Question: Please comment on the strengths of this course and/or ways to improve this course.

Response Rate: 66.67% (6 of 9)

1 This course was haphazard at best. The signals portion of the course was near impossible to understand, and it drew away time spent on circuits.

2 *Pilot Section* Circuits material should be made more difficult. Signals material needs to be simplified and integrated more seamlessly into the curriculum.

3 The main strength of the course was the combination of theory with application to produce an EKG system. The two portions of the course, circuits and signals, often felt disjoint, yet by the end of semester, both instructors merged their material in a coherent fashion. To improve the system, starting with a fundamental background in circuit theory, the course could introduce the signals material when the circuits material behind to address phasor domain analysis.

4 There is a bit of math that is fairly alien to students going into this course. Having a more in-depth review on that material, (i.e. complex numbers/differential equations in most cases) , would definitely help with the understanding of the signals portion of this class.

5 The broad overview was good, but I would like more specifics on circuits."

6 A strength of this course is that it introduces material to students who otherwise might not see it until later on or never. The flip side to that is that I do not think that we were ready for the intensity of the added topic of signals. Especially at the beginning, it was way over the top hard, maybe someone with hardly any circuits experience (AP physics in highschool) should not have volunteered for a pilots course, bt it wasn't even the circuits material I had a real problem with. Also I feel like on a first run though of the course, they shouldn't grade the homework in a way where most of the students get things like 30s and 40s. Also on the first signals quiz, a lot of the class got a 0 out of 30. It takes a while for students to learn something as comple as signal processing especially when completely new math operations are involved. For example, i still have no Idea what a convolution is. And it took me a couple to even figure out what CTFT and DTFT even do, never mind how to implement them on any function. Maybe you should start off with something like what are signals (like a voltage signal) and how they relate to functions in time and frequency so we get an idea of how physically these things work. I feel like they automatically assumed that we knew a signal would be a change in voltage over time, and at first I thought it might just be me that didn't know that at first, because how else could you create and electrical signal. But even talking to some of my friends in the regular circuits course they were confused by what I meant by signals. 'm glad I won't have to be fully introduced to Fourier transforms later and it definitely helped me figure out which direction I want to take my major, but it needs to be taught to us like we are sophomores not grad students. All in all I thought the course was a good idea but as it was the first time I think it was executed poorly. I do nt doubt that the professors had a phenomenal understanding of the material but they were not organized. Ad sometimes I did not even understand the concepts they were using to try to explain the concepts they were teaching. Never mind doing it in the lab with matlab.

Faculty: Erdogmus, Deniz

Question: Describe instructor's strengths, areas for improvement, and any additional comments.

Response Rate: 55.56% (5 of 9)

1 Professor Erdogmus is a genius. None of his students denied that. However, I believe he assumed that his students had a mathmatically competency much higher than what we actually had. Approaches things from a strictly theoretical side and would greatly benefit from more simplified real world examples.

2 Professor Erdogmus is both brilliant and a nice guy. However, after 95% of his lectures, I was left very confused on what was covered. Professor Erdogmus used a lot of unnecessary math to convey (what I think) were simple concepts. His notes on the board are messy and not methodical at all. Frequently, he would mention something important and just assume it "trivial" knowledge.

3 They were both good at teaching. But when it came to teaching signals there was a very steep learning curve that I don't think anyone in the class was catch up to come time for a quiz. Which is why the quiz average was lower that I think it would normally be for a class similar to this.

4 Sometimes notes and examples are hard to follow, but that is kind of the nature of the signals material. Perhaps typed notes with more words/explanations would be good."

5 They were both very well versed in their fields, but they could not convey the concepts at a level we could understand. And it may not be their fault as it was very difficult material (signals), but many of us were just not ready for it. One last thing, I think the homeworks shouldnt be weekly because when they are they include too many concepts on one homework. And especially fr sigals whn you can't get one part, you cant get the rest because its based off of it.