Dear Professor Kartik Mohanram:

Student Opinion of Teaching Questionnaire Results

This form contains evaluation results for VALDTN VERFCTN TECHNQ DIG SYS(ECE-2141)-1095.

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 5 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%, 0%, 66.7%, 22.2%, 11.1%
- Much more: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%

n=9
av.=3.44
dev.=0.73

1.2) In this course I have learned:

- Much less: 0%, 0%, 11.1%, 44.4%, 44.4%
- Much more: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%

n=9
av.=4.33
dev.=0.71

1.3) The grade I expect in this course is:

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

n=9

2. TEACHING EVALUATION

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

- Hardly at all: 0%, 0%, 0%, 33.3%, 66.7%
- To a very high degree: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%

n=9
av.=4.67
dev.=0.5

2.2) The instructor stimulated my thinking.

- Hardly at all: 0%, 0%, 0%, 33.3%, 66.7%
- To a very high degree: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%

n=9
av.=4.67
dev.=0.5

2.3) The instructor evaluated my work fairly.

- Hardly at all: 0%, 0%, 0%, 22.2%, 77.8%
- To a very high degree: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%

n=9
av.=4.78
dev.=0.44

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

- Hardly at all: 0%, 0%, 0%, 11.1%, 88.9%
- To a very high degree: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%

n=9
av.=4.89
dev.=0.33

2.5) The instructor maintained a good learning environment.

- Hardly at all: 0%, 0%, 0%, 22.2%, 77.8%
- To a very high degree: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%

n=9
av.=4.78
dev.=0.44

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

- Hardly at all: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 100%
- To a very high degree: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%

n=9
av.=5.00
dev.=0.00
2.7) Express your judgment of the instructor’s overall teaching effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>22.2%</th>
<th>77.8%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=9  
av.=4.78  
dev.=0.44

2.8) Would you recommend this course to other students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>22.2%</th>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
<th>77.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=9

2.9) Would you recommend this instructor to other students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>22.2%</th>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
<th>77.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=9

3. TEACHING COMMENTS

3.1) What were the instructor’s major strengths?

- Dr. Mohanram was obviously very passionate about the material, and he was able to make it interesting and stimulating. He was very responsive to questions, and covered multiple examples to make sure the students were comprehending the material.
- He is always well prepared.
- He was very passionate about the topics presented and was very knowledgeable about the course matter.
- Prof. Mohanram made the lectures very stimulating and his grasp and enthusiasm on the topic is very motivating.

3.2) What were the instructor’s major weaknesses?

- None identified.
- None that I can think of.
- Null
- Sometimes went through examples faster than I could understand them. I was able to figure them out after class working through the examples myself, but it was a little overwhelming at first.

4. COURSE COMMENTS

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

- I found the material very interesting. I particularly liked the later material such as state machine verification and reachability analysis.
- Programming assignments were difficult, but showed class concepts well.
- The background information of verification and testing for hardware design.
- The mathematical completeness to the logic synthesis was very useful for my understanding of the whole area.

4.2) What suggestions do you have to improve the course?

- I hope to divide a 3 hour lecture into two 1.5 hour lectures.
- I thought the course worked well. It may be beneficial to add some more typed notes or presentations in case a student needed to miss a class, but overall I think the format worked fine.
- Please leave us more projects or homeworks.
- Smaller programming projects more often instead of 2 major programming projects would help balance the workload.
- The course was offered for the first time this term. So the course evolved over the term (in a positive way). I can imagine that the course
would be much better during the coming terms.
## Profile

**Subunit:** ENGINEERING-ELECTRICAL & COMPUTER  
**Name of the instructor:** Professor Kartik Mohanram  
**Name of the course:** VALDTN VERFCTN TECHNQ DIG SYS(ECE-2141)-1095  

Values used in the profile line: Mean

### 1. SELF RATINGS

1.1) Compared to other courses at the same level, the amount of work I did was:  
   - Much less  
   - To a very high degree  
   - Much more  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=3.44 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=3.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.73 \]

1.2) In this course I have learned:  
   - Much less  
   - To a very high degree  
   - Much more  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=4.33 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=4.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.71 \]

### 2. TEACHING EVALUATION

2.1) The instructor presented the course in an organized manner.  
   - Hardly at all  
   - To a very high degree  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=4.67 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=5.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.50 \]

2.2) The instructor stimulated my thinking.  
   - Hardly at all  
   - To a very high degree  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=4.67 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=5.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.50 \]

2.3) The instructor evaluated my work fairly.  
   - Hardly at all  
   - To a very high degree  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=4.78 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=5.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.44 \]

2.4) The instructor made good use of examples to clarify concepts.  
   - Hardly at all  
   - To a very high degree  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=4.89 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=5.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.33 \]

2.5) The instructor maintained a good learning environment.  
   - Hardly at all  
   - To a very high degree  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=4.78 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=5.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.44 \]

2.6) The instructor was accessible to students. (Do not answer if no basis to judge)  
   - Hardly at all  
   - To a very high degree  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=5.00 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=5.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.00 \]

2.7) Express your judgment of the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness:  
   - Ineffective  
   - Excellent  
   \[ n=9 \]  
   \[ \text{av.}=4.78 \]  
   \[ \text{md}=5.00 \]  
   \[ \text{dev.}=0.44 \]