

Question		Frequency	%	Cum %
I received accurate information about what the paper would involve	Always 1	13	32.5%	32.5%
	Usually 2	22	55.0%	87.5%
	Sometimes 3	5	12.5%	100.0%
	Seldom 4	0	0.0%	
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
	Mean: 1.8		40	100.0%
The paper's objectives (learning outcomes) were stated clearly	Always 1	13	33.3%	33.3%
	Usually 2	23	59.0%	92.3%
	Sometimes 3	3	7.7%	100.0%
	Seldom 4	0	0.0%	
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
	Mean: 1.7		39	100.0%
The assessment tasks were a fair test of my learning in this paper	Always 1	10	25.0%	25.0%
	Usually 2	17	42.5%	67.5%
	Sometimes 3	10	25.0%	92.5%
	Seldom 4	3	7.5%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
	Mean: 2.2		40	100.0%
I was able to access required learning resources when I needed them	Always 1	17	42.5%	42.5%
	Usually 2	16	40.0%	82.5%
	Sometimes 3	5	12.5%	95.0%
	Seldom 4	2	5.0%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
	Mean: 1.8		40	100.0%
The paper was well organised and ran smoothly	Always 1	13	32.5%	32.5%
	Usually 2	18	45.0%	77.5%
	Sometimes 3	7	17.5%	95.0%
	Seldom 4	2	5.0%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
	Mean: 2.0		40	100.0%
I was given enough time to learn the things I had to learn	Always 1	17	42.5%	42.5%
	Usually 2	14	35.0%	77.5%
	Sometimes 3	5	12.5%	90.0%
	Seldom 4	3	7.5%	97.5%
	Never 5	1	2.5%	100.0%
	Mean: 1.9		40	100.0%
The paper was intellectually stimulating	Always 1	18	45.0%	45.0%
	Usually 2	19	47.5%	92.5%
	Sometimes 3	3	7.5%	100.0%
	Seldom 4	0	0.0%	
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
	Mean: 1.6		40	100.0%
Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of this paper	Always 1	13	32.5%	32.5%
	Usually 2	22	55.0%	87.5%
	Sometimes 3	4	10.0%	97.5%
	Seldom 4	1	2.5%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
	Mean: 1.8		40	100.0%

Question		Frequency	%	Cum %
Citizenship	NZ citizen 1	10	37.0%	37.0%
	Australian citizen 2	0	0.0%	37.0%
	Permanent resident 3	2	7.4%	44.4%
	International student 4	15	55.6%	100.0%
		27	100.0%	100.0%
For my programme of study, this paper is	Compulsory 1	4	26.7%	26.7%
	Optional 2	11	73.3%	100.0%
		15	100.0%	100.0%

TEACHING DEVELOPMENT

FINA415-09B (HAM) Computer Modelling in Finance

TEACHING - Kurt Hess (sole-taught)

TEACHING APPRAISAL RESULTS

Overall teaching effectiveness = 1.8 (n=38)

Other ratings range from 1.7 to 2.1 (n≥37)

Nov-09

Total number of questionnaires analysed = 40

Students enrolled = 93

Response rate 43%

Question		Frequency	%	Cum %
This teacher was enthusiastic about what they were teaching Mean: 1.7	Always 1	17	44.7%	44.7%
	Usually 2	17	44.7%	89.5%
	Sometimes 3	4	10.5%	100.0%
	Seldom 4	0	0.0%	
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
			38	100.0%
This teacher was good at explaining things Mean: 2.1	Always 1	8	21.6%	21.6%
	Usually 2	21	56.8%	78.4%
	Sometimes 3	5	13.5%	91.9%
	Seldom 4	3	8.1%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
			37	100.0%
This teacher made it clear what they expected of me Mean: 2.0	Always 1	11	28.9%	28.9%
	Usually 2	18	47.4%	76.3%
	Sometimes 3	7	18.4%	94.7%
	Seldom 4	2	5.3%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
			38	100.0%
This teacher gave me helpful feedback on how I was going Mean: 2.0	Always 1	16	42.1%	42.1%
	Usually 2	12	31.6%	73.7%
	Sometimes 3	6	15.8%	89.5%
	Seldom 4	3	7.9%	97.4%
	Never 5	1	2.6%	100.0%
			38	100.0%
This teacher encouraged me to get actively involved in learning tasks Mean: 1.9	Always 1	13	34.2%	34.2%
	Usually 2	20	52.6%	86.8%
	Sometimes 3	2	5.3%	92.1%
	Seldom 4	3	7.9%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
			38	100.0%
This teacher made the subject interesting Mean: 2.1	Always 1	12	31.6%	31.6%
	Usually 2	15	39.5%	71.1%
	Sometimes 3	8	21.1%	92.1%
	Seldom 4	3	7.9%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
			38	100.0%
This teacher was approachable when advice or help was required Mean: 1.9	Always 1	17	44.7%	44.7%
	Usually 2	12	31.6%	76.3%
	Sometimes 3	6	15.8%	92.1%
	Seldom 4	3	7.9%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
			38	100.0%
Overall, this teacher was effective Mean: 1.8	Always 1	15	39.5%	39.5%
	Usually 2	16	42.1%	81.6%
	Sometimes 3	6	15.8%	97.4%
	Seldom 4	1	2.6%	100.0%
	Never 5	0	0.0%	
			38	100.0%