

THE THIRD MODULE INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION SURVEY REPORT

2025–2026 Academic Year

This report presents the findings of the Third Module Instructor Evaluation Survey administered at the end of the module. The purpose of the survey was to gather instructors' feedback regarding the effectiveness of the module and identify areas for future improvement.

A total of 10 instructors participated in the survey.

Survey Scale

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

Higher mean scores indicate higher levels of agreement with the statement.

SUMMARY

Overall, instructors expressed positive views regarding the assessment procedures and student engagement during the third module. The strongest-rated aspect of the module was the alignment between assessment tasks and module objectives.

The main area of concern identified by instructors was workload distribution. While most aspects of the module received ratings above the neutral point, perceptions regarding the fairness and balance of instructor workload were noticeably less positive than other areas.

The written comments further reinforced concerns related to the allocation of teaching hours and additional responsibilities.

ANSWERS

Item level results can be observed in Table 1.

Code	Survey Item	Mean	SD
M1	The learning outcomes of the last module were appropriate and achievable within the allocated time.	3.30	1.06
M2	The coursebook and supplementary materials adequately supported the learning outcomes of the module.	3.20	1.32
M3	The workload for instructors during the module was even and appropriate.	2.50	1.51

M4	The assessment tasks and exams accurately reflected the content and objectives of the module.	4.30	0.82
M5	The level of student engagement and participation was satisfactory throughout the module.	3.90	0.99

Table 1. Item-Level Results

INTERPRETATION

Learning Outcomes (M1)

The mean score of 3.30 suggests that instructors generally viewed the learning outcomes as achievable within the allocated time. However, responses indicate some variation in perceptions across instructors.

Coursebook and Supplementary Materials (M2)

The course materials received a mean score of 3.20. While the results suggest moderate satisfaction with the materials, responses indicate room for further review and improvement.

Workload Distribution (M3)

This item received the lowest mean score (2.50) among all survey items. Responses suggest that instructors were less satisfied with the balance and distribution of workload during the module. The relatively high standard deviation (1.51) also indicates considerable variation in instructors' experiences.

Assessment and Examinations (M4)

This item received the highest mean score (4.30), indicating strong agreement that assessment tasks and examinations accurately reflected the content and objectives of the module. This represents a notable strength of the module.

Student Engagement (M5)

The mean score of 3.90 suggests that instructors were generally satisfied with student engagement and participation throughout the module.

HIGHEST AND LOWEST RATED AREAS

Highest Rated Item

M4 – Assessment tasks and exams accurately reflected the content and objectives of the module (Mean = 4.30)

Lowest Rated Item

M3 – Workload for instructors during the module was even and appropriate (Mean = 2.50)

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

Summary of Comments

Only one written comment was provided. The comment focused on workload distribution and suggested that teaching hours and additional responsibilities were not always allocated evenly among instructors. The respondent emphasized the importance of a more balanced distribution of responsibilities to support fairness, staff well-being, and overall program effectiveness.

Verbatim Comment

"I would like to suggest reviewing the distribution of teaching hours and additional responsibilities across the module. At times, the workload appeared to be unevenly allocated, with some instructors carrying a heavier combination of teaching hours and unit-related duties than others. A more balanced distribution could help ensure fairness, support staff well-being, and contribute to the overall effectiveness of the program."

KEY STRENGTHS

- Strong alignment between assessments and module objectives.
- Generally positive perceptions of student engagement and participation.
- Learning outcomes were viewed as largely achievable within the available timeframe.

AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

- Review the distribution of teaching hours and additional responsibilities across instructors.
- Evaluate whether course materials can be further improved to support module outcomes.
- Continue monitoring instructor workload to ensure consistency and equity.

CONCLUSION

The survey findings indicate that instructors generally viewed the third module positively, particularly with regard to assessment design and student engagement. The primary area requiring attention relates to workload distribution. Addressing this issue may contribute to increased instructor satisfaction and support the continued effectiveness of future module implementation.