

**FACULTY OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND ENGINEERING
QUALITY ASSURANCE OF UNITS**

Report by Unit Co-ordinator

Unit code: ELE3DDE	Year: 2008	Campus: Bundoora
Unit coordinator: Jim Whittington		
Teaching staff: Jim Whittington, Ngoc Vinh Vu & Hung Nguyen (laboratory demonstrators)		

UNIT AIMS:

- (a) foster a greater understanding of electronic design automation and digital systems design;
- (b) encourage the development of the confidence required to handle new situations and take a design from concept to completion;
- (c) facilitate deeper learning by encouraging students to become actively involved, and presenting the subject in a manner that they will find both highly relevant and an enjoyable learning experience.

SECTION A: NUMERICAL INFORMATION

Number enrolled: 29

Number completing the QAU questionnaire: 22

Grade distribution : A: 12 B: 6 C: 6 D: 1 N: 4 NS: 0

Other (Please list): none

(2007 results A: 8, B: 19, C: 6, D: 5, N: 2, NS:0)

SECTION B: STUDENT RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

(a) Specific Responses to Questions:

(No comparison with previous year - only 8 survey responses in 2007 so no statistical analysis was generated)

Qa: the unit helped me develop as a team member :- 4.3

Qb: work in the unit helped me develop my analytic skills :- 4.2

Qc: Learning in this unit helped me develop my problem-solving-skills :- 4.3

Qd: I have developed my communication skills in this unit :- 3.7

Qe: this unit has helped me in tackling unfamiliar problems :- 4.0

Qf: the unit helped me to develop the capacity to plan my work :- 3.8

Qg: I improved my oral communication skills :- 3.1

Q1: the aims of the unit were made clear at the start :- 3.9

Q2: the teaching staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work :- 4.0

Q3: I was generally given enough time to understand the things I had to learn :- 3.8

Q4: the staff made a real effort to understand the difficulties I was having with my work :- 3.7

Q5: appropriate forms of assessment were used in this work :- 4.1

Q6: teaching staff gave me helpful feedback :- 3.9

Q7: the teaching staff were extremely good at explaining things :- 3.9

Q8: the workload was manageable :- 3.3

Q9: the teaching staff worked hard to make this unit interesting :- 3.6

Q10: I was able to access the learning resources :- 4.3

Q11: the teaching staff motivated me to do my best work in this unit :- 3.9

Q12: overall I am satisfied with this unit:- 4.1

(b) Summary of student comments on best aspects

Best aspects of the unit:

- Experience working in a design team
- Tutors are very helpful
- The assignments and project – interesting and challenging
- Development of design skills
- The lecturer
- Labs and notes
- Very practical hardware design

(c) Summary of student comments on needed improvements

Aspects of the unit that need improvement:

- Assignment weighting could be higher
- At times more demonstrators would be helpful
- Two hour lecture on Tuesday, would be better as two one-hour lectures
- Sometimes workload was on the heavy side
- HDL Designer was difficult to learn – more labs/exercises would be good
- ELE3DDE and ELE3PRO assessment due around the same time
- Lab set-up could be improved with greater internet access

SECTION C: UNIT COORDINATOR'S COMMENTS

(d) Last year's suggested improvements

- If possible, have fulltime staff member teach this unit next year. If it becomes necessary for a sessional lecturer to teach this unit it is highly advisable that they be given plenty of notice to prepare adequately for the unit.

(e) Unit coordinator's comments on the unit this year

In 2007 it was noted that there appeared to be some issues surrounding the use of sessional staff to teach this highly intensive hands-on unit. In 2008 the unit was once again taught by a full-time staff member of staff. The results have improved and student feedback is generally very positive. For the most part this unit is meeting its aims. The only two questions to receive average responses less than 3.5 were (i) Qg: "I improved my oral communication skills" (3.1) and (ii) Q8: "the workload was

manageable” (3.3). Firstly, this unit does not specifically aim to improve oral communication and it does not play a significant part in the unit apart from normal teacher-student and student-student interactions. Secondly, there are some questions on the total workload and balance with other units such as ELE3PRO which had an increased credit point value in 2008.

The workload issue, while not drastic, deserves some consideration, perhaps around adjustment of the scope and timing of assignments and/or project. Some comments have also been made on difficulty of learning the EDA tools used in the unit. Where possible, addition tutorials/examples/exercises should be provided.

(f) Unit coordinator’s suggestions for improvements next year

1. Review unit workload without compromising quality of assignment and project work. Consider adjustments to scope and timing.
2. Where possible, provide addition tutorials/examples/exercises on use of EDA tools.

Signed:

Date: 11 February 2009

(Unit Coordinator) Jim Whittington

SECTION D: COMMENTS BY HEAD OF SCHOOL OR NOMINEE

A well run and mature unit. The expansion to 15CP allowed more time for the practical aspects.

Signed

(Head of School)

Date: 6 March 2009