




Q01 The lecturer produced classes that were well organised

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	0	1	8	11	9
%	0	0	3	28	38	31


RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	4.10 - 4.62
%Agr	Tot: 29
69	Valid N: 29
	Avg: 3.97



Q02 The lecturer presented material in an interesting way

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	1	2	5	14	7
%	0	3	7	17	48	24


RIGs	Mid 50%
Med	3.81 - 4.50
%Agr	Tot: 29
72	Valid N: 29
	Avg: 3.83



Q03 The lecturer gave adequate feedback on my work

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	1	3	8	9	8
%	0	3	10	28	31	28


RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	3.80 - 4.41
%Agr	Tot: 29
59	Valid N: 29
	Avg: 3.69



Q04 The lecturer treated students with respect

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	1	0	2	10	16
%	0	3	0	7	34	55


RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	4.45 - 4.81
%Agr	Tot: 29
89	Valid N: 29
	Avg: 4.38



Q05 The lecturer seemed to know the course well

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	0	0	4	11	14
%	0	0	0	14	38	48


RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	4.48 - 4.85
%Agr	Tot: 29
86	Valid N: 29
	Avg: 4.34



Q06 The lecturer communicated his/her enthusiasm for the course

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	0	2	4	13	10
%	0	0	7	14	45	34


RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	4.27 - 4.75
%Agr	Tot: 29
79	Valid N: 29
	Avg: 4.07



Q07 The lecturer emphasised thinking rather than just memorising

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	1	0	2	14	12
%	0	3	0	7	48	41


RIGs	Mid 50%
Med	4.13 - 4.67
%Agr	Tot: 29
89	Valid N: 29
	Avg: 4.24



Q08 The lecturer gave explanations that were clear

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	1	2	8	10	8
%	0	3	7	28	34	28


RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	3.92 - 4.50
%Agr	Tot: 29
62	Valid N: 29
	Avg: 3.76



Q09 The lecturer was available for consultation

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	2	0	0	4	10	13
%	7	0	0	14	34	45


RIGs	Mid 50%
Med	4.00 - 4.52
%Agr	Tot: 29
79	Valid N: 27
	Avg: 4.33



Q10 The lecturer helped me to improve my learning skills

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	1	2	1	6	12	7
%	3	7	3	21	41	24

RIGs	Mid 50%
Med	3.71 - 4.32
%Agr	Tot: 29
65	Valid N: 28
	Avg: 3.75




For overall item: 1=Very Poor; 3=Satisfactory; 5=Outstanding; For all other items: 1=SD (Strongly Disagree); 2=D (Disagree); 3=N (Neutral); 4=A (Agree); 5=SA (Strongly Agree); For all items: 0=Not Applicable



Q11 The course has fulfilled the stated objectives

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	0	2	5	13	9
%	0	0	7	17	45	31


RIGs	Mid 50%
Med	3.91 - 4.35
Tot:	29
Valid N:	29
Avg:	4.00
%Agr	76



Q12 The workload was appropriate for the credit point value of the course

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	0	2	8	12	7
%	0	0	7	28	41	24


RIGs	Mid 50%
Med	3.76 - 4.30
Tot:	29
Valid N:	29
Avg:	3.83
%Agr	65



Q13 Assessment requirements and marking criteria were made clear at the beginning of this course

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	2	3	6	9	9
%	0	7	10	21	31	31


RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	3.96 - 4.45
Tot:	29
Valid N:	29
Avg:	3.69
%Agr	62



Q14 I have achieved the graduate attributes which the course aimed to develop (e.g. oral / written communication, team work, critical thinking, problem solving)

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	2	0	7	13	7
%	0	7	0	24	45	24


RIGs	Mid 50%
Med	3.71 - 4.20
Tot:	29
Valid N:	29
Avg:	3.79
%Agr	69



Q15 The course was well administered (e.g. sufficient resources were available when needed)

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	0	4	6	10	9
%	0	0	14	21	34	31


RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	3.84 - 4.39
Tot:	29
Valid N:	29
Avg:	3.83
%Agr	65



Q16 Overall I was satisfied with the quality of this course

	NA	SD	D	N	A	SA
No.	0	2	3	4	13	7
%	0	7	10	14	45	24

RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	3.91 - 4.44
Tot:	29
Valid N:	29
Avg:	3.69
%Agr	69



Q20 All things considered, how would you rate this staff member's overall effectiveness as a university teacher?

	NA	Poor	Avg	Excel		
No.	0	1	0	5	15	6
%	0	4	0	19	56	22

RIGs	Mid 50%
Lo	4.06 - 4.63
Tot:	27
Valid N:	27
Avg:	3.93
%Agr	78

