

UG5 Staff-Student Liaison Committee 2017-18

Semester 1 meeting, 30th November 2017

Present: Mahesh Marina (UG5 Year Organiser)
Connie Crowe (UG5 Student Representative)
Justas Zemgulys (UG5 Student Representative)

In attendance: Gregor Hall (UG5 Administrator)

The Year Organiser welcomed the Committee, and the reps raised issues and comments from their own experiences and those relayed to them by class members. They started with general comments and then proceeded to comment on each course.

The content of most courses was considered to be fine. Computation resources were a major issue – students exacerbated the problem by tying machines up for long-running jobs. The documentation on Informatics cluster resources was thought to be very poor, and poorly advertised by the courses that use them. Documentation needs to be better and knowledge disseminated through the classes.

BIO1: The documentation for this course does not adequately convey the high proportion of biology content and should be updated. **ACTION:** ask the course co-ordinators for a new draft in the course descriptor.

BDL: This course was not well organised, although most issues were resolved as the semester went on. Unusual aspects included the Sunday deadline for one coursework and the hand-in during a lecture. The course slides were made available on Github, but were not accessible initially. Deadlines were not announced early on either.

CG: This course was considered interesting and its restructure successful.

EXC: Overall this course was well received, but computing resource issues plagued it.

HCI: This garnered positive feedback from the class.

IMC: There were similar organisational problems in this course as noted in BDL – they share the same course co-ordinator.

MLPR: This course was considered challenging and the lecturing was widely praised.

PM: No negative feedback for this course.

TTDS: Feedback was generally positive although the fact that the lecturer is new to the School became apparent as he did not appear to know what Maths to teach the class; pre-requisites or co-requisites for taking the course might be helpful. He attempted to be flexible with coursework, but the timing of deadlines was problematic.

TSPL: The amount of coursework was highlighted as being more than usual, and this took the students a lot of time, raising the question of how appropriate the coursework load is.

MLP: the material of this course is well regarded, but the coursework was found to take more time than advertised, and it increases throughout the semester. It was suggested that the amount of tasks that students have to implement themselves might be reduced.

MIP2: The group meeting dates were later than usual, which one rep found useful.

At the end of this meeting it was agreed to raise the possibility of returning to the format of a combined UG4/5 Staff-Student Liaison Committee. **ACTION:** Communicate this to Year 4 Organiser and reps.