University of Bangkok, Thailand | School of Communication Arts

TO: Mr. Kwanta
FROM: Steven Wong
CC: Dr. Chayo, Academic Committee Chairperson
DATE: August 12, 2018
SUBJECT: Lecturer Development Program Stipend

The Teaching Effectiveness Questionnaire Survey is distributed to students at the end of the term to assess teaching effectiveness. Academic Committee uses the results to guide them to allocate funds for professional development. The Communication Arts Department selected you for the lecturer development stipend. The award based on the following three criteria: (1) a master's degree (2) successful completion of one year of service and (3) positive survey results which are lecturer's mean rating has exceeded the department mean score on seven out of the ten items. Once again, congratulations on your achievement. Also, I will discuss the results of your surveys.

Based on your scoring, the students felt the instructor prepared for the class. The syllabus clearly stated the requirement in the course and the learning objective was clear. Your presentation was done nicely and made the class interesting due to the nature of the material. Also, the graded tests and homework returned in a reasonable time. Lastly, students will recommend this course and you to other students.

The following three areas needed some improvement. You did not do a good job to encourage participation and questions from the students. Students felt your replies to their questions were not thorough enough. You could have improved the availability of consultation outside of class hours.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact me at swong@njcu.edu.

Sincerely,

Steven Wong

Steven Wong

```
                              The Questionnaire
Instructions: Use the following scale to complete this questionnaire.

 1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Neither agree nor disagree
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree

Indicate your response to each item by circling the appropriate number. When you have completed
the questionnaire, please give it to the research assistant who is monitoring this evaluation.

 1. I had a clear understanding of what I was expected to learn.              1 2 3 4 5

 2. The course syllabus clearly stated what was required in the course.       1 2 3 4 5

 3. The instructor encouraged participation and questions from students.      1 2 3 4 5

 4. The instructor answered students' question in a through manner.           1 2 3 4 5

 5. Course material was presented in an understandable manner.               1 2 3 4 5

 6. The instructor appeared well prepared for each class.                     1 2 3 4 5

 7. Considering the nature of the material, the instructor made the class interesting.  1 2 3 4 5

 8. The instructor returned graded tests and homework within a reasonable time.  1 2 3 4 5

 9. The instructor was available for consultation outside of class hours.     1 2 3 4 5

 10. I would recommend this course and instructor to another student.         1 2 3 4 5
```

Table 1

Teaching Effectiveness Questionnaire Response Summary

| Item No. | Distribution of Responses | | | | | Total | Mean | | Difference |
	1	2	3	4	5		Kwanta (1)	Group (2)	
1	2	5	10	23	19	59	3.88	3.70	0.18
2	2	3	7	15	32	59	4.22	4.13	0.09
3	3	2	18	20	16	59	3.75	3.85	**-0.10**
4	2	2	13	21	21	59	3.97	4.03	**-0.06**
5	2	2	7	28	20	59	4.05	4.02	0.03
6	2	2	40	10	5	59	3.24	2.81	0.43
7	2	2	11	22	22	59	4.02	3.92	0.10
8	2	6	17	17	17	59	3.69	3.59	0.10
9	3	2	12	24	18	59	3.88	4.32	**-0.44**
10	3	2	15	24	15	59	3.78	3.52	0.26

Note. (1) Computer class mean and (2) Group mean represents the mean for all instructors in the department. Group mean > Kwanta mean are in boldface.