

UG2 Staff Student Liaison Meeting
Tuesday 27th November 2018

In attendance: Rik Sarkar UG2 Course Organiser, Kendal Reid ITO, May Cryan INF2A Lecturer, Paul Jackson INF2C-SE Lecturer, Kousha Estessami DMMR Lecturer

Apologies: Colin Stirling DMMR Lecturer, Boris Grot INF2C-CS Lecturer

INF2A

Negative feedback

- Lecturer overruns during the lectures by few minutes. Disadvantage for students who have to walk to the next lecture which is further away.
- Some students feel like foam microphones are better than the handheld ones, and others don't.
- Too strict no-phone and no-chatting policy during the lectures, in the beginning of the semester. Now, this issue is almost solved.
- Use visualizing tools to illustrate and show examples. Using a notepad to draw an example is not always the best solution. Visualising tools such as regex101 would be a good choice and very helpful to the students.
- Sometimes teaching during the lectures doesn't seem well organized. Sometimes the first lecturer of this course is not very confident about teaching the topic, this can be solved by taking more time to prepare for the following lecture.
- There is lack of patience from the first lecturer, students come with different backgrounds and hence some students understand things quicker than others, hence the remaining students **should not** be penalised if they are asking many questions or they don't understand a topic, the lecturer should be approachable for help and patience is a **must**.
- There was too much detail on the first coursework which was quite hard for some students to understand what they have to do, there should be more comments on the given code and slightly less and more precise detail on the coursework documentation.
- Inaccurate reading in the LL(1) Grammars topic. Lecturer should have provided external links from the web or scan these topics from a book, as only referring to last year's tutorials and lectures cannot be enough for everyone.

Positive feedback

- First coursework feedback was solid and detailed enough.
- Responsive on questions asked through emails.
- Material covered is high level and combines practical and theoretical elements throughout the semester. The material covered **should not** change.

Mary has taken all this information into account and will share this with the other lecturer Shay Cohen, who wasn't present at the meeting.

Negative feedback

- Sometimes the lecturer turns to the slides to clarify what needs to be said, this pause can drift students off, a proposed solution would be to take more time to read the slides and organize what topics will be covered in the upcoming lecture.
- Didn't receive warning well before the marking deadline for CW2, and students got a bit paranoid. Lecturer should communicate more with the markers to get a better estimation of when the marking process will be over.
- Lack of interactivity in the lecture, but as the weeks were passing, the lecturer was getting more interactive by asking students questions during the lecture to test their knowledge. Issue fixed.
- From the 30min meetings with tutors and demonstrators, some tutors were exceeding the time amount provided, and hence the following meetings were later than expected, tutors should be **very strict** on their timings.
- Coursework 3 was quite hard to follow and understand what the students had to do. There should be more comments on the code given, as students come from different backgrounds and not many of them are confident with Java programming language.

Positive feedback

- Lecturer is **very** responsive on social platforms (piazza), answering all student questions quickly and accurately.
- Very active on the email platform, informing students about changes made and important events happening on the course. Great to keep students informed.
- Lecturer tests students' knowledge during the lecture.
- Very approachable to help, he was attending the lab sessions for students to ask for help directly to the lecturer, good move, as students can get more accurate help.
- 30min meetings from demonstrators and tutors were provided, allowing students to ask questions for their coursework they are given.
- Despite some negative feedback, students are quite happy overall!

Paul has taken all this information into account.

Negative feedback

- More example exercises involving MIPS, as students had a very hard time going through the CW 1 coursework.
- Marking criteria for CW 1 coursework is ambiguous, many students got high marks (80 and up) and many got low marks (40 and below).
- Not enough details from the feedback given from the first coursework, comments on the reason behind the mark given should be provided and more details on which tests failed. Otherwise, the remaining feedback was solid and good.
- Some students complained there was a change in the code in the 19th of November on the CW 2 and there was no warning, the lecturer should have sent an email explaining this change happened on the CW."

Positive feedback

- CW 1 coursework was hard and very rewarding, allowing students to be very comfortable with low level languages.
- Very interactive with students during the lecture, allowing them to enjoy the teaching and hence higher attendance.
- Approachable to help, and somewhat active on social platforms. However, he could be more active on Piazza.

Boris Grot was not in attendance, this information will be passed onto him.

DMMR

Negative feedback

- First lecturer was referring too much on the slides during the lecture, during this pause time, students can drift off, the pace has to be constant, this again can be solved by using more time to read the slides and prepare for the following lecture.
- Sometimes, students chat during the lecture which causes distraction to the surroundings who are paying attention, by telling the students to stop, will solve the issue.
- Sometimes the lecture is not very confident on the content he is teaching, this again can be solved by taking more time to prepare for the following lecture.
- Feedback from CW 1 wasn't very detailed, and some students didn't know exactly why they got the mark they got, adding more comments on the coursework and reason why students weren't awarded with full marks, would be a great move to allow the student to understand what to improve for the next CW and prepare better for the exams.
- Tutorials need to be converted into workshops instead, as it was done on last year in first floor in Appleton Tower. Also, extend the duration time to 1.5 hours from 1 hour giving more time for students to get more feedback on their work and go through more examples in the tutorials.

Positive feedback

- Second lecturer is more interactive in the lecturers allowing the students to be more "active" in the theatre.

General (all courses)

Negative feedback

- Warning in advance if there will be a delay in sending the marks and CW feedbacks back to the students. There should be more communication between the Lecturers/ course organisers with the markers in order to get accuracy of when the marks will be handed and let the students know via email and Piazza.
- Sometimes lecturers are not very prepared to teach for the following lecture, as it can be seen by looking at the slides occasionally and not being very confident at some topics they cover, this can be solved by spending more time to prepare for the following lecture.
- Interactive features can be used to allow students to engage more with the lecture. Such interactive features are TopHat, as it was successful in year 1 math courses (Introduction to Linear Algebra and Calculus and its Applications). It allowed students to answer a given question during the lecture and discuss the answers with their neighbours, they believe using TopHat will enhance interactivity in the lectures and improve students understanding.

- Some joint degree students (CS & Maths and CS & Physics and CS & Engineering etc), have the disadvantage the fact traveling from King's Building to Central area and vice versa takes longer than 10 minutes. Hence, they end up missing half of their class, an improvement to this would be to improve the algorithm which allocates the time tables and give priority to joint degree students.

Positive feedback

- Material covered is good and accurate and students are happy. If the material is to change, I would advise to make the process very slowly to ensure there will be no mistakes.