

<b>Unit title: Instrumental Analytical Chemistry</b>		
<b>Unit code: CHEM40211</b>		
Unit co-ordinator: Nick Lockyer		
Other teaching staff: Perdita Barran, Roy Goodacre		
Response Rate: 34.3		
<b>General University Questions</b>	<b>Mean score</b>	<b>Previous Year</b>
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	<b>3.67</b>	3.71
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	<b>3.17</b>	2.71
This unit was well organised	<b>4.33</b>	3.86
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	<b>4.25</b>	3.86
<b><i>Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:</i></b>		
<p>Students particularly liked link with real-world applications, the lab tour (MIB) and Prof Goodacre's 'guess the tune' in relation to vibrational spectroscopy!</p> <p>Several comments revealed a pre-occupation with identifying material which might be examinable. This suggests some students do not recognise how to use the ILOs and past papers to guide revision.</p> <p>More detailed notes on certain aspects of the course were requested by some students.</p>		
<b><i>Please provide feedback to students comments:</i></b>		
<p>The teaching staff thank the students for their constructive feedback on are pleased to see the evaluation scores increase in 3 of the 4 categories with the overall quality score remaining high.</p> <p>On the subject of feedback, students are reminded that comments on previous exam performance and guidance on answering past papers is included on Blackboard. Expectations regarding examinations are discussed in revision sessions as well as throughout the course, with reference to the ILOs. The structure of the exam paper was included on Blackboard.</p> <p>We will reconsider the level of detail in the lecture/supplementary notes to help direct students in their reading around the subject.</p>		

<b>Unit title: Computational Modelling Techniques</b>		
<b>Unit code: CHEM40241</b>		
Unit co-ordinator: Joe McDouall		
Other teaching staff: Neil Burton		
Response Rate: 48.1		
<b>General University Questions</b>	<b>Mean score</b>	<b>Previous Year</b>
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	<b>4.92</b>	4.62
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	<b>4.92</b>	4.62
This unit was well organised	<b>4.92</b>	4.69
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	<b>4.85</b>	4.85
I found the supporting workshops for this course helpful	<b>4.85</b>	n/a
<b><i>Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:</i></b>		
<p>The course was very well received with some extremely positive feedback from the students. The delivery and content of the course was clearly found to be interesting and stimulating. The material covered and the programming skills learnt were viewed as extensively useful, often helping with work being done in final year projects, as well as explaining things that were “known” (but not understood?) previously. This year the weekly workshops were extended to 2.5 hours and it was good to see that this enabled students to complete worksheets more effectively.</p>		
<b><i>Please provide feedback to students comments:</i></b>		
<p>This year's cohort of students was a strong one with excellent engagement being shown by the majority. It was a pleasure to teach them. As always there was a very wide range of programming ability amongst the cohort, ranging from seasoned to novice programmers. A recurring problem we observed in workshops, and from the outcomes of the coursework test and the exam, is that there is still a tendency, by a few, to rely too heavily on memory. As we tried to emphasise throughout, this approach really doesn't work in learning programming. Deconstructing a problem into simple steps (as many as required) is the only way to be sure of getting things right, it is not possible to leap to an answer. This requires confidence and practise, which we try to build up in the workshops every week. Both lecturers are always happy to be contacted for help and information about the course, this year there was relatively little querying outside of the workshops and lectures. If students have any queries they should not hesitate to contact the lecturers.</p>		

<b>Unit title: Surface and Interface Chemistry</b>		
<b>Unit code: CHEM40271</b>		
Unit co-ordinator: Melissa Denecke		
Other teaching staff: Alex Walton, Lu Shin Wong		
Response Rate: 40.0%		
<b>General University Questions</b>	<b>Mean score</b>	<b>Previous Year</b>
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	<b>3.92</b>	3.75
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	<b>3.33</b>	3.25
This unit was well organised	<b>4.08</b>	4.00
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	<b>4</b>	3.94
<p><b><i>Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:</i></b></p> <p>The content was considered interesting, challenging and relevant. This is reflected in the increase in overall rating (40% return). A number of students thought more workshops or practice questions would be valuable. The deliveries of Dr. Walton and Wong were considered excellent.</p>		
<p><b><i>Please provide feedback to students comments:</i></b> Students commented that the content of CHEM40271 is a challenging but interesting and relevant, taught by experts in their fields. As material is new, students felt that more workshops and review questions would be helpful.</p>		

<b>Unit title: Radiochemistry and Nuclear Chemistry</b>		
<b>Unit code: CHEM40311</b>		
Unit co-ordinator: Francis Livens		
Other teaching staff: Louise Natrajan, Steve Liddle		
Response Rate: 24.3%		
<b>General University Questions</b>	<b>Mean score</b>	<b>Previous Year</b>
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	<b>4.28</b>	4.19
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	<b>3.5</b>	3.62
This unit was well organised	<b>3.94</b>	4.04
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	<b>3.61</b>	3.92
<b><i>Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:</i></b>		
<p>Student comments can be grouped into two themes-</p> <p>Content, where some comments suggest we overemphasise the inorganic chemistry of the radioelements, rather than their technological applications.</p> <p>Overlap/repetition, where similar material is presented by both Liddle and Natrajan, and where some of it has already been presented in previous years.</p>		
<b><i>Please provide feedback to students comments:</i></b>		
<p>Content- crudely, this course is about 50:50 chemistry and applications and this is the same mix as for the last few years, since the present lecturing group became involved. Previous incarnations, going back several years, did have more emphasis on applications topics, but the content of the current course is clearly specified and should not be a surprise</p> <p>Overlap/repetition – this course is available to students following several different pathways, some of whom will have spent a year away from Manchester and will not necessarily have met this material earlier. Some limited repetition is therefore necessary if they are not to be disadvantaged. We also find that 'repetition' is actually welcomed by many students since it revises key foundations and ensures they are well prepared for the new material they encounter.</p> <p>While Natrajan and Liddle do cover some of the same material, the emphases are very different. These different perspectives are useful, in our opinion, since Liddle and Natrajan present quite different material, and, although the foundations may be similar, the nature of the material each presents, taken as a whole, is quite different.</p>		

<b>Unit title: Advanced Organic Synthesis</b>		
<b>Unit code: CHEM40411</b>		
Unit co-ordinator: Daniele Leonori		
Other teaching staff: Andrew Regan, Alex Pulis		
Response Rate: 30.4%		
<b>General University Questions</b>	<b>Mean score</b>	<b>Previous Year</b>
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	<b>4.71</b>	4.05
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	<b>4.29</b>	4.05
This unit was well organised	<b>4.94</b>	4.62
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	<b>4.59</b>	4.14
<b><i>Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:</i></b>		
This unit was well received overall, and for all three lecturers the students appreciated the clear drawings and explanations given during the lectures.		
<b><i>Please provide feedback to students comments:</i></b> The comments showed that students appreciated the clear, careful explanations of concepts, mechanisms and stereochemistry, and we will continue to adopt this approach in future		

<b>Unit title: Organometallic Chemistry</b>		
<b>Unit code: CHEM41521</b>		
Unit co-ordinator: Mike Greaney		
Other teaching staff: Igor Larrosa, Frank Mair		
Response Rate: 30%		
<b>General University Questions</b>	<b>Mean score</b>	<b>Previous Year</b>
Overall, I would rate this unit as being excellent	<b>3.72</b>	3.05
The feedback that I received on my work was helpful	<b>3.11</b>	3.05
This unit was well organised	<b>3.89</b>	2.76
The eLearning resources provided in this unit enhanced my learning experience	<b>3.67</b>	3.24
<b><i>Please summarise the main themes from students' comments:</i></b>		
<p>Generally positive comments – some issues with excessive content [Greaney] and format of modules [Mair]. Students were broadly positive to the workshop, flipped learning concept, but felt under time pressure given its delivery in the final third of the semester when revision is starting to mount up.</p>		
<b><i>Please provide feedback to students comments:</i></b> Students are thanked for helpful comments. Emphasis on worked examples / exam practice will be increased, along with time available for workshop preparation.		