ANNUAL COURSE REVIEW REPORT

COURSE INFORMATION:

Course code	Course Title	Course Co-ordinator
EX3029	Chemical Thermodynamics	Dr Jeff Gomes

Period of review: (1ˢᵗ / 2ⁿᵈ half session and academic year)	1ˢᵗ half-session 2016-17
No. students registering:	82
No. students withdrawing:	
Pass Rate (%) based on first attempt and excluding any C7, NP, GC or MC:	

COURSE APPRAISAL:

a) **PASS RATE:** Please provide a reflective commentary on the **pass rate**, especially if it is below 80% or has changed markedly from previous years

In general, it was a good pass rate (> 70%) which was a direct result of actions taken after 2015-16 course assessment.

b) **STRENGTHS**: What worked well in the course (e.g. with respect to assessment, feedback on assessment, teaching methods, opportunity to develop graduate attributes)? You should use student feedback from (i) SCEF, (ii) SSLC meetings and (iii) from any feedback from students captured by other methods (e.g. mid-term evaluations) as well as feedback from external examiners and the teaching team if available.

   i) Detailed lecture notes with worked examples;
   ii) Solving examples in class (through visualise) – students could better understand the flow of info necessary to solve simple and complex problems;
   iii) Linked Matlab continuous assessment and tutorials – helped better understanding the theory;
   iv) Tutorials and Mock-test with detailed solutions.

c) **WEAKNESSES**: What did not work well in the course (e.g. with respect to assessment, feedback on assessment, teaching methods, opportunity to develop graduate attributes)? You should use student feedback from (i) SCEF, (ii) SSLC meetings and (iii) from any feedback from students captured by other methods (e.g. mid-term evaluations) as well as feedback from external examiners and the teaching team if available.

   i) Quality of the hand-outs;
   ii) Small number of examples solved in class;
   iii) Slow pace of lectures (course delivery).

d) **IDENTIFIED GOOD PRACTICE**: Reflect on any new/innovative or particularly effective teaching or assessment methods. Indicate whether this good practice has been disseminated more widely within the School, College, University or outside of the University

   i) Designed of detailed lecture notes (working as book replacement for most students) with worked examples;
   ii) Matlab assignment that cover theoretical aspects of the course. This improved students' understanding of part of the course;
   iii) Mock-test at Week 7 covering half of the course. This worked as self-assessment tool for students as solutions and marking scheme (that would be in the exam) became clear.

COURSE DEVELOPMENT:

a) **EVALUATION OF CHANGES MADE THIS YEAR**: Evaluate any changes implemented during this year as a result of feedback from previous years. Changes made that were not successful are just as important as changes that have been successful.

   i) Due to complaints of hand-writing on 2015-16 academic year, all examples were typed and their solutions were shown during lectures. During Mini-SCEF 2016-17, students asked that part of the solutions and theory development to be written using visualiser. This was implemented in the second-half of the course;
   ii) Due to extensive use of visualiser to introduce theoretical concepts, definitions and demonstrations on 2015-16 academic year, this year Lecture Notes were developed to cover all modules;

iii)	As highlighted in previous SCEFs, assignments were strongly focused on development of programming (Matlab) skills with limited linkage with theoretical aspects of the course. The Continuous Assessment was redesigned to students to understand the procedure to solve course problems (development of algorithms) whilst improving their programming and mathematical skills.

b) **PROPOSED CHANGES FOR NEXT YEAR**: Summarise changes planned in the light of this review
i) Improve quality of Lecture Notes and Hand-Outs;
ii) Improve course delivery.

c) **SENAS APPROVAL**:		
Will a SENAS form need to be submitted to make changes to the course[1]?		NO

Quantitative summary from SCEF (*combined* % of students responding with options 3, 4 and 'totally' from SCEF summary)			
% SCEF returns:	26.8	Number of SCEF returns:	22
Was teaching effective*?		55.56	
Did students enjoy the course*?		44.45	

*The % "enjoyment" and % "effectiveness" rating should be viewed with caution if the % and numbers of SCEF returns are low (<50% or <10 returns).

Signed: *Jefferson Gomes* Date: 06/02/2017
(Course Co-ordinator)

COPIES OF THIS FORM SHOULD BE:
1. COMPLETED BY END JAN (FOR 1ST SEMESTER COURSES) AND BY END JUNE (FOR SECOND SEMESTER COURSES)
2. PUBLISHED TO STUDENTS AND STAFF VIA MYABERDEEN
3. CONTRIBUTE TO THE DISCIPLINE SUMMARY COURSE AND PROGRAMME REVIEW
4. SUBMITTED UPON REQUEST TO THE CLERK OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE

* Phase Co-ordinator for the MBChB curriculum; Interdisciplinary Degree Programme Co-ordinator, or Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) where appropriate.

---

[1] Please note: the SENAS process now allows for the submission of minor amendments (such as changes which do not have any impact to a course's timetabling or course code, and are commonly minor changes to assessment method or weighting, or pre-requisites) throughout the academic year.