# Department of Electronic & Electrical Engineering

## Student Questionnaire 2009 - 2010 – Semester 2
## First Year Lectures

**Q1. How much of the material (factual, conceptual, technical) was new to you? (5 – nearly all, 4 – most, 3 – about half, 2 – some, 1 – little)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 3.9 |
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 3.8 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 3.8 |
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 3.7 |
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 3.6 |
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 3.4 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE116 | 3.4 |

**Q2. Assess the difficulty of the material overall (5 – very difficult, 4 – difficult, 3 – about right, 2 – fairly easy, 1 – easy)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 4.2 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 3.9 |
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 3.7 |
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 3.5 |
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 3.1 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 3.0 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE116 | 2.7 |

**Q3. Assess the amount of material presented (5 – far too much, 4 – too much, 3 – about right, 2 – too little, 1 – far too little)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 3.7 |
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 3.6 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 3.4 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 3.2 |
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 3.1 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE116 | 3.0 |
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 3.0 |

**Q4. Quality of explanation? (5 – very good, 4 – good, 3 – OK, 2 – poor, 1 – very poor)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 4.7 |
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 4.4 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 3.6 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 3.5 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE116 | 2.7 |
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 2.4 |
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 2.3 |

**Q5. Quality of presentation? (e.g. volume, diction, legibility of writing, etc.) (5 – very good, 4 – good, 3 – OK, 2 – poor, 1 – very poor)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 4.5 |
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 4.4 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 4.3 |
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 4.0 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 3.9 |
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 3.8 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE116 | 3.5 |

**Q6. Quality of tutorial sheets and answers? (5 – very good,4 – good, 3 – OK, 2 – poor, 1 – v.poor)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 5.0 |
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 4.5 |
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 4.3 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE116 | 4.3 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 4.2 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 3.7 |
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 3.7 |

**Q7. Achievement of aims? (5 – completely achieved, 4 – almost completely achieved, 3 – adequately achieved, 2 – partly achieved, 1 – not achieved at all)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 4.5 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 4.4 |
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 4.4 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE116 | 4.3 |
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 4.0 |
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 3.9 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 3.8 |

**Q8.Please rate your overall satisfaction with this module**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 4.6 |
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 4.3 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 3.6 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 2.9 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE146 | 2.7 |
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 2.7 |
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 2.5 |

**Q9. Please rate the effectiveness of the lecturer.**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 4.6 |
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 4.4 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 3.6 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 3.5 |
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 2.8 |
| G.C. Abhayaratne | EEE116 | 2.8 |
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 2.3 |

**Number of responses:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G. Vickers | MAS148 | 18 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE102 | 21 |
| R.C. Tozer | EEE103 | 20 |
| M.P. Foster | EEE115 | 18 |
| G.C. Abhayarantne | EEE116 | 16 |
| P.L. Judd | EEE112 | 8 |
| G. Vickers | MAS146 | 6 |

# Department of Electronic & Electrical Engineering

## 2009-2010 Semester 2

## First Year Coursework

**Q1. How would you describe the overall structure of the exercise? (5 – very well structured and logical throughout, 4 – logical, 3 – adequate, 2 – unstructured, 1 – chaotic)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Light Emitting Diode | 4.4 |
| Computing (C programming) | 4.3 |
| DC Drives | 4.2 |
| Spectrum Analyser | 4.0 |
| Individual Project | 3.8 |
| Transformers | 2.9 |
| Bipolar Transistor | 2.2 |

**Q2. Assistance from postgraduate demonstrators (5 - very helpful, enthusiastic, 4 - very helpful, 3 - fairly helpful, 2 - willing but not very helpful, 1 - not interested and not very helpful)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Light Emitting Diode | 4,1 |
| Computing (C programming) | 4.1 |
| DC Drives | 4.0 |
| Individual Project | 3.8 |
| Spectrum Analyser | 3.6 |
| Transformers | 3.0 |
| Bipolar Transistor | 2.6 |

**Q3. Quality of documentation provided (5 - very clear and useful for future reference, 4 - clear, but not much theory for reference, 3 - adequate for reasonable progress, 2 - not well structured, 1 - confusing with several ambiguities)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Computing (C programming) | 4.2 |
| Light Emitting Diode | 4.1 |
| DC Drives | 4.0 |
| Spectrum Analyser | 3.9 |
| Individual Project | 3.9 |
| Transformers | 3.1 |
| Bipolar Transistor | 2.4 |

**Q4. Did you understand the exercise as you were going through it? (5 – almost complete understanding, 4 - good under-standing, 3 - reasonable understanding of most sections, 2 - rough idea of what was going on, 1 - no idea of what was going on)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Spectrum Analyser | 4.0 |
| Light Emitting Diode | 3.9 |
| Computing (C programming) | 3.7 |
| DC Drives | 3.7 |
| Individual Project | 3.6 |
| Transformers | 2.8 |
| Bipolar Transistor | 2.0 |

**Q5. How much did you learn from the exercise? ( 5 - much more than existing knowledge, 4 - some new concepts, 3 - re-enforced existing knowledge, 2 - little, 1 - nothing )**

| | |
|---|---|
| Computing (C programming) | 4.2 |
| Individual Project | 3.6 |
| Spectrum Analyser | 3.6 |
| DC Drives | 3.5 |
| Light Emitting Diode | 3.5 |
| Transformers | 3.0 |
| Bipolar Transistor | 2.3 |

**Q6. Was the time allocated for the exercise correct? (5 – significantly more time than was needed, 4 – slightly more time than was needed, 3 – adequate time for the exercise, 2 – slightly less time than was needed, 1 – significantly less time than required)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Spectrum Analyser | 3.9 |
| DC Drives | 3.4 |
| Computing (C programming) | 3.4 |
| Light Emitting Diode | 3.2 |
| Individual Project | 3.2 |
| Transformers | 3.2 |
| Bipolar Transistor | 2.8 |

**Number of responses:**

| | Number of responses | Average Score |
|---|---|---|
| Light Emitting Diode | 16 | 4.18 |
| DC Drives | 15 | 4.12 |
| Spectrum Analyser | 16 | 4.05 |
| Individual Project | 16 | 3.95 |
| Transformers | 16 | 3.53 |
| Bipolar Transistor | 20 | |

## Department of Electronic & Electrical Engineering

## Student Questionnaire 2009/2010 - Semester 2

## Second Year Lectures

**Q1. How much of the material (factual, conceptual, technical) was new to you? ( 5 - nearly all, 4 - most, 3 - about half, 2 - some, 1 - little)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 4.15 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 4.34 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 4.03 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 4.21 |
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 4.35 |

**Q2. Assess the difficulty of the material overall ( 5 - very difficult, 4 - difficult, 3 - about right, 2 - fairly easy, 1 - easy)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 3.97 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 3.65 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 3.51 |
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 3.44 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 3.32 |

**Q3. Assess the amount of material presented (5 - far too much, 4 - too much, 3 - about right, 2 - too little, 1 - far too little)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 3.59 |
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 3.38 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 3.29 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 3.20 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 3.18 |

**Q4. Quality of explanation? (5 - very good, 4 - good, 3 - OK, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor )**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 4.44 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 4.00 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 3.94 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 3.83 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 3.65 |

**5. Quality of presentation (e.g. volume, diction, legibility of writing, etc. ( 5 - very good, 4 - good, 3 - OK, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 4.59 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 4.09 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 4.06 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 4.03 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 4.00 |

**Q6. Quality of tutorial sheets and answers? ( 5 - very good, 4 - good, 3 - OK, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 4.21 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 3.85 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 3.79 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 3.74 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 3.62 |

**Q7. Achievement of aims (5 – completely achieved, 4 – almost completely achieved, 3 – adequately achieved, 2 – partly achieved, 1 – not achieved at all)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 4.07 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 3.63 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 3.58 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 3.50 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 3.35 |

**Q8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with this module**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 4.07 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 3.63 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 3.58 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 3.50 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 3.35 |

**Q9. Please rate the effectiveness of the lecturer**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 4.07 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 3.63 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 3.58 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 3.50 |
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 3.35 |

**Number of responses:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| R.J. Langley | EEE206 | 35 |
| E. Winstanley | MAS243 | 34 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE222 | 34 |
| J.P.R. David | EEE207 | 34 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE202 | 34 |

# SECOND YEAR DESIGN EXERCISE

**2. How would you describe the overall structure of the Design Exercise?**

| DESIGN EXERCISE | Well structured and logical | Logical | Adequate | Unstructured | Chaotic |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Microcontroller System** | | 100.0% | | | |
| **Simple Microprocessor** | 25.0% | 50.0% | 25.0% | | |
| **Yagi Antenna** | 40.0% | 60.0% | | | |
| **Patch antenna** | 25.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% |
| **Power Electronics** | 50.0% | 50.0% | | | |
| **Brushless DC Machine** | 33.3% | 50.0% | 16.7% | | |
| **Mosfet power amplifier** | 80.0% | 20.0% | | | |
| **Surface acoustic wave filter** | | 50.0% | 25.0% | | 25.0% |

**3. How would you assess the assistance from the member of staff responsible for the Design Exercise?**

| DESIGN EXERCISE | Very helpful, very enthusiastic | Very helpful | Fairly helpful | Willing but not very helpful | Not interested |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Microcontroller System** | 20.0% | 80.0% | | | |
| **Simple Microprocessor** | | 50.0% | 50.0% | | |
| **Yagi Antenna** | | 80.0% | 20.0% | | |
| **Patch antenna** | 50.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | | |
| **Power Electronics** | | | 100.0% | | |
| **Brushless DC Machine** | 33.3% | 50.0% | 16.7% | | |
| **Mosfet power amplifier** | 80.0% | | 20.0% | | |
| **Surface acoustic wave filter** | 25.0% | | | | 75.0% |

**4. How would you assess the assistance from the postgraduate demonstrators?**

| DESIGN EXERCISE | Very helpful, very enthusiastic | Very helpful | Fairly helpful | Willing but not very helpful | Not interested |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Microcontroller System** | | 66.7% | | | 33.3% |
| **Simple Microprocessor** | 25.0% | 50.00% | 25.0.% | | |
| **Yagi Antenna** | 20.0% | 60.0% | 20.0% | | |
| **Patch antenna** | 75.0% | | | | 25.0% |
| **Power Electronics** | | | | | |
| **Brushless DC Machine** | 33.3% | 16.7% | 50.0% | | |
| **Mosfet power amplifier** | 60.0% | 40.0% | | | |
| **Surface acoustic wave filter** | | 75.0% | | 25.0% | |

**5. Did you understand the Design Exercise as you were going through it?**

| DESIGN EXERCISE | Almost complete understanding | Good understanding | Reasonable understanding | Rough idea of what was going on | No idea of what was going on |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Microcontroller System** | 50.0% | 50.0% | | | |
| **Simple Microprocessor** | 50.0% | 25.00% | | 25.0% | |
| **Yagi Antenna** | 40.0% | 20.0% | 40.0% | | |
| **Patch antenna** | | 25.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | |
| **Power Electronics** | | | | | |
| **Brushless DC Machine** | 16.7% | 33.3% | 50.0% | | |
| **Mosfet power amplifier** | 40.0% | | 20.0% | 40.0% | |
| **Surface acoustic wave filter** | | 50.0% | 25.0% | | 25.0% |

**6. How much did you learn from the Design Exercise?**

| DESIGN EXERCISE | Considerably more than existing knowledge | Some new concepts | Re-enforced existing knowledge | Little | Nothing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Microcontroller System** | 20.0% | 80.0% | | | |
| **Simple Microprocessor** | 75.0% | 25.0% | | | |
| **Yagi Antenna** | 60.0% | 40.0% | | | |
| **Patch antenna** | 25.0% | 50.0% | | 25.0% | |
| **Power Electronics** | | | | | |
| **Brushless DC Machine** | 33.3% | 66.7% | | | |
| **Mosfet power amplifier** | 40.0% | 40.0% | 20.0% | | |
| **Surface acoustic wave filter** | 25.0% | 50.0% | | 25.0% | |

**7. Did you learn more from the Design Exercise than from 1st Semester Laboratories?**

| DESIGN EXERCISE | Yes | About Same | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Microcontroller System** | 80.0% | 20.0% | |
| **Simple Microprocessor** | 75.0% | 25.0% | |
| **Yagi Antenna** | 60.0% | 40.0% | |
| **Patch antenna** | 50.0% | | 50.0% |
| **Power Electronics** | | | |
| **Brushless DC Machine** | 66.7% | 33.3% | |
| **Mosfet power amplifier** | 80.0% | 20.0% | |
| **Surface acoustic wave filter** | 75.0% | | 25.0% |

**8. Which did you find most enjoyable?**

| DESIGN EXERCISE | 1st Semester Labs | About same | Design Exercise |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Microcontroller System** | 60.0% | 40.0% | |
| **Simple Microprocessor** | 25.0% | 75.0% | |
| **Yagi Antenna** | 40.0% | 40.0% | 20.0% |
| **Patch antenna** | | 75.0% | 25.0% |
| **Power Electronics** | | | |
| **Brushless DC Machine** | 83.3% | 16.7% | |
| **Mosfet power amplifier** | 80.0% | 20.0% | |
| **Surface acoustic wave filter** | 75.0% | | 25.0% |

## Department of Electronic & Electrical Engineering

## Student Questionnaire 2009/2010 - Semester 2 - Third/Fourth Year Lectures

**Q1. How much of the material (factual, conceptual, technical) was new to you? (5 - nearly all, 4 - most, 3 - about half, 2 - some, 1 - little)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 5.00 |
| H. Porteous | AMA443 | 5.00 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 4.46 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.33 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 4.30 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 4.25 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 4.25 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 4.25 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 4.17 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 4.00 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 4.00 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 4.00 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 4.00 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 4.00 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 4.00 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.95 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 3.68 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 3.50 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 3.50 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 3.40 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 3.20 |
| S. Beck | MEC6316 | 3.00 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 3.00 |

**Q2. Assess the difficulty of the material overall (5 - very difficult, 4 - difficult, 3 - about right, 2 - fairly easy, 1 - easy)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 4.33 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 4.14 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 4.13 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 4.10 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 4.00 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 3.50 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 3.50 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 3.50 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 3.50 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 3.40 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 3.00 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 3.00 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 3.00 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 4.27 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 4.00 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.00 |
| H. Porteous | AMA443 | 4.00 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.95 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 3.80 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 3.50 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 3.38 |
| S. Beck | MEC6316 | 3.00 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 3.00 |

**Q3. Assess the amount of material presented (5 - far too much, 4 - too much, 3 - about right, 2 - too little, 1 - far too little)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 5.00 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 4.17 |
| H. Porteous | AMA443 | 4.00 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.00 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 4.00 |
| H. Porteous | EEE443 | 4.00 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 3.50 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 3.50 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 3.50 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 3.50 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 3.43 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.43 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 3.38 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 3.38 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 3.36 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 3.30 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 3.20 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 3.19 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 3.00 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 3.00 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 3.00 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 3.00 |
| S. Beck | MEC6316 | 3.00 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 2.00 |

**Q4. Quality of explanation? (5 - very good, 4 - good, 3 - OK, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| H. Porteous | AMA443 | 5.00 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 5.00 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 4.60 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 4.56 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 4.50 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 4.50 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 4.40 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.33 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 4.25 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 4.00 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 4.00 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 4.00 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 4.00 |
| S. Beck | MEC6316 | 4.00 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 3.93 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 3.75 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 3.55 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.55 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 3.50 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 3.50 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 3.30 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 2.50 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 1.00 |

**Q5. Quality of presentation (e.g. volume, diction, legibility of writing, etc.)? (5 - very good, 4 - good, 3 - OK, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| H. Porteous | AMA443 | 5.00 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 5.00 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 4.60 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 4.56 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 4.50 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 4.50 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 4.40 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.33 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 4.25 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 4.00 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 4.00 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 4.00 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 4.00 |
| S. Beck | MEC6316 | 4.00 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 3.93 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 3.75 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 3.55 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.55 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 3.50 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 3.50 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 3.30 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 2.50 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 1.00 |

**Q6. Quality of tutorial sheets and answers? (5 - very good, 4 - good, 3 - OK, 2 - poor, 1 - very poor)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| H. Porteous | AMA443 | 5.00 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 4.60 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 4.50 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 4.25 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 4.25 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 4.13 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 4.00 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 4.00 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.00 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 4.00 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 4.00 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 4.00 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 4.00 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 4.00 |
| S. Beck | MEC6316 | 4.00 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 3.86 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 3.60 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.57 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 3.55 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 3.50 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 3.50 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 3.00 |
| H. Porteous | AMA443 | 3.00 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 3.00 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 3.00 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 2.83 |

**Q7. Achievement of aims? (5 - completely achieved, 4 - almost completely achieved, 3 - adequately achieved, 2 - partly achieved, 1 - not achieved at all)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 5.00 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 5.00 |
| S. Beck | MEC6316 | 5.00 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 4.50 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 4.50 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 4.40 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 4.38 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.33 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 4.25 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 4.14 |
| H. Porteous | AMA443 | 4.00 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 4.00 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 4.00 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 4.00 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 4.00 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 4.00 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.85 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 3.67 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 3.63 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 3.50 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 3.50 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 3.50 |

**Q8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with this module**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 5.00 |
| M. Porteous | AMA443 | 5.00 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 4.80 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 4.50 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 4.40 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 4.38 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.33 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 4.05 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 4.00 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 4.00 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 4.00 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 4.00 |
| S. Beck | MEC631 | 4.00 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 3.93 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 3.88 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 3.75 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.62 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 3.55 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 3.50 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 3.50 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 3.20 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 2.67 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 1.00 |

**Q9. Please rate the effectiveness of the lecturer**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| M. Porteous | AMA443 | 5.00 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 4.88 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 4.80 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 4.67 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 4.50 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 4.38 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 4.25 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 4.25 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 4.20 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 4.13 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 4.00 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 4.00 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 4.00 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 4.00 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 4.00 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 4.00 |
| S. Beck | MEC6316 | 4.00 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 3.93 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 3.90 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 3.73 |
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 3.71 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 3.00 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 2.83 |

**Number of responses**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| J.B. Wang | EEE345 | 20 |
| D.A. Stone | EEE307 | 19 |
| J.K. Mitchell | EEE301 | 15 |
| Z.Q.Zhu | EEE305 | 13 |
| J. Rodenburg | EEE345 | 10 |
| T. Walther | EEE331 | 10 |
| N.L. Seed | EEE310 | 8 |
| A. Maiden | EEE345 | 8 |
| W. Liu | EEE309 | 6 |
| N. Allinson | EEE346 | 5 |
| S.K.Khamas | EEE317 | 4 |
| A. Tennant | EEE334 | 4 |
| M. Hopkinson | EEE416 | 3 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE6491 | 2 |
| C. Abhayaratne | EEE421 | 2 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE406 | 2 |
| G.W. Jewell | EEE409 | 2 |
| G.G. Cook | EEE443 | 2 |
| M. Porteous | AMA443 | 1 |
| G. Heppell | MEC314 | 1 |
| M. Benaissa | EEE414 | 1 |
| S. Beck | MEC631 | 1 |
| E. Rodriguez-Falcon | MEC414 | 1 |

# Final Year Projects

**Number of responses:**

| Group A Electromechanical Devices and Power Electronics | Group B Electronic, Optoelectronic and Micromechanical Devices | Group C Electromagnetism, Communications, Radio and Microwaves | Group D Electronic Systems and Circuits |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 6 | 4 | 6 |

**How would you assess the level of supervision from your supervisor?**

| | Average score (5= v.good, 1= v.poor) |
|---|---|
| Group A | 4.30 |
| Group B | 4.70 |
| Group C | 4.50 |
| Group D | 3.70 |

**At approximately what intervals were you able to see your supervisor?**

| | Average score (5= daily, 1= rarely) |
|---|---|
| Group A | 3.80 |
| Group B | 4.33 |
| Group C | 4.50 |
| Group D | 3.50 |

**How would you assess the level of assistance from your second marker?**

| | Average score (5= v.good, 1= v.poor) |
|---|---|
| Group A | 4.00 |
| Group B | 4.00 |
| Group C | 4.00 |
| Group D | 3.80 |

**How would you assess the level of assistance from postgraduates and research staff?**

| | Average score (5= v.good, 1= v.poor) |
|---|---|
| Group A | 3.00 |
| Group B | 3.33 |
| Group C | 3.50 |
| Group D | 2.60 |

**Have you had any assistance from / contact with Departmental technical staff?**

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Group A | 1% | 0% |
| Group B | 0% | 1% |
| Group C | 33% | 67% |
| Group D | 0% | 1% |

**If yes, how would you assess the level of support?**

| | Average score (5= v.good, 1= v.poor) |
|---|---|
| Group A | 2.40 |
| Group B | 1.14 |
| Group C | 2.33 |
| Group D | 2.00 |

# 1st, 2nd, 3rd / 4th YEARS

# SEMESTER 2, 2009/2010

## Tutorials – 1st & 2nd Year

### *Small Group Tutorials*

**1) How often did you have tutorials?**

| | Every 2 weeks as timetabled | Largely as time-tabled but with occasional rearrangements | Largely as time-tabled but with occasional cancellations | Many cancelled tutorials – not rearranged |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| First Year | 45.00% | 35.00% | 5.00% | 15.00% |
| Second Year | 50.00% | 32.00% | 12.00% | 6.00% |

**2) In general, how useful did you find the exercises set for the tutorials?**

| | Very useful | Useful | Reasonably useful | Not particularly useful | Not at all useful |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First Year | 15.00% | 30.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 5.00% |
| Second Year | 11.43% | 31.43% | 28.57% | 17.14% | 11.43% |

## Problem Classes

## 1st Year only

**1) How would you describe the overall structure of problem classes?**

| Very well structured and logical throughout | Logical | Adequate | Unstructured | Chaotic |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20.00% | 30.00% | 35.00% | 5.00% | 10.00% |

**2) How would you assess the assistance of your demonstrator in Semester 2?**

| Very helpful, enthusiastic | Very helpful | Fairly helpful | Willing but not very helpful | Not interested and not very helpful |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42.11% | 21.05% | 10.53% | 10.53% | 15.79% |

**3) How much did you learn from problem classes?**

| Much more than existing knowledge | Some new concepts and problem-solving techniques/skills | Re-enforced existing knowledge | Little | Nothing |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21.05% | 42.11% | 15.79% | 10.53% | 10.53% |

# General Issues

**Have you used the University's computer network this year?**

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| First Year | 93.75% | 06.25% |
| Second Year | 96.88% | 03.13% |
| Third/Fourth Year | 96.55% | 3.45% |

**If yes, how would you assess the availability of computers?**

| | Easy access at all times | Daytime and out of hours access reasonable, occasional wait | Daytime access difficult, out of hours access OK | Very difficult to get access, even out of hours | Almost impossible to get access |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First Year | | 46.67% | 26.67% | 26.67% | |
| Second Year | 18.75% | 28.13% | 37.50% | 6.25% | 9.38% |
| Third/Fourth Year | 23.08% | 53.85% | 19.23% | | 3.85% |

# OVERVIEW OF YEAR

**To what extent has the course met your expectations?(1 = not at all, 5 = in every respect)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| First Year | 3.35 | 20 |
| Second Year | 3.60 | 35 |
| Third Year | 3.60 | 15 |

**How well did your entry qualifications/previous study prepare you for the course? (1 = not at all, 5 = in every respect)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| First Year | 2.68 | 19 |
| Second Year | 3.14 | 35 |

**How would you assess the amount of practical/skills content in the course?(1 = far too little, 5 = far too much)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| First Year | 2.90 | 20 |
| Second Year | 2.80 | 35 |
| Third Year | 3.27 | 15 |

**How would you rate the overall workload?(1 = far too little, 5 = far too much)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| First Year | 3.40 | 20 |
| Second Year | 3.37 | 35 |
| Third Year | 3.84 | 19 |

**How would you describe the course?(1 = dull & uninspired, 5 = very stimulating)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| First Year | 3.25 | 20 |
| Second Year | 3.49 | 35 |
| 3.73 | 15 | 25 |

**Assuming you meet the necessary standards, which degree would you now choose?**

| | Percentage | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| **First Year** | | |
| 3 Year B.Eng. | 33.33% | 6 |
| 4 Year M.Eng. | 66.67% | 12 |
| **Second Year** | | |
| 3 Year B.Eng. | 54.29% | 19 |
| 4 Year M.Eng. | 45.71% | 16 |

**Assuming you meet the necessary standards, do you intend to pursue Chartered Engineer, C.Eng, Status?**

| **Third Year** | Percentage | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 0.645 | 9 |
| Don’t Know | 0.36% | 5 |
| No | 0.00% | 0 |

# OVERVIEW OF THE WHOLE B.Eng / M.Eng COURSE

**To what extent has the course met your expectations?**
**(1 = not at all, 5 = totally)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 3.75 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 3.43 | 7 |

**How would you rate the personal and communication skills you have acquired through the course?**
**(1 = poor, 5 = excellent)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 3.42 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 4.14 | 7 |

**Have the assessment criteria been clearly explained?**
**(1 = not at all, 5 = very clear)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 3.83 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 3.71 | 7 |

**Has the feedback been prompt and informative?**
**(1 = not at all, 5 = very)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 3.42 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 3.29 | 7 |

**How easy have you found it to see academic staff when you needed to?**
**(1 = impossible, 5 = very easy)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 4.08 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 3.57 | 7 |

**How would you rate the support from academic staff?**
**(1 = poor, 5 = excellent)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 4.17 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 3.86 | 7 |

**How would you describe the organisation and management of the course?**
**(1 = poor, 5 = excellent)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 3.42 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 3.43 | 7 |

**How would you rate your overall experience at Sheffield?**
**(1 = dismal, 5 = excellent)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 4.42 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 4.29 | 7 |

**Would you recommend Sheffield to friends as a place to study EEE?**
**(1 = not at all, 5 = strongly)**

| | Average Score | No. of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| B.Eng | 4.33 | 12 |
| M.Eng | 4.14 | 7 |

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**

# 2009/2010 Semester 2 Questionnaire

# Coursework

# FIRST YEAR GENERAL COMMENTS

## *Any suggestions for improvements or general comments on the coursework module?*

- First teach us then go to Labs, otherwise is totally pointless.
- Sort out BJT Lab (maybe use bread boards instead of weird boxes).
- Didn't get the point of individual projects.
- Make BJT understandable with a lecturer that knows what he is doing.
- Told to do it wrong by demonstrators.
- Make equations less complicated.
- Quite a good problem – challenging but not impossible.
- Quite a good problem, lecture notes useful.
- Lecturer should explain the Lab and theory of the Lab and what you are trying to show at the start of Labs and put in context.
- Remove the BJT
- Get rid of BJT
- Should use demonstrators in individual projects.

## *Any comments on facilities, equipment, organisation etc.?*

- Improvements should be made on computers
- First and Second Year labs are too old compared with other Universities.
- BJT demonstrator seemed to have no understanding of the Lab in the first session, as though they had never seen it before.
- Need more demonstrators in First Year Lab.
- Good.
- Computers in F137 could be quicker.
- BJT demonstrator in the first session didn't seem to have a clue what the Lab was about, or what they were doing. Very unhelpful.
- Poor equipment. BJT circuit boxes faulty. Individual project needs a little clamp to clam the circuit board in so solder sucking is easier.
- Fairly good.
- Computers too slow.

# Problem Classes

### *Any general comments on problem classes?*

- Duncan continued to provide high quality support.
- Duncan in good demonstrator.
- Duncan is a very good demonstrator.
- The Super Demonstrator I had in Semester 1 and her knowledge was inadequate. She didn't know simple d.c. EEE101 material always ended up asking the other demonstrator and coming back with a poor explanation. In the second Semester I used Duncan who was very good, he knew his stuff and was very helpful. I also noticed that not many people ended up working on the other Super Demonstrator's table and I would suggest this is because of her lack of knowledge! I wish I had found Duncan in Semester 1 as it would have helped a lot!
- The demonstrator couldn't really answer any questions we had and usually just went to ask another demonstrator.
- Demonstrator was unable to answer many questions without asking another demonstrator.,
- The demonstrator has improved a lot in the second Semester, he is explaining everything better and a lot more enthusiastic.

# Small Group Tutorials

### *Any exercises you found particularly useful and why?*

- Power Networks, explanation from tutor was very useful.
- Analogue circuits – loved Dr. Tozer's writing style.
- Power Networks.
- The ones related to EEE103 and EEE102 related to the course.
- The CV exercise showed up areas to improve for writing it for industry.
- CV/Cover letter exercise to develop a more professional CV.
- Lab tutorial sheets, it's difficult and I can learn more new knowledge.
- CV exercise.
- CV writing – something that is important for us all to do.

### *Any exercises you found very poor and why?*

- Plagiarism exercise – we never got to see how Turn It In would actually respond to a piece of work.
- Good communication with tutor.

### *Any general comments on small group tutorials?*

- Useful as it's more one on one which is very helpful.
- Peter Rocket was always late and often didn't turn up without informing us. Also he was not upt to date with the methods taught in Year 1 so different methods. He is quite patronising, he makes me feel dumb and confuses me. He's very narrow minded and doesn't listen properly as says I'm wrong then at the end gets the same answer, then I repeat what I said at the start and then he's like that's right. He adds a lot of confusion. His approach is not important for me. I'm insure whether it is a personal thing with him being patronising to us 1st Years, that we are a waste of his time or whether that is his character. However, I would like to have a different Tutor.
- Pretty pointless as very little was discussed or done only moaning.

# General Issues

## *Any comments on the computers or the service provided by the University's Computer network?*

- Should have more computers.
- Computers run slow.
- Often quite slow.
- A bit slow occasionally when starting up some programs.
- So slow its unbelievable.
- Very slow and unreliable.
- During exam times more than the IC should be available in the evening.
- Slow, can be hard to find a computer if required.

## *Any comments on the provision of books in the library service provided by the University's library network?*

- Generally good and availabl.e

## *Any comments on other services provided by the University, such as Student Services, Careers, Student Health etc?*

- Careers ok, Student Health good.
- All rubbish.

## *Any comments on the support provided by the Department, such as Student Office, Stores etc.?*

- Virtually non existent.
- Don't know why the university gives no help with visa matters in connection with the degree.
- It is very good having your personal tutor as a point of contact.

## *Any comments on issues not covered in the questionnaire?*

- My free choice, Module Technical Writing is terrible. It's practically Primary School, where we get taught nothing for 2 hours a week just talk about nothing. I learnt more about what was needed in the coursework after it was marked. She only marks it up to 75% rather than 100 and after 8 weeks of being in a class of about 16, she forgets who I am and asks 'Why are you here?'
- Too little info on choosing 1st Year module. Chosen – Technical Writing – Very poor course, Tutor was very poor.
- Like the EEE computer room there should be a room available for normal desk work helpful especially for group work.
- Assessment method EEE115 is unfair only 30% given for 10 weeks of lectures material which only a small part is used in 67% assignment. The test for 33% used negative marking which is grossly unfair for example student A knows 40% of the material and only ask what he knows and gets 40%. Student B knows 60% of the material and attempts another 20% of the test but gets it wrong but using negative marking student A & B get 40% so this suggests a student working at a 2:1 level is now just getting a pass (or even a fail if they attempted more than 20% more than they knew). This is unfair. Furthermore there should be some teaching of Matlab and Simulink. There should have been some practice exercise labs and some drop in sessions for the assessment. It would also be helpful for lectures to go over past papers after finishing the course to follow the approach to questions. I would like more feedback on lab reports and proceed quickly so you can improve before the next one rather than hand them all out at the end.

# Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering

## 2009/2010 Semester 2 Questionnaire

## SECOND YEAR GENERAL COMMENTS

# Coursework

### *Any suggestions for improvements or general comments on the Design Exercise?*

- The design project is well structured. The senior demonstrator is helpful on where to find additional information related to the design project.
- Design exercise was very good. Strange, that in moving it did not matter at all, what you had done practically – only report counted.
- I felt that the report was a little short (1500 words) to convey the points.
- Some questions on the exercise are based on old design process which is not suitable for us now.
- It's too close to exams. Report should be written over Easter.
- It is better to do group report.
- More involvement from the supervisor in charge of Surface Acoustic Wave Filter. Better to teach the students the theory of SAW before.
- Have the first 2 labs as a lesson or class based exercise to get up to speed before jumping into calculations.
- Variations of quantities of work to be done depending on your project, this should be made equal. Some groups have a short report and no presentation whilst others have 30 pages of individual report and a presentation.
- Students who did not take microcontroller especially direct entry students should be suggested to take other than M controller.
- A better description of what is asked from the students – attendance marking.
- Give more specific design rather than very broad or general design.
- The photolithography process could have been done sooner allowing testing before the Easter break to allow more time for research and understanding to write the report.
- Didn't see Prof Hogg once during the design project. Let students labricate the device rather than just observing.

### *Any comments on facilities, equipment, organisation etc.?*

- Facilities are good and useful.
- Great facilities except the old computers with one access to the student in the 2nd Year lab.
- Severe lack of organisation. 1 multimeter between 10 people is not good, poor allocation of stores times (stock).
- Provide a safe driver in lab for us to do with during the Moto r(generator).
- All good.
- The computers in F137 are extremely slow and I had to use my laptop which caused software compatibility problems.
- Space is not really an issued unlike in the 2nd Year and 1st Year lab exercise.

# Problem Classes

### *Any problem classes which you found particularly good and why?*

- Mathematics – The senior demonstrator really knows about the subject well. He explains clearly on the problem. He even has his own solution to the tutorial sheets. Would recommend him.
- Mathematics – E Winstanley was very helpful and personally made sure we were working a the expected level.
- Mathematics – It is on a Friday and right after the class.
- All good.
- I like the communication problem classes because the demonstrators were very helpful and the lecturer as well.
- All good and helpful.
- Mathematics – Very logical structure.

### *Any particular problem classes or rooms which caused difficulties?*

- Large rooms means hard to get help.
- More demonstrators, particularly for 202 when only the helper would appear often. Could have had better work rooms rather than the lab.
- Problem classes should be divided.
- I receive almost every week new problem sheet for semiconductor class (problem).
- Any joined problem class is very confusing feel unsure as to which clas work to do.
- The chairs in the 2$^{nd}$ lab are uncomfortable.
- Semi conductors the lecture is hard. Semiconductor for electronics Devices and Electromechancial Energy Conversion. Students tend to do either one tutorial and ignore the other in the joint tutorial hour slot. Should separate them and put them in a dedicated time slot.

# Small Group Tutorials

### *Any particular exercises you found useful and why?*

- Study skill exercise

### *Any exercises you found very poor and why?*

- The review exercise with Biofuels and the exercise for reading reports as they were a distraction from actual work and didn't really serve a purpose.

### *Any general comments on small group tutorials?*

- The tutorials were very in-personal and I wouldn't feel confident using my tutor as a job reference.
- Sometimes compared with other work we have to complete, it doesn't seem important.
- Make them mandatory.
- Waste of time.

## General Issues

### *Any comments on the computers or the service provided by the University's Computer network?*

- Slow and rooms too hot.
- Very good.
- Not enough computers around the university and multiple amounts of computers not working. WIFI is often very hard to access.
- The student should have chance to suggest the software on their own database such as free designing software.
- Computers in St. Georges Library is slow for programs that require a lot of computer resources. The computers can also get stuck when printing pdf documents using Adobe Reader.
- Accessing MATLAB in St Georges library is impossible.
- Wireless network overloaded connection drop out.

### *Any comments on the provision of books in the library service provided by the University's library network?*

- Decent amount of books.
- Fines are far too high.
- Not enough books.
- Some books on the list cant be found.
- Good. One book that is related to the design project but it is always on loan and could not get in out.
- Good

### *Any comments on other services provided by the University, such as Student Services, Careers, Student Health etc.?*

- Health Service is very good.
- Good advice given by Careers Service on CV writing and Advice Centre on accommodation.
- Good

### *Any comments on the support provided by the Department, such as Student Office, Stores, etc?*

- Stores very unhelpful
- No help in the following Semester e.g. if struggling to understand material in Sem 1, the linked module would just expect full knowledge of previously taught material despite the students understanding.
- Stores should always be open.
- Stores plenty available.
- Some components in the Departmental Electronic Store is always out of stock making the construction for the design project a bit hard.

### *Any comments on issues not covered in the questionnaire?*

- Severe lack in working space in libraries and limited access to rooms when not in use. Why can suitable rooms (e.g. design room – Portobello) not be used when no lectures are on?

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**

# 2009/2010 Semester 2 Questionnaires

# Final Year Projects

# THIRD & FOURTH YEAR GENERAL COMMENTS

## *Any additional comments on projects?*

### *THIRD YEAR*

- It is a little bit hard to do a research project for a 3rd Year student.
- The PhD students were very helpful especially with software teaching and I used to ask them if I had any problem in the project.
- Books needed for reference from library are frequently not available or have a long queue of reservations. Basic concepts needed for project is taught in Semester 1 and 2 of the yar whilst project is on-going.
- Very well organised.
- The experience of final year project is really fantastic. Although a lot of difficulties was met but I've got enough help from supervisor. He really helped me a lot.

### *FOURTH YEAR*

No comments received.

# Overview of the Year

## *Suggestions for any significant changes you would recommend?*

**THIRD YEAR M.Eng STUDENTS ONLY**

- Rather having exam at the end of the Semester have at mid-term as in first year.

# Overview of the Whole B.Eng/M.Eng Course

## *Suggestions for any significant changes you would recommend?*

**THIRD & FOURTH YEAR GRADUATING STUDENTS ONLY**

- The library should open for more hours such as 8am to 9pm.
- There should be more positions for students who need help from finance.
- Some of the courses and lecturers should be reviewed as I feel let down by some lecturers.
- Introduce more lab work/experiment for better understanding of idea/concepts learnt, where not everyone/every theory is easily understood just by works, explanation of pictures.
- Concept taught shall be liked to industrial/commercial application/more for better appreciation.
- More concern from tutors during 1st and 2nd Year rather than their research, it is a University after all!!
- It's better to emphasise the academic training of students i.e. lab skill, course understanding.

# General Issues

***Any comments on the computers or the service provided by the University's computer network?***

### *THIRD YEAR*

- Need more space.
- Generally OK too busy at exam time.
- Excellent network.
- Good.
- More PCs there are not enough seats in the Library.
- Sometimes slow.
- Wireless network coverage of St. Georges not good on 2nd floor.
- Very hard to find a computer in IC at busy times.
- Some software should be updated and making sure that the plugs are working well.

### *FOURTH YEAR*

No comments received.

## *Any comments on the provision of books in the library service provided by the University's library network?*

### *THIRD YEAR*

- Not enough engineering books and should be all in one library.
- Books that are frequently on loan/high rate of loaning should have reference copy in IC, or additional copies should be purchased – experienced frequently and long queue on book reservation.
- Easily available.
- Very good.
- The missing books should be replace quickly.

### *FOURTH YEAR*

No comments received.

## *Any comments on other services provided by the University, such as Student Services, Careers, Student Health, etc.?*

### *THIRD YEAR*

- Good to have ELTC involvement in different departments to help students in writing skills.
- Fine.
- Very good.
- Excellent.

### *FOURTH YEAR*

No comments received.

## *Any comments on the support provided by the Department, such as Student Office, Stores, etc.?*

### *THIRD YEAR*

- Stores have strict time slots (opening hours) are separated into too many sections.
- Very good.
- The products in store are more expensive than expected.

### *FOURTH YEAR*

No comments received.

## *Any comments on issues not covered in the questionnaire?*

### THIRD YEAR

- Lectures are too wide spread.
- Seminar rooms should not be used as lecture theatres. In seminar rooms only 6 out of 50 people can actually see the project screen.
- More free software for students should be available.
- Some lecture venues were not good such as seminar rooms in the Portobello. The rooms is not appropriate for lectures!

### *FOURTH YEAR*

No comments received.