

NWU BUSINESS SCHOOL
MBA LECTURER EVALUATIONS
JANUARY 2020 - STUDY SCHOOL
FIRST SEMESTER - PHASE 1

Prof Christoff Botha (Research Methodology 1)				(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.5	Content	3.4	Mean	3.5
Comments: Meticulous and straight to the point I wish Prof Botha can be my supervisor. He simplified research in these 3 classes we had with him. Experience and good explanation. Great start to the study school. Very impressive, well informed on the subject matter. Great personality. Excellent teaching methods.					

Prof Ravinder Rena (Research Methodology)				(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.1	Content	3.1	Mean	3.1
Comments: Shared important info on financial management and its importance in business. Wonderful. She was very good in explaining the concepts.					

Dr Johan Jordaan (Group forming, MBA orientation & eFundi)				(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.8	Content	3.9	Mean	3.9
Comments: Good presentation of subject matter Most candidates have already formed groups before and did not participate effectively in group forming activities. The content was every informative as I am first time student of this university. Very inspiration and funny, you can't sleep in his class. keeps the class interesting!! Very good. Class conducted in a very interactive manner. Little disorganised but excellent lecture.					

Dr Johan Jordaan (Quantitative Methods Workshop)				(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.8	Content	3.6	Mean	3.7
Comments: Very good presentation. He understands what he is doing. The content was very relevant.					

Mr GP van Rheede van Oudtshoorn (Guest Lecturer)				(out of 4)	%	
Lecturer	3.2	Content	3.3	Mean	3.3	82.5
Comments: Fair presentation. Marketing pitch to early.						

Prof Johnathan Calof (Guest Lecturer: Competitive intelligence) (out of 4)				%
Lecturer	3.9	Content	3.9	Mean 3.9 97.5
Comments: Good presentation that provided new insight. The CI was very informative and I enjoyed this concept. Excellent!! Very insightful. Would like to learn more about CI. Excellent, brilliant presentation skills.				

Will be announced (Guest Lecturer: Environmental Management Workshop Continued)				(out of 4)	%	
Lecturer	3.2	Content	3.2	Mean	3.2	80
Comments: One of the best presentations. Can assignments be done after the study school as they are long and we need time to focus.						

Will be announced (Guest Lecturer: Environmental Management Workshop Continued)				(out of 4)	%	
Lecturer	3.1	Content	3.1	Mean	3.1	77.5
Comments: Good presentation that gave insight on compliance in business for environmental management. Good presentation. Task gave very direct and beneficiary to students.						

Prof Andre Heymans (Managerial Economics)				(out of 4)	%	
Lecturer	3.7	Content	3.7	Mean	3.7	92.5
Comments: Introductory course was good and also help in identifying changes that affect business in the IR. Delivers the content well and easy to understand. Very good presentation. Very interesting. Interesting class. Sound knowledge						

Mr Mihan Louw (Guest Lecturer: Operations management 1)			(out of 4)	%		
Lecturer	3.5	Content	3.5	Mean	3.5	87.5
Comments: The presentation was all about the presenter's occupation, very little content besides obvious operational activities. Good presentation on scan within the corporate structures. Delivers the content well. Very interesting topic. The guest lecturer was on point the content was very practical. Very insightful to see practical operations side. Very informative lecturer.						

Mr Pieter Greyling (Corporate Governance)			(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.9	Content	3.8	Mean
			3.9	97.5
Comments: The presentation gave a good background on the application of law and ethics in business. Delivers the content well and easy to understand. I fell in love with Mr Greyling. He understands what he is talking about. He was more practical when presenting in class. I enjoyed all his classes. Excellent, practical example in his lecturing infused with theory. Thank you. Good presentation on context.				

Prof Christoff Botha (Research Methodology 2/3)			(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.7	Content	3.5	Mean
			3.6	90
Comments: The presentation and teaching assisted us in understanding our research topics and the approach thereof. He is very good at what he is doing. Very informative.				

Prof Raymond Parsons (Guest Lecturer: Managerial Economics) (out of 4)			%
Lecturer	3.2	Content	3.3
Mean	3.3	82.5	
Comments: The lecturer's speech was not loud and the content was not business focussed. Content well delivered. Brilliant.			

Dr Johan Jordaan (Operations management 3)				(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.7	Content	3.8	Mean	3.8
Comments: Good lecture. Easily to understand and good sense of humour. He is very loud and active. Full of energy you cannot sleep in his class even when tired. The content was relevant. He is good and informative. Excellent. A very interesting class. Lecture very good and tolerant.					

Mr Pieter Greyling (Corporate Governance 2)				(out of 4)	%	
Lecturer	3.8	Content	3.8	Mean	3.8	95
Comments: Shared info on case studies that relates to work environment. content well delivered and easy to understand. He is very practical and understand the content that he is presenting. Excellent.						

Dr Johan Jordaan (Operations management 4)				(out of 4)	%	
Lecturer	3.8	Content	3.7	Mean	3.8	95
Comments: Gave more info and understanding of subject material. Improved my knowledge in every class. Very interest.						

Prof Andre Heymans (Managerial Economics 2)				(out of 4)	%	
Lecturer	3.8	Content	3.7	Mean	3.8	95
Comments: Good presentation of technological changes that affect business. content well delivered and easy to understand. Knowledgeable and interest. Informative.						

GENERAL EVALUATIONS - 1st years (out of 4)

First year	Average
The administration of the study school	2,3
The facilities where the school took place	2,3
The food and refreshments at the study school	2,8
Prestige Day	2,9

GENERAL COMMENTS - 1st years

My general comments regarding all lecturers is that I was mind blown by all, well experienced on the respective discipline. Keep it up!!! Our guest lecturers were excellent!!!

Improvements can be on the online tests vs registration. Also access to efundi vs. registration closing date. In my opinion. Access to eFundi must only be denied on efundi after registration closing date.

The study school was not well communicated with us. We had some challenges with leave days, furthermore the fact that classes were ending at 22:00 was not fair to us as student because you get home you did not reflect on what was presented in class.

As a first year MBA the study school confused me more than before I started. I expected to get direction with regards to the course not assignments before we even grasp the coursework especially now that we still have to finalise our registration. The program needs to be reviewed as it is draining to be attending a 12 hour class rather it should broke down into orientation, then course work when all the registration has been completed. the general administration has been poor since the beginning which made me wonder if i should study my MBA with this university.

The administration was bad, communication about supper was not communicated to us. Registration remains the responsibility of the students and they must register in time in order to avoid disrupting classes. The venue was bad. Rooms were looking dirty carpets with bad smell.

**NWU BUSINESS SCHOOL
LECTURER EVALUATIONS
JANUARY 2020 - STUDY SCHOOL
FIRST SEMESTER - PHASE 2**

Prof Jonathan Calof (Guest Lecturer: Strategic Management- Competitive Intelligence)				%
Lecturer	3.4	Content	3.4	Mean
				3.4
85				
Comments: Very interesting and interactive. He is not audible. His presentation was not well prepared. The slides were not visible. Great guy, knows his stuff. Fantastic Lively presentation and practical added value to my thinking about CI. He talk/speak most of Afrikaans and that is uncomfortable to others who don't speak Afrikaans. Was speaking Afrikaans 80% of the time. Well organise presentation and easy to understand the contents. Super! Good. Insightful lecture. I learned quite a lot on competitive intelligence.				

Mr Martin Botha (Guest Lecturer: Financial Management- Financial Ratios) 3.4 +3.4					%	
Lecturer	3.4	Content	3.4	Mean	3.4	85
Comments: Simple theory but explained very well. Mr Botha was good with ratios and made it easy for learners to understand. Complex examples. He also doesn't give proper feedback on the answers, he leaves students confused. His content was relevant and at an easy level to understand. He is also speaking Afrikaans. Well organise presentation. Good						

Prof Wedzerai Musvoto (Financial Management)				(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.8	Content	3.8	Mean	3.8
Comments: Thought it was good focus on time value calculations, which is a difficult and important concept to understand. Prof Wedzerai is very very good in presenting and articulating the content. Knows and understands concepts. Excellent facilitating structure. Writing on the board small. Too enthusiastic. Awesome maybe go a bit slow and more systematically. Good. Genius. Very good friendly. Your content was really inspirational.					

Prof Tommy du Plessis (Company Project- Writing case study) (out of 4)				%
Lecturer	3.6	Content	3.6	Mean
			3.6	90
Comments: Very good. Prof Tommy is excellent in outlining expectations from the company project. Gave proper guidance. Broad scope. Too serious, looks tired. He is good.				
Ms. Yoke van Dam (Guest Lecturer: The power of pursuation) (out of 4)				%
Lecturer	3.3	Content	3.3	Mean
			3.3	82.5
Comments: Good. Presentation was irrelevant for this level of MBA. Examples were not related and not making sense. Good presentation tactics were discussed. Excellent. Good presentation. Please change the venue. Ok!				

Mr Paul Malherbe (Guest Lecturer: The alternative board)			(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.3	Content	3.2	Mean
			3.3	82.5
Comments: Very interesting. The NWU Business School do not many times provide material targeted at SME's, this talk was relevant to SME's in my opinion. Did not bring practical nor day to day examples. Not audible, slides were not visible. No convictions Engaging presentation. Definitely worth the time.				

Mr Theo Venter (Guest Lecturer: Scenario Planning 1)			(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.3	Content	3.4	Mean
		3.4		85
Comments: Very interesting. Mr Venter understands the subject matter and made it easy for students to understand scenarios presented were also grabbing learners attention. Slides were not clear for the scenario examples he made. Interesting. Need to show practical scenarios. Good				

Prof Christoff Botha (Research workshop)				(out of 4)	%	
Lecturer	3.5	Content	3.5	Mean	3.5	87.5
Comments: Good. Research workshop was not well structured. It would have been beneficial if all supervisors were here and each learner having a supervisor. Lecturers and supervisors have different approaches to writing a proposal and mini dissertation. Informative. Content is repetitive from previous workshops. Excellent, engaged us all. He is good. Well said lecture.						

Good and insightful. He is interested passionate of topic. Excellent.
 Please bring her again. Please get a better sound system and bigger screen. We struggled to see from the back of the class.
 The content is good but is not explained logically and clearly therefore the students get confused.
 Knowledgeable lecturer

Nice to have a youngest professional giving a presentation.
 Extremely excellent. Spot on.
 Informative, excellent presentation, relevant content.
 She took way too long than the time allocated. Great speaker, knows her stuff but showed a bit of lack of respect.
 Good and nice overview.
 Presentation was good and informative. The school must prepare the technical sound and visuals.

Prof Ronnie Lotriet (Strategic Management)				(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.5	Content	3.5	Mean	3.5
Comments: Good. Good.					

Prof Wedzerai Musvoto (Financial Management)				(out of 4)	%
Lecturer	3.8	Content	3.7	Mean	3.8
Comments: Good. Excellent. Information overload. Relevant content. Slow please. Knows his work very well. I'm working hard to get understanding but am hopeful. Good and interacting with students. Excellent content presentation.					

GENERAL EVALUATIONS – 2ND YEARS (out of 4)

Second year	Average
The administration of the study school	3,1
The facilities where the school took place	1,8
The food and refreshments at the study school	2,1
The social function	2,8

GENERAL COMMENTS - 2ND YEARS

Toilets were stinking and unhgienic. Monday's food was spoiled. Lecturing facilities was uncomfortable.

Can we be provided with water and coffee throughout the day. It is unacceptable that we were not provided with water. Access to WiFi limited. We could not do office work. Venue should be changed.

May I kindly request that the study school goes back to campus or another venue.

Please use main campus. The rice on Wednesday was rotten. The food served was not good at all and was different from one served for the hotel guests. The teatime food was too sweet and we only got oranges for juice. The tea was taken away and we had to drink only water.

The venue is not clean and there is sewage outside please do not use this venue ever again we prefer the main campus venue. The rice on Tuesday was rotten and we do not enjoy oranges as juice at our age. How can we be offered ice cream as a desert daily. The tea break refreshments were not enough and was too sweet. we were not allowed to dish the food the way we wanted to.

Please don't use this venue again. Facilities ugly and staff do not treat us like adults. Food on Wednesday was rotten. I suffered food poisoning and ended up going to the doctor. Requested a vegetarian option for food but was not catered for. Tea is served with sweet stuff no options for diabetics. the university venue was better.

Not enough time to attend to admin. The facility is haunted.

Please take us back to NWU campus.