

UG4 Staff Student Liaison Committee

Wednesday 8th March 2017, 2pm-3pm

Room G.A22, Forrest Hill

- Present:** Mary Cryan (chair, UG4 Year Organiser)
Angus Pearson (UG4 Student Representative)
Ben Shaw (UG4 "extra" Student Representative)
- Attending:** Gregor Hall (UG4/5 Administrator)
- Apologies:** Sanchit Gupta (UG4 Student Representative)

1. **Comments on Computing Resources** - Access to computers was mentioned as causing concern amongst the students. The Drill Hall was noted as being very busy for much of the day. It was the view of the rep that some students were changing their day – sleeping longer and arriving later – in order to get uninterrupted access to machines. So the quantity of machines available to the student body was one issue. It was also mentioned that students would often take up machines by leaving processes running for several hours at a time, exacerbating the situation. The capacity of general purpose servers such as student.compute.inf.ed.ac.uk and the general purpose machines such ug4cluster was also queried by the reps – the idea being that more capacity in this area would reduce the pressure on machines in the labs. This issue was referred to more than once in the following course comments.

ACTION: MC to contact Computing Support about the usage and capacity on remote servers.

2. Course Issues

MLP – this uses the scutter cluster of machines used for Extreme Computing and its capacity was brought into question. The course itself gained approval.

CCN - The second assignment was originally due to be released the 26th of February but was actually released on the 2nd of March. However the hand-in deadline was not adjusted. MC mentioned that it was still more than 2 weeks in advance of the deadline and that any extension of the deadline would mean encroaching into time that should be spent on the Honours Project.

1. **ACTION:** MC to ask Peggy Series about an extension (Peggy did extend the deadline a bit, in response).

EXC – The clusters used here appeared to be adequate. A complaint was made however about the capacity of the George Square Theatre – odd, since the class had 265 enrolled but the stated capacity of GST is 481.

HCI – The lecturer was praised. It was mentioned that students with previous experience in web design would find this course easier.

IAR – Both the lecturer and the coursework was well regarded.

MLPR – this course was considered to be harder than many.

ES – the reps expressed the opinion that ES overlapped with CAR, CD and OS.

MT – the computing resource available for this course was also brought up as it requires long-running processes.

SAPM – this course attracted no complaints

DS – the coursework had a big scope and was well regarded but the documentation for the tools used was immature; hence the coursework took longer than it should. This feedback was passed onto the DS lecturers.

CT – was considered to be harder than average

CS – was believed to overlap with SP – the material covered by Kami Vaniea would seem to segue into the SP content.

ACTION: Computing Resource was the major issue here

3. **Free Hoodies** – these were very much appreciated
4. **Honours Project Feedback Days** – the first day was well attended and appeared to be appreciated by those looking for guidance on writing up the project. The feedback day had a better uptake than expected; hopefully it will grow in future years.
5. **Meet the Director of Teaching Days** – the first had a respectable attendance but after this was poorly attended.
6. **Leisure Facilities** – coffee machines / vending facilities were requested by the students.
7. **Computers** – the flip desks were not popular as the screens were too small. One rep enquired as to the possibility of having dual-screens per machine as he had seen them in St. Andrews. Alternatively he suggested using two smaller screens on a computer where a large screen was not available.