Responses: **17** / 108

PX390 - Module Feedback

Thank you for submitting your feedback on this module - the results will be collated and the information viewed by the module leader and the Education Committee and can help to improve the experience of students taking this module in future.

1 I watched or read through the notes of (...?...) of the online lecture material

Response	Average	Total
>80%	76%	13
50-80%	12%	2
<50%	12%	2
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

2 I attended (...?...) of the Live events for this module

Response	Average	Total
All	18%	3
Most	35%	6
Some	35%	6
None	12%	2
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

3 The quantity of material was...

Response	Average	Total
About right	59%	10
Too great	29%	5
Too little	12%	2
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

4 By the end of the module its purpose and direction were...

Response	Average	Total
Clear	59%	10
Hazy	24%	4
Unclear	18%	3

Response	Average	Total
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

5 Explanation of new terms and concepts was...

Response	Average	Total
Adequate	50%	8
Poor	50%	8
Total responses to question	94%	16/17

6 I have a (...?...) set of notes

Response	Average	Total
Good	13%	2
Adequate	53%	8
Poor	33%	5
Total responses to question	88%	15/17

7 Would you like a course taking this subject further ?

Response	Average	Total
Yes	47%	8
Neutral	29%	5
No	24%	4
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

8 Did you use any of the recommended/suggested textbooks?

Response	Average	Total
Yes - consulted	31%	5
No	69%	11
Total responses to question	94%	16/17

9 I found the textbook(s) used to be...

Response	Average	Total
Helpful	19%	3

Response	Average	Total
Unhelpful	19%	3
I did not use a textbook	63%	10
Total responses to question	94%	16/17

I understood the following main topics...

10 Pointers

Response	Average	Total
First time through online lectures or notes	18%	3
After more work	76%	13
Poorly	6%	1
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

11 Compiling

Response	Average	Total
First time through online lectures or notes	53%	9
After more work	41%	7
Poorly	6%	1
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

12 Stability

Response	Average	Total
First time through online lectures or notes	12%	2
After more work	59%	10
Poorly	29%	5
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

13 Advection

Response	Average	Total
After more work	47%	8
Poorly	53%	9

Response	Average	Total
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

14 Boundary conditions

Response	Average	Total
First time through online lectures or notes	12%	2
After more work	59%	10
Poorly	29%	5
Total responses to question	100%	17/17

15 Matrices

Response	Average	Total
First time through online lectures or notes	13%	2
After more work	75%	12
Poorly	13%	2
Total responses to question	94%	16/17

16 The best features of this module were:

Respondent	Response
	The live question and answer sessions on Teams, the Moodle forum, and the first few moodle quizzes (CodeRunner).
	The live lectures were great for getting some tips on the assignment.
	N/A
	Learning a new programming language and the Q&A sessions. I enjoyed learning how numerical problems in science are solved in practice
	I really enjoyed the initial struggle to get the code to work, particularly on the latter 3 assignments. This meant that when I finally got it to output good data (which I plotted on matlab), it was so satisfying to see how interactive the models could be. I particularly liked testing the final assignment with funky data points and constants to see what would happen.
	Good pre recorded content.
	The content was delivered succinctly and well.
	Assessment was 100% coursework based
	The depth of the assignments
	All coursework
	The small number of assignments

Respondent	Response
	it was assignment based
	C is a great language to know, very versatile and useful as a workplace skill. The Moodle quizzes were particularly good as they developed specific areas of knowledge through practical work
	None
Total responses to question	14/17

17 Any particular aspects/items needing improvement (and suggestions how):

Respondent	Response
	The quality of teaching and the lecture notes need to be much higher. The topics discussed should help and be more clearly related to the assignments and the notes should be much more rigorous. The module began with a rocky start with confusion regarding how to setup and run things, in particular what software to write code in, where/how to compile it, and finally actually compiling and running on nenneke instead of on our own home computers. This should certainly be clarified in future.
	I'm not sure whether it was the fact the module was online or not, but I found the lectures really difficult to follow and it was challenging to understand what I actually needed from them. Assignments took so long to complete and the individual feedback didn't tell me in much detail where I went wrong in the assignment which was annoying as I spent so long doing them. The marking doesn't seem particularly fair, as it is mostly done from test cases and so one mistake can propagate through all the test cases and lose lots of marks from one small mistake. This could perhaps be looked at in the next year.
	The module is poorly explained before being taken. I expected a coding module but in reality it was more like a PDEs module with some aspects of C.
	Sometimes it was difficult to interpret what was needed for the assignments and some of the new material that was introduced in lectures was difficult to understand. Also, the module did run over the allotted time. This was fine, however it would have been useful to have been made aware of this when choosing modules at the beginning of the year.
	I think at times the specification lacked clarity in key areas, or sometimes differed from the notes. For example, on assignment 3 the answer for dx in terms of length and # of grid points was not the same as the notes. I think adding some additional detail could be useful, as for me the majority of the assignment was spent deciphering exactly what was meant by some of the specification requirements.
	• While the pre-recorded content was good I think it wasn't in detailed enough, I used many YouTube videos to understand the content better. I think there should have been more depth to the content. • I very much disliked the assignments going across to week 7 of term 2. Very much struggled to keep up with 2nd term modules since there was SO much work for this module into term 2 - I think it is very much achievable to have them all in term 1/ last one due in the first week of term 2. That way there is less time in between to forget content and have to rewatch everything again and a more manageable workload. • I definitely spent over the 10hour per CAT recommendation for this module.
	Producing a test which doesn't account for all testing but allows for students to see if they were on the right lines would be very helpful as currently it is hard to know what to test for and whether the tests done are passed or not.
	What would have helped me was a better or further explanation of the numerical methods introduced.
	Lecture notes could be improved as they were, at times, unclear and confusing
	If you made a small mistake in the maths/calculations in the assignment you lost a large chunk of the marks Spreading the lecture material over the whole ten weeks of term one rather than cramming it into seven weeks
	Make marking criteria more clear when setting exercises. For example, in assignment 3 marks were only given for certain specific coding formats, whereas in 4 they were additionally given for 'pointer checks' etc whereas in 5 they were mostly given for outputs and compiling efficiency

Respondent	Response
	could work more on boundary condition
	The content of assignments 4 and 5 went beyond being challenging and became a poor reflection of a students ability to code as opposed to a test of how able they were to solve linear PDEs. I was surprised and disappointed at the large number of marks (about 50%) given not for code design or quality but simply for whether or not the solution to the equation was correct. It should be noted that not all students taking this course are Physics students and that the heavy focus on solving PDEs was unexpected and inappropriate. It should also be noted that this module was described as an introductory course to C. Assignments 4 and 5 were an inappropriate step up and at a level many students couldn't be reasonably expected to reach. I understand the need for content to differentiate between good and exceptional candidates, but these assignments were inaccessible to too many.
	The quality of teaching and more practice problems for the assignments.
Total responses to question	14/17

18 Any other comments:

Respondent	Response
	This has been my least favourite module so far, this may be partly due to the lack of in-person workshops as a result of COVID-19, as these workshops have been very useful in previous computing modules. In general I would have felt much more comfortable and confident with this module if there had been more guidance and more personal feedback for the assignments
	Very useful module! It has made me overall a better programmer
	More tests for later assignments
	The lecturer's marking was unfair and inconsistent. On the second assignment, they did not enable correct validation, and students were able to get 100% marks, despite submitting incorrect solutions. While I myself was not one of these people, I know people who are, and this undermines the integrity of the module. Additionally, the marking for assignments 3-5 was highly I consistent, and codes which produced the same solutions were marked differently. The marking seemed arbitrary at times, and was also flawed fundamentally, as multiple test cases were tied to each other, meaning if one of them was failed; they all were. Overall I enjoyed this module, but the lecturer has much work to do before this is a complete and fair module.
	Felt that using C instead of C++ was much harder work and very frustrating at times
	proper mark scheme after the assignment would be nice
	I found most of the feedback for the assignments insufficient to help me improve for the next one. I have used the notes extensively yet I was still unable to solve some of the problems as I have not seen a full implementation for one. Please release the solutions for the assignments so we can see where we went wrong.
Total responses to question	7/17