## STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER



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 (Laboratory) within the department.
(b) the mean score of same activity type (Laboratory), at the same module level (level 3000 ) within the department.
5. Fac. Avg Score :
(c) the mean score of same activity type (Laboratory) within the faculty.
(d) the mean score of same activity type (Laboratory), at the same module level (level 3000) within the faculty.

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ON TEACHER

| Faculty Member: | ANAND BHOJAN |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Department: | COMPUTER SCIENCE | Academic Year: | $2013 / 2014$ |
| Faculty: | SCHOOL OF COMPUTING | Semester: | 1 |
| Module: | COMPUTER NETWORKS LABORATORY - CS3103L |  |  |

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


Nos. of Respondents(\% of Respondents)

| ITEMISCORE | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self | 4 (40.00\%) | 5 (50.00\%) | 1 (10.00\%) | 0 (.00\%) | 0 (.00\%) |

Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Laboratory), at the \| 21 (19.27\%) 60 (55.05\%) 27 (24.77\%) 0 (.00\%) 1 (.92\%) same level within Department
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Laboratory), at the \| 21 (19.27\%) 60 (55.05\%) 27 (24.77\%) 0 (.00\%) 1 (.92\%) same level within Faculty

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


## Self

Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within
$\square$ Department
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within $\square$ Faculty

Nos. of Respondents(\% of Respondents)

| ITEMISCORE | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self | 5 (50.00\%) | 4 (40.00\%) | 1 (10.00\%) | 0 (.00\%) | 0 (.00\%) |

Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Laboratory), at the \| 24 (22.02\%) 52 (47.71\%) 32 (29.36\%) 0 (.00\%) 1 (.92\%) same level within Department
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Laboratory), at the \| 24 (22.02\%) 52 (47.71\%) 32 (29.36\%) 0 (.00\%) 1 (.92\%) same level within Faculty

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


## Self

Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within
$\square$ Department
Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within $\square$ Faculty

Nos. of Respondents(\% of Respondents)

| ITEMISCORE | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self | 5 (50.00\%) | 4 (40.00\%) | 1 (10.00\%) | 0 (.00\%) | 0 (.00\%) |
| Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Laboratory), at the same level within Department | \| 29 (26.61\%) | 60 (55.05\%) | 17 (15.60\%) | 2 (1.83\%) | 1 (.92\%) |
| Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Laboratory), at the same level within Faculty | \| 29 (26.61\%) | 60 (55.05\%) | 17 (15.60\%) | 2 (1.83\%) | 1 (.92\%) |

## STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON TEACHER

| Faculty Member: | ANAND BHOJAN |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Department: | COMPUTER SCIENCE | Academic Year: | $2013 / 2014$ |
| Faculty: | SCHOOL OF COMPUTING | Semester: | 1 |
| Module: | COMPUTER NETWORKS LABORATORY - CS3103L |  |  |
| Activity Type: | LABORATORY |  |  |

## What are the teacher's strengths? (4 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 knows the course content very well and takes the time to explain the concepts and theory to students who don't understand the networking protocols or if the content hasn't yet been taught in the main CS3103 lecture which is commendable
2. enthusiastic about teaching, provides adequate feedback to students

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. Can communicate his ideas very well, clear and concise explanations.
2. Passionate. Very helpful. Doesn't throw students to go and die on their own.

What improvements would you suggest to the teacher? (1 comments)
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. Keep up the good work

## STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

| Faculty Member: | ANAND BHOJAN |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Department: | COMPUTER SCIENCE | Academic Year: | $2013 / 2014$ |
| Faculty: | SCHOOL OF COMPUTING | Semester: | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Module Code: | CS3103L | No of Nominations: 3 |  |

1. He power-leveled me.
