School of Chemistry – Unit Survey Feedback 16/17

Unit title: Soft Matter Chemistry		
Unit code: CHEM30212-40222-61082		
Unit co-ordinator: Rob Dryfe		
Other teaching staff: Peter Budd, Andrew Horn		
Response Rate:	31/190 (16.32%)	
Questions	**Mean score**	**Previous Year**
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	**3.94**	4.42
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	**3.84**	4.11
This unit was well organised	**4.13**	4.44
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	**4.13**	4.33
I found the tutorials linked to this course helpful	**4.29**	4.33

Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:

The course had not changed significantly from the previous year. It is a little hard to understand why the feedback score dropped, whilst the tutorials score remained – essentially- the same. These scores were slightly above the BM data.

Note that the feedback on individual lecturers reveals that while P Budd retained good feedback for both content and delivery (> 4 in both cases), Dryfe's had dropped to the high 3 zone (3.94 & 3.74, respectively), as had Horn's (3.90 & 3.48, respectively). Again, not immediately clear why this should be as there were no radical departures from last year, when the each part of the course had been received very well.

Please provide feedback to students comments:

More copies of handouts will be provided, in response to this specific criticism. We will also consider changing the order of the lectures.

School of Chemistry – Unit Survey Feedback 16/17

Unit title: Electronic Structure Calculations		
Unit code: CHEM30242		
Unit co-ordinator: Richard Henchman		
Other teaching staff: Klaus Muller-dethlefs, Paul Popelier		
Response Rate:	5/38 (13.16%)	
General University Questions	**Mean score**	**Previous Year**
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	**3.8**	4.2
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	**2.8**	3.4
This unit was well organised	**4.2**	4
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	**4.2**	4.4

Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:

Students enjoyed the course, finding it informative, filling a gap in the curriculum, and the lecturers generally engaging and open to questions.

The main concerns of the students are more practice questions, greater awareness of Prof Popelier's online material, a more engaging style from Dr Henchman, less material in the Molecular Photon Science section and less reliance on earlier material.

Please provide feedback to students comments:

All lecturers provide a sizeable amount of practice questions covered in workshops, together with past exam papers. Lecturers will continue to make their courses as engaging and clear as possible.

Students should expect that material from earlier modules will always be commonly drawn on so as to progress the level of material. Earlier content, for example in first year 10101, is still fundamental to active research.

A new section on Macromolecular Multiscale Modelling will be taught by Dr Warwicker, replacing the Molecular Photon science section of Professor Muller-Dethlefs. Hence it is not necessary to discuss here any changes to the section being removed.

The main mistakes made in the exam were:

* In part 1(a) on writing explicit Hamiltonians the S atom was often forgotten in the answer and the H2+ answer not simplified/see through to the end.

* In part 1(b) the naming and discussion of the oldest density functional was poorly answered.

* few students had really not revised at all and were making up answers on the spot.

* not answering the question concerning force-field strategy or the purpose of the mixing rules.

* misapplying Coulomb's law, missing sign of force, (non-linear) molecules have three rotational degrees of freedom, wrong units, excessive significant figures

* 3(a) not all students grasped that they needed to argue that 5/2kT changes into kinetic energy of the jet.

* 3(b) some confusion about the barrier height in potential energy curve with respect to angle between ammonia moieties.

* 3(c) CARS energy diagram well understood, except for very few students.

* 3(d) time-resolved measurement principle and experimental set-up explained by most students.

School of Chemistry – Unit Survey Feedback 16/17

Unit title: Solid State & Surfaces		
Unit code: CHEM30312-31312-61302		
Unit co-ordinator: Martin Attfield		
Other teaching staff: Robin Pritchard, Sihai Yang		
Response Rate:	30/212 (14.15%)	
Questions	**Mean score**	**Previous Year**
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	**3.97**	4.07
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	**4.17**	4
This unit was well organised	**4.33**	4.37
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	**4.33**	4.33
I found the supporting workshops for this course helpful	**4.60**	4.72
I found the Tutorials linked to this course useful	**4.13**	4.4

Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:

Overall the students seem very satisfied with the whole unit as indicated by the scores for the individual questions. The students liked the balance of lectures, pod casts, tutorials and workshops and additional support of the material and quizzes on Blackboard. They also appreciated the different styles of lecture delivery and notes. The main area for improvement covered the presentation and detail of some of the lecture handouts and request for more quiz and problem examples. Some comments concerning the difficulty of the crystallography section of the course were made which will come under review in the next two years.

Please provide feedback to students comments:

Overall we are pleased that this course was well received by the students as evidenced by the ratings and feedback provided for all aspects of the content and delivery of the course.

The following concerns that were raised by several students will be addressed:

(i) The presentation/ content of section one of the course will be reviewed and delivered by different members of staff.
(ii) Additional past paper questions will be made available for section two of the course.
(iii) Additional on-line quizzes will be produced where appropriate

Additional individual concerns raised by students will be discussed in the annual review of the course and implemented where appropriate.

School of Chemistry – Unit Survey Feedback 16/17

Unit title: Core Organic		
Unit code: CHEM30412-40222		
Unit co-ordinator: Roger Whitehead		
Other teaching staff: Daniele Leonori, Sabine Flitsch		
Response Rate: 20/180 (11.11%)		
General University Questions	**Mean score**	**Previous Year**
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	**4.45**	4.06
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	**4.15**	3.77
This unit was well organised	**4.4**	4.39
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	**3.95**	3.87
I found the Tutorials linked to this course useful	**4.4**	

Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:

In general, the students' comments were extremely positive, in particular regarding style of lecturing, quality of handouts, content and workshops. One student suggested the course is "perfect" which is certainly encouraging and all scores improved over last year. There are some suggestions that Sabine's content is a little 'information heavy' given the number of lectures and there is also a suggestion that there is insufficient provision of feedback.

Please provide feedback to students comments:

Regarding the perception that the first section of the course is information heavy, these comments have been noted although due to sabbatical arrangements this lecture block will be given by a different member of staff next year and the material is likely to be subject to change.

Regarding feedback: tutorials are provided for provision of feedback however attendance at these was generally poor in 2017. An open office hour was provided every week during the central four weeks of the course for provision of individual feedback, however no students took up the opportunity. This offer will be repeated next year and all lecturers on the course will be encouraged to do the same. Students will be similarly encouraged to attend tutorials and make use of open office hours in order to be provided with feedback and assistance with any difficulties being met.

School of Chemistry – Unit Survey Feedback 16/17

School of Chemistry – Unit Survey Feedback 16/17

Unit title: Bioorganic and Medicinal Chemistry		
Unit code: CHEM30432		
Unit co-ordinator: John Gardiner		
Other teaching staff: Sabine Flitsch, Cliff Jones		
Response Rate:	11/92 (11.96%)	
General University Questions	**Mean score**	**Previous Year**
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	**3.36**	3.47
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	**3.18**	3.16
This unit was well organised	**3.64**	3.89
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	**3.27**	3.63

Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:

Main comments in overview of bets aspects were that all parts were interesting, and a number of comments suggesting further increase in workshop-style content would be useful. Specifically this was a combination of intermixed and end-of-section workshops for exam this year and the indication is interjection of more workshop problem material within each of the blocks would be appreciated.

Positive comments about detail of content in handouts in all sections with clear explanations.

Please provide feedback to students comments:

We are pleased that the feedback indicates the content is broadly interesting and that content / handouts are comprehensive and explained. Aware that some non-medicinal chemists may not have seen some concepts efforts will continue to ensure any areas identified are further explained in material, and that any issues with relation to pace of content will be reviewed.

We note mainly the interest in including more tutorial-style regular workshop questions throughout the weeks across all sections. This year we had a combination of that format and end-of-section workshop/exam lecture. We will introduce in-lecture workshops across more weeks. It is noted however that the attendance at the exam revision / end of section workshops (well-advertized) was well under half the class.

School of Chemistry – Unit Survey Feedback 16/17

Unit title: Advanced Practical Training		
Unit code: CHEM30620		
Unit co-ordinator: Lu Shin Wong/Peter Gorry/Mike Ingleson		
Response Rate:	10/93 (10.75%)	
General University Questions	**Mean score**	**Previous Year**
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	**3.4**	3.26
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	**3.3**	3.26
This unit was well organised	**3.3**	2.39
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	**3.4**	3.57

Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:

- For the 2nd floor labs, students complained about the general lack of organisation and time constraints of MS1.

Group Projects:

- Marking "unfair" depending solely on group quality
- On our own – minimal support from supervisor
- More guidance for writing up physical/theoretical projects

Note: this is based on a very low response rate – 10.75% of the cohort!

Please provide feedback to students comments:

We acknowledge that there were some issues with the delivery of the MS1 experiment due to a change in the length of time allocated to it. Although the tasks in this MS1 experimental programme we also reduced to compensate, this appeared to be insufficient. The entire programme will be revised to ensure it will run more smoothly in future.

Group Project feedback

- The mark breakdown is designed so assessment of an individual's performance significantly outweighs that of the group's combined performance. For example, individual marks (50% project report – individual mark) assess the individual student's ability to write and discuss science concisely, critically and correctly and their contribution / performance across both semester of the project (15% project execution individual mark). Combined these two components are the dominant contributors to the overall mark (65/100).
- This is designed to be a peer supported exercise led by the student and assisted to some extent by an academic supervisor. So there will be more independence required. If more contact with supervisor was required groups were directed to seek this and be proactive in doing so.
- There is no single correct format for a project report and groups can obtain more information/guidance from blackboard and from their supervisors.