

17th August 2005

To: All Faculty

From: David Wilson
Associate Dean (Education)

Subject: **Teaching and Learning Update, Autumn 2005**

Learning and Teaching Performance Fund

Stage 2 of the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund for 2005 has now been implemented by DEST. UTS been advised of our weighted scores and rankings on the seven criteria used by DEST to arrive at an overall assessment of our performance in teaching and learning. The data used is from 2004 and in most cases relates to 2003 performance. UTS scored very well on two categories (overall student satisfaction and student attrition), creditably on three, and disappointingly on two (good teaching and students in full-time employment). The Australian newspaper published an aggregation of all the Australian university results which ranked UTS 18th overall, 1st of the ATN universities and 5th in NSW. The PVC Teaching and Learning, Professor Richard Johnstone, comments that “this is a creditable result, particularly when we take into account some factors that in our view particularly affect the chances of ATN universities achieving a high overall score by this method. It is very unlikely however that we will be in the band that qualifies for a share of the \$54m in funding under the scheme for 2005”.

There is a further stage of the process: all universities have been invited to comment on their results by 26 August, and in particular to identify areas where they think that the results do not accurately reflect their actual performance. UTS will be making such a submission, drawing attention in particular to: (a) alternative data that contradicts the CEQ result by demonstrating very high levels of student satisfaction with the quality of teaching at UTS; and (b) evidence that the recent fall in Graduate Workplace Success not only followed a period of very high results but is now picking up again, suggesting that the year's data used by DEST for this calculation was atypical.

The disappointing UTS result on students gaining full-time employment may surprise some. Please bear in mind that the ‘raw’ results were adjusted according to the local employment market (Sydney-based universities had their raw score downgraded, whilst rural universities had their score boosted).

Teaching Feedback Autumn 2005

This report contains a summary of the Autumn 2005 Student Feedback Survey (SFS). The ratings shown are either the average of a 5 point Likert scale or percentages of responses against points on a 5 point Likert scale.

When reviewing the survey results, please note that the new Student Feedback Survey (SFS) was introduced in Autumn 2005. This contained six items carried forward from the previous Subject Feedback Survey:

- 1 The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives
- 2 My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking
- 3 I found the assessment fair and reasonable
- 4 There were appropriate resources available to support the subject
- 5 I received constructive feedback when needed
- 6 Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject

... plus two new questions introduced by the Faculty:

- 10 The tutorials assisted my understanding of this subject
- 11 The laboratories assisted my understanding of this subject

There are also three new questions related to teaching, but these are only to be published at the aggregate level of Faculty and UTS, not for an individual subject.

Comment by Subject

In the Autumn 2005 SFS, the following subjects have been identified as producing outstanding results (overall satisfaction 4.0 or greater; no rating below 3.5; responses 20 or greater; percentage response greater than 50%):

Sub Code	Subject Name	Question							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	10	11
31096	Managing Client/Vendor Relations	4.4	4.5	4.1	3.7	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.8
31099	Distributed Database Prog and Admin	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.3	3.9	3.8
32144	IT Research Preparation	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.4	4.0	3.9	4.0
32520	UNIX Systems Administration	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
32524	LANs and Routing	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1
32531	Global Information Systems	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.7	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.0

Congratulations to the relevant Subject Coordinators (and other lecturing and tutoring staff): Bernard Wong (31096), Laurie Benkovich (31099), Teresa Dovey (ELSSA) (32144), Wayne Brookes (32520), Priya Nanda (32524), and Daniel Chandran (32531).

The following subjects have similar outstanding results in ratings, but do not meet the qualifying criteria specified above (i.e. number of responses, response rate and/or results on the two Faculty questions):

Sub Code	Subject Name	Question							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	10	11
31005	Introduction to Game Programming	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0
31034	Advanced Communication for IT	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.6
31100	Enterprise Dev with .NET Framework	4.3	4.4	3.9	3.6	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.9
31603	3D Computer Animation	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.8	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.8
31605	Comp Graphics Rendering Techniques	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.0
31904	Systems Programming	4.7	4.3	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.3	4.0
32003	Computer Game Design	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.0
32006	Information Technology Governance	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.6
32124	e-Business Project Management	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.6
32544	Advanced Image Synthesis Techniques	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.5
32549	Advanced Internet Programming	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.2	3.6	3.6
32551	IT Service Management and Standards	4.1	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.7	2.9

Sub Code	Subject Name	Question							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	10	11
32601	Advanced Project Management	4.1	4.4	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.0	3.9	3.5
32702	Contemporary Telecommunications	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1	3.7	3.4
95569	Digital Media Project	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.5

Congratulations to the relevant Subject Coordinators (and other lecturing and tutoring staff): Yusuf Pisan (31004 and 32003), Ross Foreman (ELSSA) (31034), Jim Underwood (31100), Kevin Suffern (31603, 31605 and 32544), Qiang Wu (31904), Ken Dovey (32006 and 32551), David Wilson (32124), Robert Steele (32549), Chris S Johnson (32601), Valerie Gay (32702), and Grant Matthews (IML) (95569).

The number of subjects receiving high ratings is very positive and reflects the efforts being made to improve the Faculty's teaching and learning. In Autumn 2004, only one subject had outstanding results and met the criteria (seven in Spring 2004 and six in Autumn 2005), while five subjects had outstanding results but did not meet all the criteria (eight in Spring 2004 and fifteen in Autumn 2005). In summary, 21 subjects have been noted in Autumn 2005 compared to 15 in Spring 2004 and 6 in Autumn 2004 – a very good result.

Comment on Overall Faculty Results

The new Student Feedback Survey (SFS) was introduced in Autumn 2005. This contained six items carried forward from the previous Subject Feedback Survey and these items have historical data that enable trend comparisons to be made. The new SFS also contains three new questions related to teaching which have no trend data. The Faculty also introduced two new questions:

- The tutorials assisted my understanding of the subject
- The laboratories assisted my understanding of the subject

The tables below contain results for the six items in common with previous surveys, including historical trends, plus results for the three new teaching questions and the two new Faculty questions, both without trend data.

With respect to the average scores, the Autumn 2005 SFS results show that the university results are largely levelling off (all items consistent with Spring 2004 except '*I found the assessment fair and reasonable*' which dropped from 3.8 to 3.7, and '*I received constructive feedback when needed*' which also dropped from 3.8 to 3.7), while the Faculty results are also largely consistent with Spring 2004, except '*The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives*' which improved from 3.6 to 3.7 and '*My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking*' which dropped from 3.6 to 3.5. The improvement in consistency with stated objectives can probably be attributed to the Faculty's continued efforts in improving Subject Outlines. Also, maintaining results in the area of assessment when university results have fallen is positive given that this is a Faculty priority. Overall, on this measure, the Faculty has maintained its improvement against the university averages, albeit narrowly.

The average scores on the 5 point Likert scale compared with previous surveys are as follows ("U" indicates that a previous Faculty study was primarily undergraduate; "P" indicates that a previous Faculty study was primarily postgraduate):

	S 2001 (U)	S 2003 (P)	A 2004 (U)	S 2004 (U+P)	A 2005 (U+P)
1 The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives	3.3 (3.9)	3.7 (3.9)	3.5 (3.8)	3.6 (3.9)	3.7 (3.9)
2 My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking	3.1 (3.5)	3.6 (3.8)	3.4 (3.8)	3.6 (3.8)	3.5 (3.8)
3 I found the assessment fair and reasonable	3.2 (3.6)	3.6 (3.8)	3.3 (3.7)	3.5 (3.8)	3.5 (3.7)
4 There were appropriate resources available to support the subject	3.0 (3.6)	3.5 (3.6)	3.3 (3.6)	3.4 (3.7)	3.4 (3.7)
5 I received constructive feedback when needed	3.0 (3.4)	3.6 (3.7)	3.3 (3.7)	3.5 (3.8)	3.5 (3.7)
6 Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject	3.1 (3.4)	3.5 (3.8)	3.4 (3.8)	3.5 (3.8)	3.5 (3.8)
7 The teacher appears to be well prepared and presents the material in a well organised manner					3.8 (4.1)
8 The teacher is able to explain concepts clearly					3.7 (4.0)
9 Overall, I am satisfied with the teaching of this staff member					3.6 (4.0)
10 The tutorials assisted my understanding of this subject					3.5
11 The laboratories assisted my understanding of this subject					3.5

[UTS averages shown in parenthesis]

With respect to the percentages of students agreeing / disagreeing, the Autumn 2005 SFS results show a slightly different picture with the Faculty falling further below the overall university performance. The university results show consistent and uniform improvement on all questions: all 'agreeing percentages' are up while all 'disagreeing percentages' are down. The Faculty picture is more mixed. On the positive side, the Faculty has recorded its best ever results for 'The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives', 'My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking', and 'There were appropriate resources available to support the subject'. The questions on assessment show little change from Spring 2004 with a slight rise in students strongly agreeing / agreeing offset by the small rise in students strongly disagreeing / disagreeing. Despite these results the Faculty's overall satisfaction rating fell.

The percentages of responses against points on the 5 point Likert scale compared with previous surveys are as follows ("U" indicates that a previous Faculty study was primarily undergraduate; "P" indicates that a previous Faculty study was primarily postgraduate):

	S 2001 (U)		S2003 (P)		A 2004 (U)		S 2004 (U+P)		A 2005 (U+P)	
	% SA/A	% SD/D	% SA/A	% SD/D	% SA/A	% SD/D	% SA/A	% SD/D	% SA/A	% SD/D
1	50 (68)	19 (9)	65 (72)	13 (8)	58 (70)	14 (9)	64 (73)	11 (7)	67 (78)	9 (4)
2	42 (62)	30 (15)	57 (67)	18 (11)	49 (64)	25 (13)	57 (67)	15 (12)	59 (71)	17 (10)
3	47 (61)	23 (14)	57 (64)	15 (11)	47 (63)	24 (12)	55 (66)	16 (12)	57 (67)	18 (10)
4	38 (55)	31 (18)	54 (59)	21 (14)	48 (60)	24 (15)	54 (62)	22 (14)	54 (65)	19 (11)
5	36 (42)	27 (17)	57 (60)	15 (13)	52 (59)	22 (14)	53 (62)	16 (12)	54 (64)	17 (11)
6	44 (64)	28 (14)	57 (68)	18 (11)	52 (66)	22 (12)	59 (69)	15 (11)	58 (70)	17 (10)
7									69 (79)	13 (7)
8									64 (77)	15 (9)
9									64 (77)	15 (8)
10									57	18
11									56	16

[UTS averages shown in parenthesis]

Summary

Overall, Autumn 2005 is probably best described as a period of consolidation. The Faculty has largely maintained its position versus UTS averages whilst recording best ever results in three areas: *'The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives'*, *'My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking'*, and *'There were appropriate resources available to support the subject'*. Also, there are more subjects than ever before recording commendable results: 21 subjects have been noted in Autumn 2005 compared to 15 in Spring 2004 and 6 in Autumn 2004.

The new teaching questions are rather difficult to interpret without trend data. The only observation I can make is that they seem to be below the UTS averages by about the same scale as the other measures. More meaningful interpretation will be possible at the end of 2006 when we have three semesters of results.

Thank you for your efforts in Autumn 2005. The positive results are as a direct result of your efforts. The Faculty Quality Committee will review these results to identify the key improvement actions for the coming semesters.

If you have any questions regarding these results, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Student Feedback Results : Autumn 2005

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	18:00 - 31/05/2005
Subject Code: 31002	No. Enrolled: 30
Subject Name: Game Design	No. of Responses: 18

Order No: 34	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
1. It was always easy to know the standard of work expected.	3.4 (0.8)	1	SA	6
		8	A	44
		7	N	39
		2	D	11
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
2. The subject developed my problem solving skills.	3.4 (0.9)	1	SA	6
		8	A	47
		5	N	29
		3	D	18
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
3. The teaching staff on this subject motivated me to do my best work.	3.6 (0.9)	2	SA	12
		9	A	53
		3	N	18
		3	D	18
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
4. The workload was too heavy.	3.2 (0.9)	1	SA	6
		6	A	33
		7	N	39
		4	D	22
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
5. The subject sharpened my analytic skills.	3.5 (0.9)	1	SA	6
		10	A	56
		5	N	28
		1	D	6
		1	SD	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
6. I usually had a clear idea of where I was going and what was expected of me in this subject.	3.4 (1.0)	1	SA	6
		9	A	50
		5	N	28
		2	D	11
		1	SD	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
7. Staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work.	3.2 (0.7)	1	SA	6
		4	A	22
		11	N	61
		2	D	11
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
8. To do well on this subject all you really needed was a good memory.	2.0 (0.8)	0	SA	0
		1	A	6
		3	N	17
		9	D	50
		5	SD	28
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
9. The subject helped me to develop my ability to work as a team member.	3.1 (1.1)	1	SA	6
		6	A	33
		7	N	39
		2	D	11
		2	SD	11
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results : Autumn 2005

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	18:00 - 31/05/2005
Subject Code: 31002	No. Enrolled: 30
Subject Name: Game Design	No. of Responses: 18

Order No: 34	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
10. As a result of my subject, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems.	3.3 (0.8)	1	SA	6
		6	A	35
		7	N	41
		3	D	18
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
11. The subject improved my skills in written communication.	3.5 (0.9)	2	SA	12
		6	A	35
		7	N	41
		2	D	12
		0	SD	0
		1	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
12. Staff seemed more interested in testing what I had memorised than what I had understood.	2.4 (1.1)	0	SA	0
		3	A	18
		4	N	24
		6	D	35
		4	SD	24
		1	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
13. It was often hard to discover what was expected of me in this subject.	2.9 (1.1)	1	SA	6
		5	A	28
		4	N	22
		7	D	39
		1	SD	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
14. I was generally given enough time to understand the things I had to learn.	3.7 (0.8)	2	SA	11
		10	A	56
		4	N	22
		2	D	11
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
15. The staff made a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work.	3.4 (1.0)	2	SA	11
		7	A	39
		7	N	39
		1	D	6
		1	SD	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
16. The assessment methods employed in this subject required an in-depth understanding.	3.4 (0.8)	1	SA	6
		8	A	44
		6	N	33
		3	D	17
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
17. Teaching staff normally gave me helpful feedback on how I was going.	3.4 (0.8)	1	SA	6
		7	A	39
		8	N	44
		2	D	11
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
18. My lecturer(s) were extremely good at explaining things.	3.3 (1.1)	2	SA	11
		6	A	33
		8	N	44
		0	D	0
		2	SD	11
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results : Autumn 2005

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	18:00 - 31/05/2005
Subject Code: 31002	No. Enrolled: 30
Subject Name: Game Design	No. of Responses: 18

Order No: 34	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
19. Too many questions asked were just about facts.	2.4 (0.9)	0	SA	0
		1	A	7
		7	N	47
		4	D	27
		3	SD	20
		3	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
20. Teaching staff worked hard to make this subject interesting.	4.0 (0.8)	4	SA	22
		11	A	61
		2	N	11
		1	D	6
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
21. There was a lot of pressure on me as a student in this subject.	2.8 (0.7)	0	SA	0
		2	A	11
		11	N	61
		4	D	22
		1	SD	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
22. This subject helped me to develop my ability to plan my own work.	3.5 (0.8)	0	SA	0
		11	A	61
		6	N	33
		0	D	0
		1	SD	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
23. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this subject meant that it couldn't all be thoroughly comprehended.	2.9 (0.8)	0	SA	0
		4	A	22
		10	N	56
		3	D	17
		1	SD	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
24. The staff made it clear from the start what was expected of students.	3.4 (0.7)	1	SA	6
		5	A	29
		10	N	59
		1	D	6
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
25. Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject.	3.7 (1.0)	3	SA	17
		9	A	50
		4	N	22
		1	D	6
		1	SD	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results : Autumn 2005

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	18:00 - 31/05/2005
Subject Code: 31002	No. Enrolled: 30
Subject Name: Game Design	No. of Responses: 18

Order No: 34	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
26. All things considered, how would you rate the teaching of this lecturer in this subject?	4.8 (1.3)	2	E	11
		3	VG	17
		7	G	39
		3	S	17
		2	NQS	11
		1	P	6
		0	VP	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
27. All things considered, how would you rate this subject?	4.6 (1.5)	1	E	6
		3	VG	17
		7	G	39
		4	S	22
		1	NQS	6
		1	P	6
		1	VP	6
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	

Scale:	VP	P	NQS	S	G	VG	E
	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Not Quite Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory (4)	Good (5)	Very Good (6)	Excellent (7)

Student Feedback Results : Autumn 2005

Subject Coordinator's Name: Yusuf Pisan	00:00 - 01/01/2005
Subject Code: 32003	No. Enrolled: 7
Subject Name: Computer Game Design	No. of Responses: 3

Order No: 278	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
1. The subject was delivered in a way which was consistent with its stated objectives.	4.7 (0.6)	2	SA	67
			A	33
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0
2. My learning experiences in this subject were interesting and thought provoking.	4.7 (0.6)	2	SA	67
			A	33
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0
3. I found the assessment fair and reasonable.	4.7 (0.6)	2	SA	67
			A	33
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0
4. There were appropriate resources available to support the subject.	4.7 (0.6)	2	SA	67
			A	33
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0
5. I received constructive feedback when needed.	4.7 (0.6)	2	SA	67
			A	33
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0
6. The teacher appears to be well prepared and presents the material in a well organised manner.	4.7 (0.6)	2	SA	67
			A	33
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0
7. The teacher is able to explain concepts clearly.	4.7 (0.6)	2	SA	67
			A	33
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0
8. Overall, I am satisfied with the teaching of this staff member.	4.7 (0.6)	2	SA	67
			A	33
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0
9. Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject.	4.3 (0.6)	1	SA	33
			A	67
			N	0
			D	0
			SD	0
			Not Applicable No Response	0

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results : Autumn 2005

Subject Coordinator's Name: Yusuf Pisan	00:00 - 01/01/2005
Subject Code: 32003	No. Enrolled: 7
Subject Name: Computer Game Design	No. of Responses: 3

Order No: 278	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
10. The tutorials assisted my understanding of the subject.	4.3 (0.6)	1	SA	33
		2	A	67
		0	N	0
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable No Response	0
11. The laboratories assisted my understanding of the subject.	4.0 (0.0)	0	SA	0
		3	A	100
		0	N	0
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable No Response	0

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results: Spring 2005

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	18:00 - 08/11/2005
Subject Code: 31004	No. Enrolled: 30
Subject Name: Game Programming	No. of Responses: 11

Order No: 106	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
1. It was always easy to know the standard of work expected.	3.90 (0.57)	1	SA	10
		7	A	70
		2	N	20
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
2. The subject developed my problem solving skills.	4.20 (0.63)	3	SA	30
		6	A	60
		1	N	10
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
3. The teaching staff on this subject motivated me to do my best work.	4.33 (0.50)	3	SA	33
		6	A	67
		0	N	0
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		2	No Response	
4. The workload was too heavy.	3.56 (0.73)	1	SA	11
		3	A	33
		5	N	56
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		2	No Response	
5. The subject sharpened my analytic skills.	3.82 (0.75)	1	SA	9
		8	A	73
		1	N	9
		1	D	9
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
6. I usually had a clear idea of where I was going and what was expected of me in this subject.	3.73 (0.65)	1	SA	9
		6	A	55
		4	N	36
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
7. Staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work.	3.20 (0.63)	0	SA	0
		3	A	30
		6	N	60
		1	D	10
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
8. To do well on this subject all you really needed was a good memory.	2.20 (1.14)	0	SA	0
		2	A	20
		1	N	10
		4	D	40
		3	SD	30
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
9. The subject helped me to develop my ability to work as a team member.	2.57 (1.51)	0	SA	0
		3	A	43
		1	N	14
		0	D	0
		3	SD	43
		3	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results: Spring 2005

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	18:00 - 08/11/2005
Subject Code: 31004	No. Enrolled: 30
Subject Name: Game Programming	No. of Responses: 11

Order No: 106	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
10. As a result of my subject, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems.	3.64 (0.50)	0	SA	0
		7	A	64
		4	N	36
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
11. The subject improved my skills in written communication.	2.70 (0.95)	0	SA	0
		2	A	20
		4	N	40
		3	D	30
		1	SD	10
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
12. Staff seemed more interested in testing what I had memorised than what I had understood.	2.27 (1.49)	1	SA	9
		2	A	18
		1	N	9
		2	D	18
		5	SD	45
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
13. It was often hard to discover what was expected of me in this subject.	2.50 (0.97)	0	SA	0
		2	A	20
		2	N	20
		5	D	50
		1	SD	10
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
14. I was generally given enough time to understand the things I had to learn.	3.30 (0.82)	1	SA	10
		2	A	20
		6	N	60
		1	D	10
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
15. The staff made a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work.	3.90 (0.32)	0	SA	0
		9	A	90
		1	N	10
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
16. The assessment methods employed in this subject required an in-depth understanding.	4.00 (0.94)	3	SA	30
		5	A	50
		1	N	10
		1	D	10
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
17. Teaching staff normally gave me helpful feedback on how I was going.	3.90 (0.32)	0	SA	0
		9	A	90
		1	N	10
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
18. My lecturer(s) were extremely good at explaining things.	3.50 (0.97)	1	SA	10
		5	A	50
		2	N	20
		2	D	20
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results: Spring 2005

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	18:00 - 08/11/2005
Subject Code: 31004	No. Enrolled: 30
Subject Name: Game Programming	No. of Responses: 11

Order No: 106	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
19. Too many questions asked were just about facts.	2.56 (1.13)	0	SA	0
		2	A	22
		3	N	33
		2	D	22
		2	SD	22
		1	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
20. Teaching staff worked hard to make this subject interesting.	3.91 (0.83)	2	SA	18
		7	A	64
		1	N	9
		1	D	9
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
21. There was a lot of pressure on me as a student in this subject.	3.64 (1.12)	3	SA	27
		3	A	27
		3	N	27
		2	D	18
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	
22. This subject helped me to develop my ability to plan my own work.	3.80 (0.42)	0	SA	0
		8	A	80
		2	N	20
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
23. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this subject meant that it couldn't all be thoroughly comprehended.	3.50 (0.97)	2	SA	20
		2	A	20
		5	N	50
		1	D	10
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
24. The staff made it clear from the start what was expected of students.	3.90 (0.57)	1	SA	10
		7	A	70
		2	N	20
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		1	No Response	
25. Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject.	4.00 (0.77)	3	SA	27
		5	A	45
		3	N	27
		0	D	0
		0	SD	0
		0	Not Applicable	
		0	No Response	

Scale:	SD	D	N	A	SA
	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)

Student Feedback Results: Spring 2005

Lecturer's Name: Yusuf Pisan	18:00 - 08/11/2005
Subject Code: 31004	No. Enrolled: 30
Subject Name: Game Programming	No. of Responses: 11

Order No: 106	Mean (SD)	Number of Responses		%
26. All things considered, how would you rate the teaching of this lecturer in this subject?	5.75 (0.71)	1	E	13
		4	VG	50
		3	G	38
		0	S	0
		0	NQS	0
		0	P	0
		0	VP	0
		0	Not Applicable	0
		3	No Response	
27. All things considered, how would you rate this subject?	6.13 (0.99)	4	E	50
		1	VG	13
		3	G	38
		0	S	0
		0	NQS	0
		0	P	0
		0	VP	0
		0	Not Applicable	0
		3	No Response	

Scale:	VP	P	NQS	S	G	VG	E
	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Not Quite Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory (4)	Good (5)	Very Good (6)	Excellent (7)