PA raised discussion points for conducting these meetings in the future; point 1 of the agenda had been revised to take this into account. PA then asked for course feedback from the UG1 Reps, from their individual experiences as well as from communications with the student body.

1. Future SSLC Meetings:
PA noted that the last semester 1 SSLC meeting was conducted over two years ago and that rather than discussing that meeting it would be useful to discuss specific aspects of future meetings. PA favours having regular SSLC meetings and believes that they should be driven by the Class Reps.

1.1 Remit
PA put forward the option of adding specific items to the agenda for future meetings if desired.

1.2 Membership
PA asked if the Reps would like attendance from Computing Support or any other staff. RA noted that the staff:student ratio would need to be kept at 1:1 or a great number of students so students were not unintentionally put under pressure; the Reps reassured the staff that no one felt intimidated by the current arrangement. PA offered assistance in coordinating future meetings since he is not lecturing in semester 2.

1.3 Selection of Reps
PA asked if the current random selection of Reps from the applications at the beginning of the year was the preferred system. VD stated that an election may be better, and that the School of Mathematics’ election for UG1 Reps had gone well this year. CM favoured a random selection for UG1 and elections for future years. PA noted that this could be considered and discussed further in the semester 2 SSLC meeting.

1.4 Chair
PA is currently Chair but would be happy for a Rep to take on the role.
**Action 1.4.1:** RA to email PA regarding a Rep taking on the Chair role prior to the semester 2 SSLC meeting.
**Action 1.4.2:** RA to review documents from previous SSLC meetings and send a list to PA.
1.5 Frequency
PA feels one meeting towards the end of semester 2 is necessary, but no more since the weekly Class Rep meetings are effectively providing ongoing feedback.

1.6 Documents
Documents table in last SSLC meeting on Monday 20 April 2015
- Agenda
- Minutes

2. Comments on Lectures, Tutorials, Labs and Coursework:
PA noted that the School of Informatics is in the process of reviewing the UG1 curriculum and that Inf1-CL and Inf1-FP may be combined in subsequent years. PA invited feedback on the following courses: Inf1-CL, Inf1-FP, CP.

2.1 Informatics 1 – Computation and Logic
CM noted that almost all students were confused at the beginning of the course and that many were still confused by the end of the semester. Since there was no textbook and no clear underlying structure for the concepts taught it was difficult to understand how they could be integrated and related to the goals of the course, even though the individual concepts were interesting and well explained. VD agreed that more written material would have aided understanding. CM noted that the textbook *Engines of Logic* was a useful resource. VD requested more practical application of the concepts as students found learning the concepts alone to be too abstract.

DS responded that combining Inf1-CL and Inf1-FP for future years would allow for more Java in semester 1. CM asked how the two courses would be combined as she was unsure of the interaction of the logical and practical aspects. PA stated that it would be the sum of both courses, and that the concepts and knowledge would feed back and forth; logic encourages a particular way of thinking rather than rigidly learning facts. VD felt that with more content and work for one larger course it would be harder to recover if a student were to fall behind. CM noted that students outside the School of Informatics would be discouraged from taking a combined course.

**Action 2.1.1:** RA to email PA for details of curriculum review regarding the combining of Inf1-CL and Inf1-FP. Potentially discuss with Sharon Goldwater.

VD relayed the students enjoyed the charisma of the first year professors, and that the music in the lectures went down well. A negative point was that some tutors didn’t have the knowledge to answer some questions during tutorials.

2.2 Informatics 1 – Functional Programming
VD noted that feedback for Inf1-FP has been positive, however there were difficulties with implementation of Atom. A negative point raised was the lack of practical application; more practical tasks would be preferable. CM concurred regarding the positive feedback but requested more coursework and more exercises to get to know the language in more detail and to increase knowledge of the underlying maths. VD noted the problems with Haskell in the mock exam. Notepad++ and Visual Studio were discussed.
DS apologised for the issues regarding Atom. It was intended to be an improvement on previous years, however due to the complications this year other options are being considered.

2.3 Computer Programming Skills and Concepts
The Class Reps had not received any feedback for this course. CM was aware of some Biology and Maths students who took the course but none had gotten in touch.

**Action 2.3.1:** RA to email VD for any feedback gathered at the end of semester 1.

3. ITO Support
CM noted that the ITO were helpful and responded quickly when asked for assistance. VD asked for an updated on when the two additional Appleton Tower lifts would be completed. RA responded that the ITO had not been given a schedule for this aspect of the building work.

4. Any other business
4.1 InfBase/InfPALS
RA invited feedback. VD noted that they have not received any feedback but they are aware that a number of students are using these services.