

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**  
**Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**  
**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)**

R A Hogg	EEE105	4.49
P.L. Judd	EEE160	4.13
N.J. Powell	EEE104	3.95
R C Tozer	EEE101	3.51
P.L. Judd	EEE112	3.06
E-J Kim	MAS145	2.29
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	2.16
S Marsh	MAS145	2.00

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

R A Hogg	EEE105	4.47
R C Tozer	EEE101	3.62
P.L. Judd	EEE160	3.37
N.J. Powell	EEE104	3.36
P.L. Judd	EEE112	3.12
S Marsh	MAS145	3.00
E-J Kim	MAS145	2.75
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	2.42

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

R A Hogg	EEE105	3.59
E-J Kim	MAS145	3.43
S Marsh	MAS145	3.33
P.L. Judd	EEE160	3.32
R C Tozer	EEE101	3.27
N.J. Powell	EEE104	3.27
P.L. Judd	EEE112	3.22
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	2.97

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

S Marsh	MAS145	5.00
N.J. Powell	EEE104	4.27
P.L. Judd	EEE160	4.27
R C Tozer	EEE101	4.20
P.L. Judd	EEE112	4.12
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	3.83
E-J Kim	MAS145	3.79
R A Hogg	EEE105	2.82

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

S Marsh	MAS145	5.00
P.L. Judd	EEE160	4.45
N.J. Powell	EEE104	4.42
P.L. Judd	EEE112	4.39
R C Tozer	EEE101	4.04
E-J Kim	MAS145	4.00
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	3.97
R A Hogg	EEE105	3.16

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

S Marsh	MAS145	5.00
N.J. Powell	EEE104	4.18
P.L. Judd	EEE112	4.17
P.L. Judd	EEE160	4.02
R C Tozer	EEE101	4.00
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	4.00
R A Hogg	EEE105	3.91
E-J Kim	MAS145	3.86

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

S Marsh	MAS145	5.00
P.L. Judd	EEE160	4.20
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	4.19
P.L. Judd	EEE112	4.17
E-J Kim	MAS145	4.17
N.J. Powell	EEE104	4.00
R C Tozer	EEE101	3.91
R A Hogg	EEE105	2.93

**Q8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with this module (5 - very satisfied, 4 - well satisfied, 3 - just satisfied, 2 - slightly unsatisfied, 1 - very unsatisfied)**

S Marsh	MAS145	5.00
P.L. Judd	EEE112	4.22
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	4.21
N.J. Powell	EEE104	4.13
P.L. Judd	EEE160	4.05
R C Tozer	EEE101	4.02
E-J Kim	MAS145	3.93
R A Hogg	EEE105	2.69

**Q9. Please rate the effectiveness of the lecturer (5 – very effective, 4 – quite effective, 3 – marginally effective, 2 – slightly ineffective, 1 – very ineffective)**

S Marsh	MAS145	5.00
P.L. Judd	EEE112	4.56
R C Tozer	EEE101	4.44
P.L. Judd	EEE160	4.41
N.J. Powell	EEE104	4.31
E-J Kim	MAS145	4.29
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	4.23
R A Hogg	EEE105	3.04

**Number of returns:**

R C Tozer	EEE101	45
N.J. Powell	EEE104	45
R A Hogg	EEE105	45
P.L. Judd	EEE160	44
C Van der Bruck	MAS147	35
P.L. Judd	EEE112	18
E-J Kim	MAS145	14
S Marsh	MAS145	1

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**  
**Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**  
**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)**

Computing (C prog.)	4.10
Digital Logic Circuit	4.08
Workstation 1	3.79
Workstation 2	3.74
PN1	3.68
PN2	3.65
Computer Aided Design	3.64
Professional Skills	3.30

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

Professional Skills	N/A
Computing (C prog.)	4.27
Digital Logic Circuit	4.13
Workstation 1	3.95
Workstation 2	3.95
Computer Aided Design	3.90
PN1	3.85
PN2	3.85

**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 prog.)	4.40
Workstation 1	4.20
Workstation 2	4.13
Digital Logic Circuit	4.13
Professional Skills	4.08
PN2	4.00
PN1	3.83
Computer Aided Design	3.56

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

Workstation 1	3.95
Workstation 2	3.88
Computing (C prog.)	3.85
Professional Skills	3.81
Digital Logic Circuit	3.80
PN1	3.45
PN2	3.33
Computer Aided Design	3.18

**Q5. How much technical material 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 prog.)	4.18
Digital Logic Circuit	4.08
PN2	3.73
Computer Aided Design	3.62
PN1	3.60
Workstation 2	3.55
Workstation 1	3.43
Professional Skills	3.19

**Q6. How much did you learn from the exercise about experimental skills/technique? (5 - much more than existing knowledge, 4 - some new concepts, 3 - re-enforced existing knowledge, 2 - little, 1 - nothing)**

Computing (C prog.)	4.15
Digital Logic Circuit	4.03
PN2	3.80
PN1	3.65
Computer Aided Design	3.59
Workstation 1	3.45
Workstation 2	3.43
Professional Skills	3.21

**Q7. 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)**

Professional Skills	3.57
Digital Logic Circuit	3.41
Workstation 1	3.30
Computing (C prog.)	3.30
Workstation 2	3.23
PN1	3.23
PN2	3.21
Computer Aided Design	3.15

**Average for Q1 – Q7**

Computing (C prog.)	4.04
Digital Logic Circuit	3.95
Workstation 1	3.72
Workstation 2	3.70
PN2	3.65
PN1	3.61
Professional Skills	3.53
Computer Aided Design	3.52

\*Professional Skills is an average of only 6 questions.

**Number of responses**

Workstation 1	42
Workstation 2	42
PN1	41
PN2	40
Computing (C prog.)	40
Computer Aided Design	39
Digital Logic Circuit	39
Professional Skills	37

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**  
**Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**  
**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)**

R. A. Hogg	EEE105	4.50
C.H. Tan	EEE201	4.45
L. Wyatt	MAS242	4.00
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	3.89
D. Kitchen	EEE221	3.83
P.L. Judd	EEE221	3.43
J. Kelly	EEE220	3.08

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

R. A. Hogg	EEE105	4.50
C.H. Tan	EEE201	4.16
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	3.95
L. Wyatt	MAS242	3.95
J. Kelly	EEE220	3.26
D. Kitchen	EEE221	2.97
P.L. Judd	EEE221	2.92

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

R. A. Hogg	EEE105	4.00
L. Wyatt	MAS242	3.38
C.H. Tan	EEE201	3.34
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	3.32
J. Kelly	EEE220	3.24
D. Kitchen	EEE221	3.17
P.L. Judd	EEE221	3.14

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

P.L. Judd	EEE221	4.38
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	4.27
R. A. Hogg	EEE105	4.00
D. Kitchen	EEE221	3.67
C.H. Tan	EEE201	3.45
L. Wyatt	MAS242	3.16
J. Kelly	EEE220	2.92

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

R. A. Hogg	EEE105	4.50
P.L. Judd	EEE221	4.46
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	4.41
C.H. Tan	EEE201	3.82
D. Kitchen	EEE221	3.72
L. Wyatt	MAS242	3.68
J. Kelly	EEE220	2.89

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

R. A. Hogg	EEE105	5.00
C.H. Tan	EEE201	3.89
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	3.84
P.L. Judd	EEE221	3.76
J. Kelly	EEE220	3.65
L. Wyatt	MAS242	3.59
D. Kitchen	EEE221	3.57

**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	EEE221	4.17
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	4.03
R. A. Hogg	EEE105	4.00
L. Wyatt	MAS242	3.89
D. Kitchen	EEE221	3.77
J. Kelly	EEE220	3.73
C.H. Tan	EEE201	3.58

**Q8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with this module (5 - very satisfied, 4 - well satisfied, 3 - just satisfied, 2 - slightly unsatisfied, 1 - very unsatisfied)**

R.C. Tozer	EEE204	4.11
R. A. Hogg	EEE105	4.00
P.L. Judd	EEE221	3.89
L. Wyatt	MAS242	3.51
C.H. Tan	EEE201	3.50
D. Kitchen	EEE221	3.44
J. Kelly	EEE220	3.24

**Q9. Please rate the effectiveness of the lecturer (5 - very effective, 4 - quite effective, 3 - marginally effective, 2 - slightly ineffective, 1 - very ineffective)**

P.L. Judd	EEE221	4.27
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	4.16
C.H. Tan	EEE201	3.55
R. A. Hogg	EEE105	3.50
D. Kitchen	EEE221	3.44
L. Wyatt	MAS242	3.22
J. Kelly	EEE220	2.92

**Number of returns**

C.H. Tan	EEE201	38
J. Kelly	EEE220	38
P.L. Judd	EEE221	37
R.C. Tozer	EEE204	37
L. Wyatt	MAS242	37
D. Kitchen	EEE221	36
R. A. Hogg	EEE105	2

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**  
**Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**  
**SECOND 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)**

Semiconductors (Schottky Diode)	4.42
Amplifiers	4.00
AC Machines	3.83
MATLAB Signals	3.78
Transmission Lines	3.67
Microprocessors	3.61

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

Semiconductors (Schottky Diode)	4.44
Amplifiers	4.11
MATLAB Signals	3.89
Transmission Lines	3.78
Microprocessors	3.69
AC Machines	3.44

**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)**

Semiconductors (Schottky Diode)	4.08
Amplifiers	4.08
AC Machines	3.86
MATLAB Signals	3.72
Transmission Lines	3.61
Microprocessors	3.50

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

Semiconductors (Schottky Diode)	3.94
Microprocessors	3.36
Transmission Lines	3.33
MATLAB Signals	3.31
Amplifiers	3.25
AC Machines	3.22

**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)**

Semiconductors (Schottky Diode)	4.17
Amplifiers	3.61
MATLAB Signals	3.61
Transmission Lines	3.56
Microprocessors	3.44
AC Machines	3.19

**Q6. The lab increased my experimental skills. (5 - agree strongly, 4 - somewhat agree, 3 - neutral, 2 - somewhat disagree, 1 - strongly disagree)**

Semiconductors (Schottky Diode)	4.25
Amplifiers	3.81
MATLAB Signals	3.58
Microprocessors	3.50
Transmission Lines	3.31
AC Machines	3.08

**Average for Q1 - Q6**

Semiconductors (Schottky Diode)	4.22
Amplifiers	3.81
MATLAB Signals	3.65
Transmission Lines	3.54
Microprocessors	3.52
AC Machines	3.44

**Number of responses:**

Semiconductors (Schottky Diode)	36
Microprocessors	36
Amplifiers	36
AC Machines	36
Transmission Lines	36
MATLAB Signals	36

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**  
**Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**  
**THIRD 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)**

R. Pursehouse	EEE342	4.83
A. Hodzic	MEC305	4.50
P.I. Rockett	EEE343	4.43
M.P. Foster	EEE340	4.17
K. Mitchell	EEE341	3.83

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

P.I. Rockett	EEE343	4.17
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	3.67
M.P. Foster	EEE340	3.50
K. Mitchell	EEE341	3.17
A. Hodzic	MEC305	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)**

P.I. Rockett	EEE343	3.50
A. Hodzic	MEC305	3.50
K. Mitchell	EEE341	3.17
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	3.17
M.P. Foster	EEE340	3.00

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

M.P. Foster	EEE340	4.33
K. Mitchell	EEE341	4.33
A. Hodzic	MEC305	4.00
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	3.83
P.I. Rockett	EEE343	3.50

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

M.P. Foster	EEE340	4.83
K. Mitchell	EEE341	4.50
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	4.17
A. Hodzic	MEC305	4.00
P.I. Rockett	EEE343	3.67

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

K. Mitchell	EEE341	4.67
M.P. Foster	EEE340	4.33
P.I. Rockett	EEE343	4.17
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	3.83
A. Hodzic	MEC305	

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

K. Mitchell	EEE341	4.67
M.P. Foster	EEE340	4.50
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	4.00
A. Hodzic	MEC305	4.00
P.I. Rockett	EEE343	3.50

**Q8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with this module (5 - very satisfied, 4 - well satisfied, 3 - just satisfied, 2 - slightly unsatisfied, 1 - very unsatisfied)**

M.P. Foster	EEE340	4.50
K. Mitchell	EEE341	4.50
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	3.67
P.I. Rockett	EEE343	3.33
A. Hodzic	MEC305	3.00

**Q9. Please rate the effectiveness of the lecturer (5 - very effective, 4 - quite effective, 3 - marginally effective, 2 - slightly ineffective, 1 - very ineffective)**

M.P. Foster	EEE340	4.83
P.I. Rockett	EEE343	4.00
A. Hodzic	MEC305	4.00
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	4.00
K. Mitchell	EEE341	3.83

**Number of responses:**

K. Mitchell	EEE341	6
R. Pursehouse	EEE342	6
P.I. Rockett	EEE343	6
M.P. Foster	EEE340	6
A. Hodzic	MEC305	2

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering**  
**Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**  
**FOURTH YEAR LECTURES**

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

N.L. Seed	EEE6491	5.00
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	5.00
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	5.00
N.L. Seed	EEE411	4.40
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	4.33
J.B.Wang	EEE407	4.33
K. Atallah	EEE407	4.33
G. Heppell	MEC408	4.20
J.B. Wang	EEE408	4.00
L. Shao	EEE422	3.67
K.L. Ford	EEE401	3.50

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

N. J. Powell	EEE6491	4.25
J.B. Wang	EEE408	4.25
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	4.25
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	4.25
J.B.Wang	EEE407	4.00
S. Khamas	EEE403	4.00
L. Shao	EEE422	4.00
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	3.86
N.L. Seed	EEE411	3.80
K. Atallah	EEE407	3.67
K.L. Ford	EEE401	3.50
G. Heppell	MEC408	3.40

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

S. Khamas	EEE403	4.00
L. Shao	EEE422	3.67
N.L. Seed	EEE411	3.20
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	3.14
J.B.Wang	EEE407	3.00
K. Atallah	EEE407	3.00
K.L. Ford	EEE401	3.00
J.B. Wang	EEE408	3.00
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	2.75
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	2.75
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	2.75

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

S. Khamas	EEE403	5.00
N.L. Seed	EEE411	4.80
G. Heppell	MEC408	4.20
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	4.17
J.B. Wang	EEE408	4.00
K.L. Ford	EEE401	4.00
K. Atallah	EEE407	4.00
J.B.Wang	EEE407	3.67
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	3.25
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	3.25
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	3.25
L. Shao	EEE422	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)**

N.L. Seed	EEE411	4.80
J.B.Wang	EEE407	4.33
K. Atallah	EEE407	4.33
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	4.29
G. Heppell	MEC408	4.20
J.B. Wang	EEE408	4.00
K.L. Ford	EEE401	4.00
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	4.00
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	4.00
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	3.75
S. Khamas	EEE403	3.00
L. Shao	EEE422	1.00

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

G. Heppell	MEC408	4.50
J.B.Wang	EEE407	4.50
K. Atallah	EEE407	4.33
K.L. Ford	EEE401	4.00
J.B. Wang	EEE408	4.00
N.L. Seed	EEE411	3.67
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	3.50
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	3.50
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	3.50
S. Khamas	EEE403	3.00
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	3.00
L. Shao	EEE422	1.33



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

R. Edyvean	CPE414	
N.L. Seed	EEE411	4.80
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	4.75
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	4.75
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	4.75
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	4.57
G. Heppell	MEC408	4.40
K.L. Ford	EEE401	4.00
S. Khamas	EEE403	4.00
J.B.Wang	EEE407	4.00
K. Atallah	EEE407	4.00
J.B. Wang	EEE408	4.00
L. Shao	EEE422	1.33

**Number of responses:**

P.I. Rockett	EEE412	7
N.L. Seed	EEE411	5
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	4
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	4
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	4
G. Heppell	MEC408	4
L. Shao	EEE422	3
K. Atallah	EEE407	3
J.B. Wang	EEE408	2
J.B.Wang	EEE407	2
K.L. Ford	EEE401	2
S. Khamas	EEE403	1

**Q8. Please rate your overall satisfaction with this module (5 – very satisfied, 4 – well satisfied, 3 – just satisfied, 2 – slightly unsatisfied, 1 – very unsatisfied)**

G. Heppell	MEC408	4.60
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	4.14
S. Khamas	EEE403	4.00
K.L. Ford	EEE401	4.00
K. Atallah	EEE407	4.00
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	3.75
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	3.75
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	3.75
J.B.Wang	EEE407	3.67
J.B. Wang	EEE408	3.50
L. Shao	EEE422	1.00
R. Edyvean	CPE414	
W. Liu	EEE6400	

**Q9. Please rate the effectiveness of the lecturer (5 – very effective, 4 – quite effective, 3 – marginally effective, 2 – slightly ineffective, 1 – very ineffective).**

N.L. Seed	EEE411	4.80
K.L. Ford	EEE401	4.50
G. Heppell	MEC408	4.50
K. Atallah	EEE407	4.33
P.I. Rockett	EEE412	4.29
N.L. Seed	EEE6491	4.25
M. Benaissa	EEE6491	4.25
N. J. Powell	EEE6491	4.25
J.B. Wang	EEE408	4.00
J.B.Wang	EEE407	3.67
L. Shao	EEE422	2.00

**1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> / 4<sup>th</sup> YEARS**  
**SEMESTER 1, 2010/2011**  
**Tutorials – 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> 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	67.50%	25.00%	7.50%	0%
Second Year	52.94%	29.41%	14.71%	2.94%

**1<sup>st</sup> Year only**

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	7.50%	37.50%	37.50%	15.00%	2.50%

**Large Group Tutorials**

**1<sup>st</sup> Year only**

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

Very well structured and logical throughout	Logical	Adequate	Unstructured	Chaotic
12.82%	56.41%	28.21%	2.56%	0%

2) **How would you assess the assistance of your demonstrator in Semester 1?**

Very helpful, enthusiastic	Very helpful	Fairly helpful	Willing but not very helpful	Not interested and not very helpful
27.50%	32.50%	25.00%	12.50%	2.50%

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
15.00%	67.50%	15.00%	0%	2.50%

## **3<sup>rd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> Year General Issues**

**How often have you used the University Careers service this year?**

Many times	Three times	Twice	Once	Not at all
15.38%	0%	7.69%	0%	76.92%

**If used, how would you assess the service given during your initial job hunting?**

Very good	Good	OK	Poor	Very poor
0%	100/0%	0%	0%	0%

## **Final Year Projects**

**What type of project are you doing?**

Year 3 Individual B. Eng	Year 3 Individual M. Eng	Year 4 Group M. Eng	Year 4 Individual M. Eng
30.77%	15.38%	53.85%	0%

**Which group is your project from?**

Group A Electromechanical Devices and Power Electronics	Group B Electronic, Optoelectronic & Micromechanical Devices	Group C Electromagnetism, Communications, Radio and Microwaves	Group D Electronic Systems and Circuits
53.85%	30.77%	7.69%	7.69%

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

	Very good	Good	OK	Poor	Very poor
Group A	100.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Group B	75.00%	25.00%	0%	0%	0%
Group C	100.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Group D	100.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

	Daily	1 Week	2 Weeks	3 Weeks	Rarely
Group A	0%	100.0%	0%	0%	0%
Group B	0%	75.00%	25.0%	0%	0%
Group C	0%	100.0%	0%	0%	0%
Group D	0%	100.0%	0%	0%	0%

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

	Very good	Good	OK	Poor	Not applicable
Group A	0%	28.57%	0%	0%	71.43%
Group B	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0%	0%
Group C	0%	0%	0%	100.0%	0%
Group D	0%	0%	0%	0%	100.0%

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

	Yes	No
Group A	100.0%	0%
Group B	75.00%	25.00%
Group C	0%	0%
Group D	0%	100.0%

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

	Very good	Good	OK	Poor	Very poor
Group A	0%	85.71%	14.29%	0%	0%
Group B	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0%	0%
Group C	0%	0%	0%	100.0%	0%
Group D	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**SHIPS**  
(2<sup>nd</sup> year only)

**How would you assess the project which you were allocated?**

Very interesting	Interesting	Reasonably interesting	Fairly tedious	Very tedious
13.51%	54.05%	24.32%	8.11%	0%

**How would you assess the level of interest from the company?**

Very enthusiastic	Enthusiastic	Reasonably interested	Not particularly interested	Not at all interested
13.89%	50.00%	30.56%	5.56%	0%

**How would you assess the contribution of your tutor to the project?**

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very poor
16.22%	27.03%	37.84%	16.22%	2.70%

**How would you assess the benefits gained from SHIPS?**

Very worth-while, learnt a lot	Worthwhile, learnt a fair bit	Reasonably useful, learnt a few things	Not particularly worthwhile	Complete waste of time
27.03%	51.35%	21.62%	0%	0%

**How would you assess the presentation day, particularly the experience gained in giving a presentation?**

Extremely useful	Useful	Reasonably useful	Not particularly useful	Not at all useful
27.03%	62.16%	8.11%	2.70%	0%

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering  
Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**

**GENERAL ISSUES**

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

	Yes	No
First Year	92.86%	7.14%
Second Year	97.30%	2.70%
Third/Fourth Year	100%	0%

**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	27.03%	29.73%	40.54%	2.70%	0%
Second Year	32.43%	37.84%	24.32%	5.41%	0%
Third/Fourth Year	22.22%	33.33%	44.44%	0%	0%

**Do you have use of your own computer at Sheffield?**

	Yes	No
First Year	83.33%	16.67%
Second Year	97.30%	2.70%
Third/Fourth Year	100%	0%

**Do you use the VPN (Virtual Private Network) system to connect your computer to the University network?**

	Yes	No
First Year	34.15%	65.85%
Second Year	42.86%	57.14%
Third/Fourth Year	53.85%	46.15%

## FIRST YEAR GENERAL COMMENTS

### Coursework

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

- For lab it is not very fair to the first group that goes in when the theory hasn't been taught in the lectures. Also they have to submit the report before the lecturer covers the theory which is a BIG DRAWBACK and an advantage to the preceding groups.
- They are perfect.
- Very good.
- Labs are not explained well, we are just given a lab sheet and are asked to do everything.
- Good.
- No support on how to write lab reports, feedback too slow.
- The facilities appear to be standard.
- Existing knowledge needed to understand is high.
- Too much coursework. It is impossible to do all work set, only possible to partly complete, or focus on one bit.

### Tutorials

#### Large Group Tutorials (Problem Classes)

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

- More problem classes and better demonstrators.
- Good.
- The demonstrator cannot spend much time on one person. It is a disadvantage.
- Combining tutorials for 101 and 104 is not a good idea.
- More demonstrators.
- Sometimes difficult to ask lecturer for help when many have questions.
- I have gained a lot in tutorials.
- Separate tutorials for digital and circuit should be essential.
- James Green is a god.
- James Green excellent.
- Don't feel that I get as much help as I need.
- What's the point when there's too much coursework to attempt tutorial sheets.

#### Small Group Tutorials (with personal tutor)

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

- The solution to a question on circuits and signals was useful, and the discussions on topics in which we are weak, such as electronic devices.
- EEE104 problem – useful to course.
- Digital – learning about movement control.
- 101 exercise. With practicing every method we learnt we can have a summary and review of 101.
- EEE101 Analysis tutorial was very helpful. Made me understand Nodal analysis for the first time.
- Are equally useful.
- Logic problem.

- The one related to 104. It was hard but practical.
- Summarizing a report as it gets me used to thinking about what to write.
- EEE101.
- Both the circuit and digital problems.
- All were good. Neil Powell's was too hard.
- 101 problem sheet helped me understand nodal analysis.
- The exercise related to modules like 101 and 104 as it helped sort out some issues I was having with the module.
- Assignment – learn something.
- The summary exercise.

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

- PDP – didn't result in anything.
- Summary. There is no need in doing that.
- None.
- Writing summaries assignment – no feedback whatsoever.
- CAD – never seen the experiment in my life. Not even heard of the topic.
- Neil Powell's – too advanced.

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

- Some of them were very boring, like the one on plagiarism. Much less time could have been spent on it.
- It is better to have one to one tutorial.
- Good.
- The tutor does not know our conditions well.
- Good and beneficial.
- Good way of meeting people on course.
- It is good to have the time to sort out any issues.
- Not particularly useful as of yet.
- Partly useful.

## **General Issues**

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

- Worth what I imagine is a significant portion of your budget.
- They are good!
- St. George's needs more computers.
- Mine doesn't like it when I leave the browser open overnight. Is there any alternation that can be made to make it better?
- It is difficult to find computers available.
- Excellent service, uninterrupted, efficient and very helpful.
- Wireless has been hit and miss sometimes.
- Had issues with saving word docs on desktop.
- Too few for busy periods. Very slow ping from residences 2500ms+!
- Logging into MUSE is difficult sometimes because of SQL connection problems.
- Good.
- Too many stupid people on facebook.
- Difficult to get access in IC.
- Good.

***Any comments on the library services, such as availability and relevance of textbooks, journals, etc. and library staff support?***

- Excellent.
- The variety is very appreciable.



- Good.
- Excellent.
- Good.
- Good service, especially the online book locator.
- Good.
- Excellent.
- Certain text books are hard to get hold of eg. 105 text books.

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

- Ok
- Need dentist.
- I've had a few problems with a flat mate and accommodation services don't seem to be doing much about it.
- SAC have been very helpful.
- Never been to student healthcare.
- Very helpful.
- It is good to have such a range of services.

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

-

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

- Eat With Us portion size sucks. Charge as much as high street shops, but that's not what they should be competing with. Increase portion size, allow seconds!
- Maybe spread assignments over the semester. Hardly any work at the start leads to complacency, then we have a lot of large assignments due in for weeks 8-12, which interferes with FYGER.
- Too much noise in many lectures from students talking.
- Teachers are too afraid to disrupt the lecture to tell persistent talking students to shut up.
- Far too much work. Do not understand why an unrestricted module was included. Workload not at all thought out. Staff seem oblivious to workload. Therefore pretty unhappy with course.

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering  
Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**

**SECOND YEAR GENERAL COMMENTS**

**Coursework**

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

- All good.
- Need more information for what need to focused more.
- Start up on computers are slow, recommend using solid state drives instead of hard disk drive (although expensive).
- During the 'Matlab' experiment, twice the computer crashed on me which was very annoying as it wasted about 30 mins of my time (Room F165).
- Timetable for labs was changed during the semester causing confusion.
- LT22 is far too cold.
- Need more café's like the one in the Turner Museum.
- Computers could be running faster.
- Very good as far as I know.
- A few computers to do Matlab wasn't fully functioning – speakers and such.
- Some boards on amplifier was a bit not working.
- Classrooms are too cold and not ventilated.

**Large Group Tutorials (Problem Classes)**

***Any tutorials which you found particularly good and why?***

- Nope, there were none that stood out from the rest.
- Yes, they helped to solve questions.
- Mr Duncan's tutorial about "the owl and the cat", very interesting outcome.
- I think for EEE220 and EEE204 there are enough postgrds/helpers.
- Maths tutorials are good. Demonstrators are good.
- Most tutorials were busy and not enough demonstrators to help with everybody's issues.
- EEE204, EEE201, MAS242: As I required help on problems effectively.
- EEE220: Reasonable.
- Not enough demonstrators.
- Maths – the explanation of questions from lecturer and demonstrator is quite good.
- Overall tutorials were not effective – need more tutors.
- Signal & System, the lecturer was very enthusiastic.

***Any particular tutorials or rooms which caused problems?***

- I would say that often there isn't enough postgrads/lecturers to help.
- Individuals would remain with a tutor preventing others asking questions. Question time should be limited per person. Tutor moves on after 10-15 mins to allow others a chance.
- Tutorials are monopolized by individuals so the tutor doesn't get to see anyone else.
- LT22 is too cold, even before winter.
- Tutorial classes are too big with nowhere near enough helpers per student.
- The tutorial classes are too big with not enough demonstrators/helpers to get around, especially in 201.
- Don't like having 204 and 220 tutorials at the same time.
- MAS242, EEE204, EEE201.
- This years tutorials didn't have many demonstrators so you would have to wait half an hour to get an answer.

- Total waste of time – just let us stay at home and answer our questions by e-mail.
- Its not ok having two tutorials at the same time. We tend to concentrate in one and not in the other. It is only 50 mins.
- Having EEE204 – Richard Tozer tutorial at the same time as EEE220 – James Kelly meant you could not ask questions about both in the hour. This is especially silly as there are different demonstrators for it yet they are timetabled at the same time. This is like having 2 lectures timetabled at once in different rooms and you can only attend one. Why not timetable them at different times.
- Do not timetable joint tutorials otherwise you might as well just have one!
- Make this digitally available.

## **SHIPS**

### ***Any suggestions for improvements or general comments on SHIPS?***

- Make the word count clearer – one of the people in my group wrote over 7000 words by himself for one subsection.
- Our project was a research project, the lectures etc were all geared towards a design and make project.
- Takes up too much time so that other modules are put on hold.
- Maybe if the project could be assigned a little earlier in the semester as SHIPS leaves you with little time to complete tutorials etc.
- Very interesting and different to usual course structure.
- Use proper lecture theatres for presentation. F137 was not appropriate.
- Good concept, need to have better projects from Arup.
- The tutors should care about their tutees. I'm very disappointed with my tutor. She didn't help us but always complained that we don't do enough work. How can we know that if we don't get any guide from our tutor. I'm totally disappointed.
- SHIPS? Very fun. Thanks a lot to Mr Peter Judd. I ♥ you!!
- Tutor should build a friendly environment between tutees and understand them more so that they can be comfortable with each other.
- The problem did not catch my interest.
- More realistic projects. Some of the projects have already been proved unfeasible. OK learning, but waste the practical. If researchers failed, what do you expect from us. Need to be more realistic.

## **General Issues**

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

- Are quite slow from initial power-up.
- No the system is good.
- Some are very good, others can be quite slow.
- Wifi access was very good, CICS were helpful during PC problems.
- Want more choice for internet browsers like on the VIE computers.
- Wifi systems is not stable enough.
- IC PC's too slow.
- Not enough.
- More computers in St. Georges Library.
- Should provide more.
- The wireless coverage is not good enough. The signal is too weak.
- Not enough silent PC's in the IC.

***Any comments on the library services, such as availability and relevance of textbooks, journals etc. and library staff support?***

- Low availability in day time, esp 2-5pm.
- Some books are not up to date.
- Good availability of text books and needed books were supplied.
- The desk for the library needs to open at the same time as the library, not at 10.
- Provide more books and easier searching systems.
- Books for energy engineering in IC are not enough.
- Most of the books are for reference and cannot be borrowed out.
- When a printer breaks down don't put the sign "an engineer will come" because this insults all that do this course.
- Superb!

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

- Student health did not take my medical issue of tonsillitis seriously. This made an important presentation difficult.
- Never attend yet.
- Career service is good.

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

- Never ask for support.
- Students need a room to meet and drink, café, plus lockers.

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

- Snow messages were good.
- U-Sport are the most useless people ever. They should be completely removed.
- Cheap food like in the glass museum near LT22 Mappin should be added throughout the university.
- St. George's café is a bit too expensive for students.
- Should improve quality of student accommodation. We pay more than private accommodation but we get less than what we deserve!
- Overall everything is ok.
- Living in university accommodation is pretty expensive.

**Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering  
Student Questionnaire 2010/11 - Semester 1**

**THIRD/FOURTH YEAR GENERAL COMMENTS**

**Year 3 / 4 Projects**

***Any additional comments on projects***

- Severe lack of equipment available for use if your project supervisor doesn't have their own research space. Weeks were spent chasing for an oscilloscope and DMM/signal generator. Incredibly disappointing that basic equipment isn't available for 3<sup>rd</sup> year students to use.
- The postgraduate assistance was made by one PhD student and that's not enough to cover the need. Because the PhD students are busy all the time so more than one student should be an assistant.
- Kind supervisor and very patient, good explanation and supervision of my project but he is very busy I feel it is difficult to find him daily.
- Confused for the first few weeks into the project but gradually pieces of the project started to make sense as the project progressed.
- Stores not open when it should be on multiple occasions. F137 technician not helpful at all.

**General Issues**

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

- Good.
- Very slow sometimes.
- If I can access the department computer is better the management school students have their own computer room and can access with a password. Sometimes I waste a lot of time waiting for a computer just for printing something.
- The computers in D137 need to be improved.
- The VPN hardly ever works. Major problem!

***Any comments on careers support?***

- Good support and advice provided in a CV workshop I attended.

***Any comments on the library services, such as availability and relevance of textbooks, journals etc. and library staff support?***

- Always full with students. Getting hard to have a place there as well as booking any book or accessing internet.
- Need more main books – often on loan.
- People are still eating other than the in the designated area in the library (St. Georges). Level of noise is unacceptable especially those who are with a group of friends. Use of mobile phones are not in the designated area. Top most level of student space at St. Georges Library is not a silent study space since it is not sound-proof.
- Lots of recommended books missing or only a few available. Therefore hard to get books – given up and downloaded ebook versions instead.
- Good.

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

- Helpful staff.
- Student Health – hard to make an appointment on day as always fully booked.

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

- Good
- Stores often closed during day.
- Some parts ordered in stores need quite long time to arrive.
- Office was closed at 11am when trying to hand in survey

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

- IC is a stupid place to study. Should have converted it into a Starbucks. Group work in the IC is still alright though.
- I have no idea how to attempt to revise for the exam as I have learnt nothing from this module at all and do not even know how to attempt to learn the content myself.
- I would also like to praise N.L. Seed. Very good lecturer, goes beyond what is necessary to help even with things unrelated to his lectures. Best lecturer/staff member in the department (that I have dealings with).