

Biochemistry BCH32MCB (Molecular Cell Biology)
Summary of responses to QAU questionnaire - 2006

Students voluntarily completed a questionnaire during the final week of second semester. The response rate was 67% (47 questionnaires were returned from a class of 70 students).

Questions 1 – 14 were answered with the following numeric responses:

1 = none of the time; 2 = little of the time; 3 = half of the time; 4 = most of the time; 5 = all of the time

(so the higher the score, the more positive the response from the students).

The average scores (out of 5) for the responses to these questions were as follows:

Q1:	The aims were made clear	4.3
Q2:	The workload is manageable	4.0
Q3:	The amount and type of assessment is appropriate for this unit.....	4.0
Q4:	The level of support, help and advice is appropriate for this unit	4.4
Q5:	I have learned a lot in this unit	4.5
Q6:	The unit was well organized.....	4.4
Q7:	Things have been explained well in the lectures	3.9
Q8:	You can clearly see how the various parts of the unit fit together	4.2
Q9:	I try to relate ideas in this unit to those in others, whenever possible	4.2
Q10:	Practicals were a useful learning experience	4.7
Q11:	The instructions in the prac manual were clear	4.5
Q12:	The demonstrators helped me to understand the pracs.....	4.5
Q13:	Access to the online lecture material enhanced my understanding of the lecture content	4.5
Q14:	Overall, the quality of the teaching was high	4.4

Question 15 was answered with the following numeric responses:

1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = satisfactory 4 = good 5 = very good

(again, the higher the score, the more positive the response from the students).

The average score (out of 5) for the responses to this question was:

Q15:	All things considered, how would you rate this unit?	4.5
------	--	-----

The overall average score for all 15 questions answered with numeric responses was 4.3 out of 5.

Questions 16 to 18 were open-ended questions about the unit. The most common responses to each of these questions are summarized below, with the % of respondents shown in parentheses. Only those responses given by two or more students (4% or more of respondents) are shown.

Q16:	What is the best thing about this unit?
	The practical classes were informative and well organized (21%)
	The practical classes were very interesting (15%)
	Unit coordinator Steve Jones approachable, explained things thoroughly, made topics interesting (6%)
	The unified, “mini-research project” style of the prac course (6%)
	The lecture material related well to the practical work (4%)
	The high level of hands-on experience gained in pracs (4%)
	The way in which the different parts of practical work were linked, provided a “big picture” view (4%)
Q17:	How could this unit be improved?
	All lecture notes should be available on WebCT before lectures (6%)
	Weighting of the practical component of the unit should be increased to reflect workload (6%)
	Diagrams given in lectures need written explanations (4%)
Q18:	Do you wish to comment on any other aspect of this unit?
	It was great (6%)
	Need more tutorials (4%)
	Learned lots (4%)

In response to these comments, attempts will be made to ensure a more timely uploading of teaching materials to WebCT in advance of lectures. The assessment of practical work will be reviewed in light of the workload associated with this component of the unit.