		4.032 ( 4.068)	
4	The teacher has helped me develop relevant research skills.*	NA	NA	NA		NA	
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	3.878	0.857	3.876 ( 4.120)		3.837 ( 3.847)	
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.082	0.702	4.015 ( 4.172)		3.989 ( 3.957)	
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.020	0.692	3.945 ( 4.074)		3.890 ( 3.863)	
	<b><u>Average of Qn 1-7</u></b>	4.065	0.673	3.977 ( 4.171)		3.937 ( 3.940)	
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.061	0.659	4.014 ( 4.198)		3.982 ( 3.970)	

\* 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	11 (22.45%)	31 (63.27%)	6 (12.24%)	1 (2.04%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Department	148 (35.32%)	218 (52.03%)	44 (10.50%)	6 (1.43%)	3 (.72%)

Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same

Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Faculty		230 (29.79%)	363 (47.02%)	126 (16.32%)	32 (4.15%)	21 (2.72%)
---	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	------------	------------

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 3000 ) 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 3000 ) within the faculty.

## STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON FACULTY MEMBER

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI  
Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2009/2010  
Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2  
Module: INTRODUCTION TO COMPUTER SECURITY - CS3235  
Activity Type: LECTURE

**Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?**

1. gives real life example from time to time.
2. Nice and responsible teacher
3. He's very knowledgeable
4. Fun (Tell jokes to help us understand better) give real-word example so we can better relate to the concepts taught.
5. He is very approachable. He did a lot of demo which is interactive.
6. Helpful
7. Makes his classes very lively by showing more videos related to the chapters.
8. He is very friendly and approachable.
9. Willingness to repeat or explain thoroughly concepts and ideas. Very approachable.
10. This module is a core module for E-commerce students and i am glad that the lecturer take into consideration that there are two groups of students in the lecture. Being in the lower standard group, i appreciate greatly that the lecturer tries to take care of us.
11. He will try his best to explain by giving demonstrations.
12. He explains the topic clearly and understands the student well
13. Detailed in teaching. Patient
14. approachable
15. He is patient and enthusiastic in his teaching
16. harkworking, ontime feedback
17. Professional.
18. Highly approachable and helpful, always willing to help students clear any conceptual doubts and understand concepts Clear and detailed explanation of topics
19. knows his stuff.
20. His interests in the security is really contagious. I enjoyed the homeworks he set for us as it really got us thinking.
21. The teacher is helpful and clear in explanation.
22. Gives very timely feedback. Students need not wait very long to get back assignment grades and this will help a lot as students will be able to know in the most timely fashion, their weaknesses and improve on the weak areas before the lecture moves too far ahead. Very impressed with the encouragement of students to approach and consult/discuss with him security related concepts even after the completion of the module. Shares a lot of related security experience and this helps students to be able to link the topic being taught and real-life situations.
23. Demonstrates certain interesting attacks and viruses. Interacts with students
24. He puts a lot efforts to teaching.
25. Easy to approach

26. he is knowledgeable in his field
27. He is clear in his concept to deliver the teaching material. Able to use simply concept to translate a new concept.
28. good examples, approachable
29. Mr Liang tried his best to bring across the main points to us.
30. give detailed explanation and examples
31. He brings relevant real life applications to the module content.
32. He is friendly, approachable. Helps us to have a better understanding of the concept.
33. friendly, approachable

**Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?**

1. detail more certain parts and always give more demonstrations :)
2. none
3. Should conduct more activities for class beside tutorial and lecture
4. N.A
5. Nil
6. Need to speak a bit louder while teaching in class.
7. nil
8. The demonstrations sometimes were too boring, not interactive enough.
9. Perhaps go through sample exam questions
10. Do not give too many homework assignments.
11. better lecture presentation
12. Nil.
13. Speaking.
14. Maybe in english and ensuring that he doesn't tell insider jokes as most people will not understand it.
15. None
16. Questions in assignments may be a little confusing at times. Setting the question in a way that it is easier to understand may reduce confusion.
17. Nil
18. N.A.
19. N.A.
20. talk slower
21. Perhaps have a lab session to use some of the softwares that had introduced in the module.
22. Generally, i prefer Dr Liang to stick to his current style. He is very good already, i feel. Enjoyed his lessons.
23. Maybe written clarification could be done in the future for students who had problem understanding him.
24. Nil
25. nil
26. some unnecessary detail can be omitted.
27. Speak a little slower, some times hard to get what you are saying

## STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI  
 Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2009/2010  
 Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2  
 Module: INTRODUCTION TO COMPUTER SECURITY - CS3235  
 Activity Type: TUTORIAL  
 Class Size / Response Size / Response Rate/ Contact Session/ Teaching Hour : 36 / 24 / 66.67% / 22 / 22

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.	4.125	0.612	3.827 ( 3.951)		3.849 ( 3.945)	
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.	4.333	0.482	3.866 ( 4.008)		3.925 ( 4.057)	
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.	4.565	0.507	3.951 ( 4.081)		4.000 ( 4.110)	
4	The teacher has helped me develop relevant research skills.*	NA	NA	NA		NA	
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.	4.000	0.885	3.698 ( 3.834)		3.723 ( 3.830)	
6	The teacher has helped me acquire valuable/relevant knowledge in the field.	4.250	0.532	3.829 ( 3.946)		3.862 ( 3.948)	
7	The teacher has helped me understand complex ideas.	4.125	0.680	3.819 ( 3.940)		3.836 ( 3.930)	
	<b><u>Average of Qn 1-7</u></b>	4.231	0.647	3.831 ( 3.959)		3.865 ( 3.969)	
8	Overall the teacher is effective.	4.292	0.550	3.866 ( 3.992)		3.910 ( 4.015)	

\* 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	8 (33.33%)	15 (62.50%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (.00%)	0 (.00%)
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department	91 (24.73%)	196 (53.26%)	71 (19.29%)	7 (1.90%)	3 (.82%)

Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same  
Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level | 204 (28.18%) 359 (49.59%) 138 (19.06%) 14 (1.93%) 9 (1.24%)  
within Faculty

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 3000 ) 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 3000 ) within the faculty.

## STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON FACULTY MEMBER

Faculty Member: LIANG ZHENKAI  
Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE Academic Year: 2009/2010  
Faculty: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING Semester: 2  
Module: INTRODUCTION TO COMPUTER SECURITY - CS3235  
Activity Type: TUTORIAL

**Q9 What are the teacher's strengths?**

1. He give further explanation on concepts very well.
2. attentive
3. Willingness to repeat or explain thoroughly concepts and ideas. Very approachable.
4. A brief review before going through the tutorial questions is good.
5. Detailed in explanations.
6. Nil.
7. -
8. same
9. Encourages participation and class discussion. Clearly explains the questions and recommended answers. Takes the effort to get to know the students personally.
10. N.A.
11. Recap the concepts again when begin the tutorial which bring back our memory for the tutorial question.
12. Explain concepts with clarity. Approachable after class.
13. He is friendly, approachable. Helps us to have a better understanding of the concept.
14. Fun (Tell jokes to help us understand better) give real-word example so we can better relate to the concepts taught.

**Q10 What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?**

1. detail more certians parts and always give more demonstrations :)
2. N.A
3. Nil
4. nil
5. Post the slides of the review done at the start of tutorial to IVLE.
6. Focus less on giving too much theory concepts.
7. Nil.
8. -
9. same
10. Ending the lesson a little earlier den exactly on the hour mark will be good. Even though I am unaffected as I do not have any lessons after the tutorial, some students might have to travel to the other side of campus for lessons after the tutorial.
11. N.A.
12. More interaction time for the security news update that is relevent to the module.
13. Group discussions of cases in class is less productive, as the group is only 2 and can be large and

hard to maintain. Suggest smaller groups of 4-5 so that discussion can be more productive.

14. nil

15. Speak a little slower, some times hard to get what you are saying



## STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member:	LIANG ZHENKAI	Academic Year:	2009/2010
Department:	COMPUTER SCIENCE	Semester:	2
Faculty:	SCHOOL OF COMPUTING		
Module Code:	CS3235	No of Nominations:	6

1. He is approachable and friendly. Computer security is a difficult subject, but he has put in many efforts in making the subject more interesting and easier to learn.
2. teach the module very well
3. Clear idea and easy to consulate.
4. He shows alot effort in trying to make the module as easy to understand as possible. Computer security is a module that is not usually very interesting but he show realistic example make it easier to understand. He tried his very best possible to help the student to understand all the theory.

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.