

Teaching History

1. Modules Taught and Description (From 2009/2010 To 2009/2010)

S.No.	Acad Year - Sem	Module Type	Module Code	Module Name	Modular Credit	Programme
1	2009/2010 - 1	TUTORIAL	PP5294	DYNAMIC MODELLING OF PUBLIC POLICY SYSTEMS	4	PG
2	2009/2010 - 1	TUTORIAL	PP5294	DYNAMIC MODELLING OF PUBLIC POLICY SYSTEMS	4	UG

2. Research Students Supervised - UG

No record found.

3. Research Students Supervised - GD (From 2009/2010 To 2009/2010)

S.No.	From	To	Name	Thesis Title	Examiner Category	Degree	Year Conferred	Student Status
No record found.								

4. NUS - Thesis Committees Participated (From 2009/2010 To 2009/2010)

S.No.	From	To	Name	Degree	Role	Year Conferred	Student Status
No record found.							

5. Non NUS - Thesis Committees Participated

No record found.

Teaching Achievements

1. Leadership Roles (module/curriculum)

No record found.

2. Contributions to Teaching Materials

No record found.

3. Innovative Methodology

No record found.

4. NUS - Teaching awards or Prizes (From 2009 / 2010 To 2009 / 2010)

S.No.	Date of Award	Award Name	Award Type	Nature of Award
No record found.				

5. Faculty Level and Other awards - Teaching awards or prizes

No record found.

Teaching Portfolio

1. Summary of Student Feedback Scores and Comments (From 2009/2010 To 2009/2010)

Academic Year: 2009/2010	Semester: 1	Module: PP5294-DYNAMIC MODELLING OF PUBLIC POLICY SYSTEMS	Activity: TUTORIAL
--------------------------	-------------	---	--------------------

Class Size: 26		Response Size: 14		Response Rate: 53.85%		Contact Session: 26		Teaching Hour: 78	
Q	Items Evaluated		Fac. Member Avg Score	Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev	Dept Avg Score		Fac Avg Score		
					(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	
1	The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.		4.143	1.099	3.475	3.475	3.475	3.475	
2	The teacher provides timely and useful feedback.		4.286	0.825	3.671	3.671	3.671	3.671	
3	The teacher is approachable for consultation.		4.571	0.646	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	
4	The teacher has helped me develop relevant research skills.*		NA	NA	NA	(NA)	NA	(NA)	
5	The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.		4.286	1.069	3.399	3.399	3.399	3.399	
6	The teacher has helped me to apply the knowledge learned in this module.		4.214	0.802	3.521	3.521	3.521	3.521	
7	The teacher has encouraged me to ask critical questions.		3.857	1.167	3.390	3.390	3.390	3.390	
	Average of Qn 1-7		4.226	0.949	3.579	3.579	3.579	3.579	
8	Overall the teacher is effective.		4.214	1.051	3.665	3.665	3.665	3.665	

Frequency Distribution of responses for Qn 8

		Nos. of Respondents (% of Respondents)				
Item /Score		5	4	3	2	1
Self		6(42.86%)	7(50.0%)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	1(7.14%)
Teachers teaching all modules of the same activity type(TUTORIAL), at the same level with in the department		82(19.62%)	169(40.43%)	119(28.47%)	41(9.81%)	7(1.67%)
Teachers teaching all modules of the same activity type(TUTORIAL), at the same level with in the faculty		82(19.62%)	169(40.43%)	119(28.47%)	41(9.81%)	7(1.67%)

* This includes skills in research methodology, research problems/questions, literature search/evaluation, oral presentation and manuscript preparation.

** If Qn 4 is NA, it will not be included in the computation of average score (Average of Qn 1-7).

NOTE

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. Fac.Member Avg Score: The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev: A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average score differs form all the scores in the faculty memeber's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. Dept Avg Score:
(a) the mean score of same activity type (TUTORIAL) within the department
(b) the mean score of same activity type (TUTORIAL), at the same module level (level 5000) within the department
5. Fac. Avg Score:
(c) the mean score of same activity type (TUTORIAL) within the faculty.
(d) the mean score of same activity type (TUTORIAL), at the same module level (level 5000) within the faculty

Q9	What are the teacher's strengths?
	<p>1. 1. Very knowledgeable in the subject</p> <p>2. Interesting cases for lab sessions</p> <p>3. Useful feedbacks for the assignments</p> <p>4. Excellent examples during lectures, when the professors could not come up with simple examples.</p> <p>2. He's just brilliant and very smart in not only this subject but way beyond it.</p> <p>3. Anthony is one of the best professionals I have ever met in my academic career. He is a true clear-thinker, knowing what he wants from the course, what the students needs are and well equipped with the important concepts. He is always approachable for student's consultation, and his feedback is usually immediate and very constructive.</p> <p>4. He is very articulate and sophisticated</p> <p>5. Ability to make one think. Commitment and dedication to learn himself and make sure that students make genuine effort in learning too.</p> <p>6. he is very very helpful and has a great knowledge of Stella.</p> <p>7. 1. Very knowledgeable on the subject.</p> <p>2. Takes the time to think about queries and provide useful and helpful responses.</p> <p>8. Anthony is excellent as a TA. He's very sharp and quick when assessing students' STELLA modelling problems, and gives highly relevant and useful advice and suggestions. He has never turned down my requests for help, both for face-to-face consultations and email queries. He thinks through his responses thoroughly before replying and encourages student thinking and perseverance with the problem at hand by not giving answers outright. Yet, his answers are crafted so well that it's possible to move towards getting the right model by attending to his words carefully.</p> <p>His lab sessions are very well planned and delivered. The pace is too fast, but that's because the lab sessions require more time allocation.</p> <p>Anthony, you've been a gem - the very best TA I've had. I would have been quite lost with STELLA without you!</p> <p>9. He is knowledgeable (perhaps, too knowledgeable to impart them)</p> <p>10. His Stella sessions are clear and great help for us who are new to the software.</p> <p>11. He knows students' abilities and limitations. He knows that teaching is not only about the subject, it starts with alleviating anxiety, listening and answering exact questions. An *exception* among the teachers who taught this course.</p> <p>12. Anthony's level of knowledge on the subject matter was impressive and may have exceeded the professors'. He was accessible, helpful, and fair.</p>
Q10	What improvements would you suggest to the teacher?

<p>1. 1. Not to rush during the lab sessions and let students to catch up.</p> <p>2. Regularly ask students if his lab sessions are too fast.</p> <p>2. Do not assume that students are at the same level as you are. So allow them time to digest especially in the first part of the sessions.</p> <p>3. Being so extremely smart, he probably thought that we are as genius as he is :) It would be good if the pace of the lab sessions was slightly lower.</p> <p>Also, for the lab sessions, it would be good if the introduction to the basic tools is made from the very first lecture.</p> <p>4. Kindly be a little slower in lab sessions and make things complicated by difficult articulation.</p> <p>5. One drawback probably was that the pace of the lab sessions was not to the liking of all.</p> <p>6. NA</p> <p>7. 1. Take things slower in lab sessions. Not everyone picks up the concepts and "systems thinking" quickly.</p> <p>2. Teach the whole course instead of only TAing.</p> <p>8. On a few occasions, we were asked to reproduce models shown on the screen during our lab sessions. It was hard to do this as quite often you continued with your explanations due to shortage of time. Also, it was time consuming reproducing the models. Perhaps students could be asked to reproduce these models before the lesson.</p> <p>9. He is toooooo fast while delivering the lab sessions. Have asked him several times to slow down but he just went on. Seems like he is more interested in finishing the syllabus on time rather than making effort to help us to understand.</p> <p>Students asked for help in searching for the required readings from the e-journal. He gave some not so helpful steps. Can't he simply email the readings over? And in the first place, can't they upload the required readings on IVLE instead of making the students search for them?? WE have so many assignments to juggle with. It's a total waste of time!</p> <p>10. None</p> <p>11. He should have had more time to familiarize students with the STELLA software and practice building models.</p>

STUDENTS' NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING			
Module Code:	PP5294	No of Nominations:	3
	1. Every effective teaching skills, especially noteworthy in conveying to students the nuts and bolts of such a technical course in such an interesting and engaging manner. Simply brilliant.		
	2. Anthony is an excellent TA. Please see my comments under "Strengths"!		
	3. He has all the skills required for being a great teacher. He is well planned, calm, interested, responsive, energetic, interactive, and efficient. He has a sense of humor and he is not afraid of using it ;)!		
	[I would have nominated prof Charles Adam, but I am sure he has won enough of these already and/or may not need them as much]		

Teaching Philosophy

1. Personal Teaching Philosophy

No record found.

2. Strategies, Objectives and Methodologies

No record found.

3. Goals for next 5 years

No record found.

4. Steps to reflect and improve teaching

No record found.

Other Evidence

1. Other Evidence of Teaching Excellence

No record found.