Dear Professor Kartik Mohanram:

Student Opinion of Teaching Questionnaire Results

This form contains evaluation results for TOPICS IN VLSI CAD(ECE-2130)-1010.

Attached is a report in PDF format containing your Student Opinion of Teaching Survey results from last term. The report is best viewed and/or printed in color.

The evaluation results are broken down into three distinct categories. The first part of the report shows a breakdown of student responses to the quantitative questions. For each item, the number of students (n) who responded, the average or mean (av.) and standard deviation (dev.) are displayed next to a chart or histogram that shows the percentage of the class who responded to each option for that question. The percentages are above the number on the rating scale which increases from left to right, i.e. the number 1 equals the least favorable rating and the number 4 or 5 (depending on the scale) equals the most favorable rating. The sum of percentages will equal 100%. A red mark is displayed on the chart where the average or mean is located. To calculate how many students responded to each option, multiply the number of students who answered the question by the percentage for that option. For example, if 14 students answered the question and 50% responded to option 3 then 7 students marked option 3 for that item (14 x .50 = 7). The standard deviation is a common measure of dispersion around the mean that may be useful in interpreting the results.

If your school had previously calculated norms, they will be on OMET’s website (omet.pitt.edu).

The second part displays individual comments to each question in the open-ended section of the evaluation. All the responses to the first question will be listed together after the first question and then the responses to the next question will be listed together after the next question, and so on.

The final part gives you a profile of the student responses to the quantitative section of the evaluation. This is a chart listing all of the means for the scaled items with a dashed red line connecting the means.

If the number of respondents for any of the scaled items is fewer than seven, please be cautious in interpreting the quantitative results.

Office of Measurement and Evaluation of Teaching (OMET)
1. SELF RATINGS

1.1) Compared to other courses at the same level, the amount of work I did was:

- Much less: 0%
- 1: 14.3%
- 2: 28.6%
- 3: 28.6%
- 4: 28.6%
- Much more: 0%

n=7
av.=3.71
dev.=1.11

1.2) In this course I have learned:

- Much less: 0%
- 1: 0%
- 2: 16.7%
- 3: 16.7%
- 4: 66.7%
- Much more: 0%

n=6
av.=4.5
dev.=0.84

1.3) The grade I expect in this course is:

- A: 100%
- B: 0%
- C: 0%
- D: 0%
- F: 0%
- Other: 0%

n=7

2. TEACHING EVALUATION

2.1) The instructor presented the course in an organized manner:

- Hardly at all: 0%
- 1: 0%
- 2: 14.3%
- 3: 14.3%
- 4: 71.4%
- To a very high degree: 0%

n=7
av.=4.86
dev.=0.38

2.2) The instructor stimulated my thinking:

- Hardly at all: 0%
- 1: 0%
- 2: 0%
- 3: 16.7%
- 4: 83.3%
- To a very high degree: 0%

n=7
av.=4.71
dev.=0.49

2.3) The instructor evaluated my work fairly:

- Hardly at all: 0%
- 1: 0%
- 2: 0%
- 3: 0%
- 4: 100%
- To a very high degree: 0%

n=7
av.=5
dev.=0

2.4) The instructor made good use of examples to clarify concepts:

- Hardly at all: 0%
- 1: 0%
- 2: 0%
- 3: 0%
- 4: 100%
- To a very high degree: 0%

n=7
av.=5
dev.=0

2.5) The instructor maintained a good learning environment:

- Hardly at all: 0%
- 1: 0%
- 2: 0%
- 3: 0%
- 4: 100%
- To a very high degree: 0%

n=7
av.=5
dev.=0

2.6) The instructor was accessible to students. (Do not answer if no basis to judge)

- Hardly at all: 0%
- 1: 0%
- 2: 16.7%
- 3: 16.7%
- 4: 83.3%
- To a very high degree: 0%

n=6
av.=4.83
dev.=0.41
2.7) Express your judgment of the instructor’s overall teaching effectiveness:

Excellent 100%
Ineffective 0%

n=7  av.=5  dev.=0

2.8) Would you recommend this course to other students?

Definitely yes 100%

n=7

2.9) Would you recommend this instructor to other students?

Definitely yes 100%

n=7

3. TEACHING COMMENTS

3.1) What were the instructor’s major strengths?

- His knowledge about the work going on in the industry. That kept us up to date with current technical happenings.
- Kartik is a really knowledgeable person and gave us a clear guideline of what we were to expect from this course. He knows the subject matter very well, and explains concepts crisply. He shared his experiences in industry as an intern and helped us relate the material being taught to industrial projects and practices. Kartik explained the concepts concisely, and walked us through the basic idea of every programming assignment we had, so we were clear about what we had to implement. The idea of grading based on performance in the assignments and spreading the assignments throughout the semester, is a great way to go I think, since it keeps the students working uniformly throughout the semester.
- Prof. Mohanram is extremely knowledgeable in the area of CAD. His expertise coupled with his clear and organized style of presentation made me learn a lot of new and useful concepts from this course.
- Very approachable and familiar with the field and the material.
- Very broad and deep knowledge of the subject
  Unique way of info delivery
- Very knowledgeable and experienced.

3.2) What were the instructor’s major weaknesses?

- He sometimes elaborated a concept too much.
- I can’t think of anything.
- I have not perceived any weakness as such while taking this course
- Not applicable

4. COURSE COMMENTS

4.1) What aspects of this course were most beneficial to you?

- All
- Although this class is tough to me at the beginning, I feel that I really learn a lot at the end.
- Free reign to create our own development environment and a refresher on C and C++
- The course required the students to do a considerable amount of C++ coding. Coding was not my forte, but after doing all the programming assignments of this course, I am more confident now about my coding abilities, and have confidence that I can skim through large code projects work and grasp the core mechanism of its implementation.
- This course not only improved my CAD knowledge, but improved my algorithmic knowledge (due to the programming assignments). This is helping me a lot in my research too.
- assignments and industrial talks by the instructor.
4.2) What suggestions do you have to improve the course?

- A review of C/C++ programming during first couple of lectures.
- Could extend it into two classes to make it easier for more students to take.
- I do not have any suggestions right now to improve the course.
- I think the course is just perfect for a student like me.
- None
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1. SELF RATINGS

1.1) Compared to other courses at the same level, the amount of work I did was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much less</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Much more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>av.=3.71</td>
<td>md=4.00</td>
<td>dev.=1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2) In this course I have learned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much less</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Much more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>av.=4.50</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. TEACHING EVALUATION

2.1) The instructor presented the course in an organized manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>To a very high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>av.=4.86</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2) The instructor stimulated my thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>To a very high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>av.=4.71</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3) The instructor evaluated my work fairly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>To a very high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>av.=5.00</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4) The instructor made good use of examples to clarify concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>To a very high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>av.=5.00</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5) The instructor maintained a good learning environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>To a very high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>av.=5.00</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6) The instructor was accessible to students. (Do not answer if no basis to judge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>To a very high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>av.=4.83</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7) Express your judgment of the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>av.=5.00</td>
<td>md=5.00</td>
<td>dev.=0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>