UG3 Staff Student Liaison Committee Meeting
2.30pm-3.30pm, Friday 09 November 2018
Appleton Tower, 6.16

Present: C Dubach (chair and UG3 year organiser), L Masselos (UG3 student rep), A Varadi (UG3 student rep), G Gilligan (UG3 student rep), L Branney (UG3 administrator)

1. Introduction and overview of SSLC:

The meeting opened with a brief introduction from the UG3 Year Organiser on the purpose of the meeting, which is mainly to gain feedback to help enhance student's experience for the next academic year.

2. Comments on UG3 courses:

Automated Reasoning
There was praise for the enthusiastic lecturer. It was also noted that it would be preferred if the exam was set earlier for the main cohort (in Semester 1, instead of Semester 2). There could also be more of an introduction to the ISAR tool.

Compiling Techniques
It was noted that there has been good amount of activity/participant in Piazza. Students felt that the coursework specification is too vague and that there should be more feedback on code instead of just a mark. The deadline for coursework 1 could also be earlier in the semester to allow a more balanced workload.
ACTION: Course organiser to look into this and report back. The course organiser explained that the best way for students to get feedback is to attend the lab sessions. Students are encouraged to ask questions and this will help them with their coursework.
ACTION COMPLETED: No further comments to add from course organiser.

Computational Cognitive Science
Students feel the lecturer is great and very informative. They also feel the content is leaning more towards language and logistics instead of theory. Students really enjoy the interactive element within the lectures, the word games etc.

Computer Design
No complaints reported.

Database Systems
Great lecturer, good examples and answers to questions. Students think that the lab sessions are more useful than the tutorials, especially during coursework submission time.

Informatics Large Practical
The student reps noted that they had a discussion with S Anderson (DoT) previously regarding student's disgruntlement with the marking of coursework 1. There had reportedly been several mistakes with the marking and students were upset by this. Students feel that due to the simplicity of the coursework it should have been easy to get a higher distribution

of marks. Clarification on what was expected of them was requested, but they still did not achieve good marks. The marking scheme/specification is very vague. Students have suggested a more hard lined specification with clearer expectations, and it was noted that the current mark allocation is very bizarre. Overall, students were happy with the practical aspect of the course. The lectures are useful as practical is hard to teach.

Introduction to Vision and Robotics
It was noted that the main issue is this course is 10 credits and student's feel that it should be 20 credits. The labs are very hard to grasp and the course would benefit from tutorials. There is the same amount of time committed to labs as compared with IAML (20 credits). The coursework is a big step up but with more time spent on it, it would be more workable. However, students found the coursework to be very interesting, Tim is enthusiastic and the feedback is well done. The TA however, should be given more time to write the lab solutions prior to assignments and improve the presentation. Overall, the class room structure is very good and works well.

Introductory Applied Machine Learning
Students complained that the marks and feedback for coursework 1 is late. Generally, there is disappointment with the content of the course. Students feel that it is a recap of INF2B with too much of an overlap therefore a little too easy for those who took INF2B in Year 2. However it is noted that IAML is more applied, grounded and interesting compared with INF2B. Students feel that MLPR is a much better follow up to INF2B and IAML should not be compulsory. The video quality during lectures is poor in comparison to other courses such as IVR, there was an issue with noise distortion/technical issues. The questions for assignments changed frequently, one even had the solutions included which could be due to technical problems with GitHub. Communication could be improved in relation to smaller changes to questions.

Professional Issues
Students love Stuart as a lecturer, the slides are very useful. It would be good to have a better overview of the learning outcomes and some context to it. Peerwise wasn't very well explained, there was not enough guidance on how best it can be used. Lots of praise for Stuart who does an excellent job and overall the course is great. One issue with grading scheme on Learn, shows as unavailable. **ACTION**: Stuart to add grading scheme to Learn. **ACTION COMPLETED:** Stuart will improve the presentation of the use of Peerwise. He has distributed the grading scheme for the individual page in the coursework via piazza.

Software Design and Modelling
Perdita is a great lecturer, she posts a lot of videos which is helpful. Students feel that the first exam/assessment is too heavily weighted which is de-motivating. It was also noted that Perdita marks too harshly and is open about how the questions have been changed to be harder to comply with policy. Students find this discouraging and state that it is not clear what is expected of them.

3. Comments on other courses:

No complaints reported.

4. General issues about the year and specific courses:

A lot of UG3 courses aren't running this year, which is disappointing especially the lack of level 9 courses, as this is the last chance to take them. The assignment quality and timeliness of feedback is not great. Students feel that more attention should be given to Honours years when it comes to feedback. **ACTION:** Pass comments onto Stuart.
ACTION COMPLETED: In future we will prioritise key level 8 and 9 courses to ensure there is sufficient choice in third year. On feedback we are attempting to improve this by looking more carefully at the provision of formative feedback, the design of practical's to facilitate more effective feedback and tutor training.

5. Comments on Computer Facilities, labs, study spaces and social spaces:

Students would love to have more quiet study spaces. The computer labs presently are very busy and Appleton Tower has become more of a social hub, even in the labs. The library is quiet but there are no DICE machines, so it would be good to have a designated quiet study area. The current designated areas only host a few computers, which is not enough.
ACTION: Pass comments to Stuart
ACTION COMPLETED: We are investigating what can be done about quiet space. In particular we are investigating the possibility of having some space at KB for joint degree students and we are looking at how best to use all available space in Appleton tower. Building Appleton Tower into a strong social space and community hub is positive but we will seek to make it clear that many spaces are to support study and this should be respected.

6. Comments on Computing Support:

It was noted that students receive a good level of support from the Computing Support team. They receive timely help and they always follow up to confirm the issue is resolved/they are happy with the outcome.

7. Comments on ITO Support:

Overall, students are happy with the ITO, they feel they are the best in comparison with other Schools.

8. AOB

Generally the semester is going really well, students on the joint degree feel that the Schools (Maths and Informatics) communicate well together. Few requests for more vending machines.