

Analyzing Data for a Statistical Report

Susan Suarez

New Jersey City University

University of Bangkok

TO: Mr. Kwanta, Lecturer
FROM: Susan Suarez, Faculty
DATE: August 12, 2019
SUBJECT: Lecturer Development Program
CC: Dr. Chayo, Academic Committee Chairperson

The University of Bangkok's lecturer development program offers a stipend for professional development for qualifying lecturers. In order to qualify, lecturers must be employed at this institution for at least one year and receive a mean rating that surpasses the mean for all classes in the Communication Arts Department on a minimum of 7 of the 10 items on the end of term evaluations.

Congratulations, you have qualified for the professional development stipend!

A comparison table is appended to the end of this email and includes the computed ratings and mean. Please see below for your specific questionnaire results and recommendations for professional development. The areas are ranked by the greatest difference from the department.

Strength Areas

Your mean on the following items exceeded the department mean.

Item #6: The instructor appeared well prepared for each class.
Item #10: I would recommend this course and instructor to another student.
Item #1: I had a clear understanding of what I was expected to learn.
Item #7: Considering the nature of the material, the instructor made the class interesting.
Item #8: The instructor returned graded tests and homework within a reasonable time.
Item #2: The course syllabus clearly stated what was required in the course.
Item #5: Course material was presented in an understandable manner.

Growth Areas

Your mean on the following items was less than the department mean.

Item #9: The instructor was available for consultation outside of class hours.
Item #3: The instructor encouraged participation and questions from students
Item #4: The instructor answered students' question in a thorough manner.

Recommendations

The findings illustrate the care you take in preparing for class and your communication of expectations. It is telling that most of your students would recommend your course. Your hard work is noted and appreciated.

To further improve performance, it is recommended you focus on your availability outside of class hours. Consider establishing office hours or digital consultations through email or the online discussion board. Additionally, seek professional development with a focus on formative assessment and classroom discussion to increase student engagement and understanding and to improve your questioning strategies.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions regarding the results.

Table 1

Teaching Effectiveness Questionnaire Response Summary

Distribution of Responses								
Item Number	1	2	3	4	5	Kwanta (1)	Department (2)	Difference
1	2	5	10	23	19	3.88	3.70	0.18
2	2	3	7	15	32	4.22	4.13	0.09
3	3	2	18	20	16	3.75	3.85	-0.10
4	2	2	13	21	21	3.97	4.03	-0.06
5	2	2	7	28	20	4.05	4.02	0.03
6	2	2	10	10	5	3.48	2.81	0.67
7	2	2	11	22	22	4.02	3.92	0.10
8	2	6	17	17	17	3.69	3.59	0.10
9	3	2	12	24	18	3.88	4.32	-0.44
10	3	2	15	24	15	3.78	3.52	0.26

Note: (1) Computer class mean and (2) Department mean represents the mean for all instructors in the department.

University of Bangkok

TO: Dr. Chayo, Academic Committee Chairperson

FROM: Susan Suarez, Faculty

DATE: August 12, 2019

SUBJECT: Critique of Mr. Kwanta

The purpose of this memo is to notify you of Mr. Kwanta's automatic approval of the professional development stipend and to offer findings based on the end of term student evaluations.

Findings

Mr. Kwanta's results show he is perceived to be well prepared for class and clearly communicates his expectations. Most of his students would recommend his class.

The most significant area for improvement is a perceived lack of availability after class hours. Additionally, some students indicate he neither encourages nor adequately addresses his questions. Overall, the results illustrate he is an asset to the department with a few related areas in need of improvement.

Table 1
Teaching Effectiveness Questionnaire Response Summary

Distribution of Responses								
Item Number	1	2	3	4	5	Kwanta (1)	Department (2)	Difference
1	2	5	10	23	19	3.88	3.70	0.18
2	2	3	7	15	32	4.22	4.13	0.09
3	3	2	18	20	16	3.75	3.85	-0.10
4	2	2	13	21	21	3.97	4.03	-0.06
5	2	2	7	28	20	4.05	4.02	0.03
6	2	2	10	10	5	3.48	2.81	0.67
7	2	2	11	22	22	4.02	3.92	0.10
8	2	6	17	17	17	3.69	3.59	0.10
9	3	2	12	24	18	3.88	4.32	-0.44
10	3	2	15	24	15	3.78	3.52	0.26

Note: (1) Computer class mean and (2) Department mean represents the mean for all instructors in the department.