

Unit Evaluation Report (standard units)

Unit evaluation results

UNIT CODE:	PH30056												
TITLE OF UNIT:	Computational physics B												
UNIT CONVENOR:	Dr Anton Souslov & Dr Ville Rimpilainen												
SEMESTER AND ACADEMIC YEAR:	S2 - 2018/9												
PH30056 Computational physics B													
Question/Response	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	Mean	Median	Mode
I can see how this unit contributes to my overall programme of study.	1	4	1	4	4	17	12	52	5	22	3.83	4	N/A
The teaching was effective in helping me learn.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	N/A
It was clear to me what criteria would be used to assess my work before assessment took place.	0	0	2	9	2	9	17	74	2	9	3.83	4	N/A
I found the resources (e.g. those available via Moodle, lecture notes etc.) supported my learning.	0	0	0	0	3	13	14	61	6	26	4.13	4	N/A
Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the unit.	2	9	1	4	7	30	12	52	1	4	3.39	4	N/A
LR1 : I was able to improve my understanding by working through the worksheets	3	13	0	0	5	22	12	52	2	9	3.45	4	N/A
FEA2 : I received helpful feedback on my work	0	0	3	13	5	22	7	30	0	0	3.27	3	N/A
Dr Anton Souslov - The teaching was effective in helping me learn.	0	-	3	-	4	-	13	-	2	-	3.64	4	N/A
Dr Ville Rimpilainen - The teaching was effective in helping me learn.	0	-	1	-	5	-	14	-	2	-	3.77	4	N/A

Number of completed unit evaluation forms so far:	23 / 90
Current response rate:	26%
1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree	

Unit Convenor's response
IDENTIFIED UNIT STRENGTHS:
<p>The course combines physics and programming. Assessment by two courseworks was found to be fair, and the students found it useful to practice scientific writing. The students also found it helpful that the first coursework took less time and weighted less (in terms of the final mark) than the second coursework. This also allowed faster feedback, which the students were able to implement for the second coursework. The lectures, Q&A sessions, Moodle resources and PC labs were all found appropriate and useful.</p> <p>The students found the experience with C++ programming helpful, as for many it was their first encounter with this language. This year we had the opportunity to have a Skype conversation with Professor Tom Witten about his area of expertise, which is Diffusion Limited Aggregation (one of the coursework topics) – the students were really engaged and excited about this. The students found the lecturers and demonstrators approachable and helpful, which is important in creating a good atmosphere for the unit.</p>
SUGGESTED AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:
<p>Using Visual Studio through UniDesk was found to be bit slow and cumbersome. Sometimes this led to disruptions during the labs and the students found it less than an ideal solution. The IT department is aware of this issue. We hope that this will be fixed during the summer.</p> <p>A set of student comments addressed the balance between physics and C++ programming: some students were more interested in the physics than the programming, and others vice versa. We therefore feel that we have struck a nice balance between the programming and physics content that largely addresses the different individual preferences and needs of the students. For example, a questionnaire was put online to map the programming needs of the students, and a lecture was tailored based on the feedback given. Moreover, Q & A sessions were held so that students could come and ask guidance on topics they found difficult.</p> <p>One of the comments mentioned that exercises and coursework handouts were found to be formulaic. These will be edited for clarity for the next year.</p> <p>The students find it important to get sufficient feedback from CW1 before writing the CW2 report. This is a challenge because CW1 takes some time to mark while the students start on the CW2 project. However, overall the students did have more time to implement feedback from CW1 coursework for their CW2 report than last year and we hope to further improve this scheduling issue in the future.</p>

PROPOSED CHANGES (WHERE APPROPRIATE):
<p>The IT department has been notified about the issues related to using Visual Studio, and we are optimistic that these problems will be solved during the summer.</p> <p>The handouts are updated regularly, so the wordings will be clarified for next year.</p>
UNIT CONVENOR'S COMMENTS:
<p>The course is well structured and established. The schedules were changed from last year to get the feedback from CW1 faster to the students, and more time was given to finish both of the courseworks. This change seemed to work well. We balance between programming and physics content in this unit, and we are aware that some students wish more practise in programming and some wish for more focus on physics instead. Fortunately, based on the student feedback, the balance seems to be about right at the moment. Throughout the lectures, we already take care to emphasize that this unit is a Physics unit, and not a programming unit, even though programming is an integral part of the work that is required to get the results.</p>