

MSc Staff Student Liaison Committee Meeting

3pm-5pm, Wednesday 12th February

Appleton Tower 6.16

Present: B. Franke (MSc Year Organiser), L. Seal (MSc Administrator), R. Finlayson (MSc Teaching Secretary), N. Darragh (Msc Rep), T. Loderhose (MSc Rep)

1. Introduction and overview of SSLC

The meeting opened with a brief introduction on the purpose of the meeting, mainly to gain feedback to help enhance student's experience and to offer student representatives a chance to talk to the Year Organiser directly.

2. Comments on MSc Courses

ANLP

What can be improved?

- more practical materials such as example programs are better
- Tutorial questions are often relatively straightforward and discussions in tutorials often don't go far beyond giving simple answers to the questions. While changing this may make the tutorials slightly more difficult, I feel I would learn more if there was more challenging questions and in depth discussions as well. I feel like this works well in other modules such as MLPR
- More time for the coursework
- Lecture slides can be presented in a better way
- Shay's lectures seemed somewhat unorganized and chaotic. Perhaps he needs some practice, but knowing it was his first time teaching this course I'm confident that next time he'll do better.
- More effort needs to be put into course material across the board. Courses lack a proper syllabus, which should be specified in detail at the beginning of the course.
- Quality of lectures varies drastically depending on the lecturer. In general, it often felt like lectures were being held for the sake of covering as much content as possible. A race to the bottom, as it is unclear to what level of detail certain topics should be known. Courses like MLPR clearly outline what is examinable, and there, the lecture notes are also informative. Neither of these is the case for this course. More effort is needed, the material should be better curated. Lab sessions are extremely simple, and I often felt it would be better to just have tutorial sheets every week.

What is good?

- Good assignments, fun and useful to learn.

- courseworks and tutorials are really good
- Lectures are generally very well delivered and course material is at an appropriate standard.
- The quality of the coursework, can learn a lot from them
- Coverage of ethics, Sharon Goldwater
- The coursework
- The coursework was in general well designed, feedback was great, and I liked the overall organization and layout of the course.
- Sharon's part was clear and well presented.
- ANLP feedback was very good. ANLP lectures are good. ANLP tutorials, labs, coursework, all good. MLP labs and coursework instructions are amazing.
- Lab material
- Lectures are well given especially Sharon
- Sharon's lectures were amazing

What is bad?

- For some topics, very little emphasis is put on the implementation of some of the methods discussed in lectures. Having to implement more algorithms etc. from scratch would probably lead to a deeper understanding of some of the content but it is hard to find much time to do this by yourself given the workload from the rest of the course/other courses
- All due of the coursework just in the same week, heavy academic pressure
- Lecture slides
- The second coursework was a bit too restrictive on the dataset
- The labs felt absolutely useless as all they required was us to click through buttons while uncommenting parts of the code.
- Lecture slides are often uninformative and it is unclear what the course syllabus actually includes. Similarly, coursework is often disorganized, with vague specifications and poor support material. In general, courses would benefit by being organized better, as this would avoid many issues which students don't have the time to be dealing with, and that frankly, shouldn't have a place in any PG program.
- My ANLP tutorial supervisor, the same who gave the guest lecture, was extremely disappointing. She was unable to answer the most basic questions that diverged from the solution sheet. Those tutorials were just a total waste of time as it ended up with her just reading off the solution and then responding to every question with "you should ask that on piazza".
- the workload is not healthy.
- The Tuesday lecture hall was probably too small

Any additional comments?

- Try to not change the lecturers during the semester
- Shay Cohen wasn't as good as Sharon Goldwater in the lectures, but it was his first time teaching the course so I suspect it will be better next year.

B. Franke: With regard to issues about coursework being due all at the same time, this is inevitable. There is only so many weeks in the semester, so there will be clusters of

deadlines. Generally, Course Organisers are aware that there is a lot being demanded of students, but again, they are limited to what they can do.

This feedback is help change things systematically for next year, but also to know what we can fix now. With regard to new lecturers, there is a peer observation process, where other academics will observe and give feedback. This works both ways, with both experienced lecturers sitting on new lecturers and vice versa. New lecturers go on teaching training, but it is a hard job, especially when people come from strong research backgrounds with little teaching experience and/or come from different countries.

It's hard to get information on how courses are going week to week, but courses have mid-semester feedback in place to highlight any issues at an early point.

CDI1

No specific comments reported regarding this course.

CDI2

No specific comments reported regarding this course

IVC

What can be improved?

- More time for the coursework
- Everything from the lecture format, additional material and more important a new lecturer.
- The lecturer was not receptive to feedback at all. The coursework was ridiculously excessive, and the lecturer didn't listen to complaints until the university got involved, and it was too late by then.
- Lectures could be more organized.

What is good?

- Lecturer was great, as was TA, the format forced us to actually learn stuff before lectures which is beneficial, and the coursework was cool, even if we were given too little time to do it.
- The TA had tried to help as much as possible. He designed interesting labs with no notice
- The TA was good, although he was assigned to the course very late.
- Lecturer was enthusiastic and knowledgeable.

What is bad?

- There was not enough time to reasonably do the coursework.
- Laura, she should not be given *any* teaching responsibility as she clearly does not care. She is not prepared on some of the course topics, she clearly does not care, she

is quite arrogant during lectures, often seeking confrontation with some student, and she literally does not put *any* effort in this course.

The TA told us he prepared an assignment which was quite easier and that she stopped him because it was not difficult enough, we all know the mess she forced us into.

When asked about using Piazza during revision she said she does not like it and hence she will not reply to questions there (contrary to all the other lecturers) but she will arrange a single office hour close to the exam.

- The coursework required a ridiculous amount of work, they didn't rectify until 4 days before the deadline. Apart from this the lecturer refused to listen to our feedback, she didn't upload material to the LEARN page until very late, and overall seemed to not put any effort into the course.
- Disorganized lectures, lack of clarity about labs and assignments in advance. The lecturer was quite aggressive to students, singling them out constantly. Wanting students to participate is understandable, but bullying them isn't a great approach.

Any additional comments?

- It is my understanding that this course came under fire from some students in the class. It is my opinion that those students are trying to take advantage of uncertainties in the course since it is being taught by a new professor to make their lives easier, I thought the lecturer for this class was excellent, the way she taught and issued assignments was fair, and even the coursework, which has been the source of much controversy, would probably be fair if we had only been given, say, 3 weeks to do it (it should be noted that I do agree that the assignment was totally unwieldy given the allotted timeframe). I say all of this in the hope that the complaints of some individuals will not be ascribed to all students in what I think was a great class.
- It took 5 WEEKS to get the slides, that were not even prepared by Laura, we only got them because the TA uploaded them (he did it in front of us and it took him less than 2 minutes). We are still waiting for the slides used in lecture and the additional material not covered in the previous year videos.
- We had class quizzes and when asked she will return them back to us in January, I am sure they can be marked in half an hour.

There were complaints about this course every week in the rep meetings. It took months to let students know what was going on. While there were minor improvements throughout, these would be superseded by other major issues. There were compliments for the great content and good lectures, but the organisation of the course was bad.

IRR

What can be improved?

- My lecturer has never reviewed literature reviews himself. The lectures and labs are mostly about general stuff, and not specific topics. Not useful for me.
- More examples may be more helpful.

- Don't expect work to be completed when other classes have lots of more immediate deadlines
- The specification of what the literature review should look like should be more clear. There are different types of literature review
- Organisation, especially of web resources, and planning. make it even across tutorial groups
- General organizational structure, communication of dates should be more open and in time.
- Tutor could be better prepared, coming to the tutorial each week with a plan of things to say / discuss instead of it being a free-wheeling discussion which was a bit of a waste of time. It didn't seem that he had put much thought into the class sessions or was following the course content as laid out online. Kept mentioning what he was paid for and not paid for (seems like they aren't allocated enough hours to deliver the course well enough in the time given).
- There was a lot of confusion caused by the re-assigning of students to tutors early on. All the tutors were confused - I was regularly receiving IRR emails from 3 different tutors throughout the semester.
- Earlier draft deadline announcement.
- Lectures are slow/not very useful. They don't help me grow as a writer or researcher. Maybe there could be an additional workshop halfway through semester for this purpose.
- Make research reviews feel less formulaic
- Useful information
- The tutor should have at least a bit background in the field I'm doing my review in.
- The tutorials didn't seem very useful to me, and having to hand in preliminary drafts interferes with my time management. I think it would be best to make attending tutorials optional.
- Clarity in deadlines and expectations for students in advance. Better organization in general - the tutors didn't have the information they needed to help us in some cases. Seemed like a problem with administration rather than the fault of the tutors.
- The lectures should be engaging
- The nature of the preliminary tasks and deadlines for anything but the draft and final review seems to vary substantially depending on the tutor. More structure on this may be better as I consistently get the impression that many students' impression of this module depends substantially on how organised their tutor is.
- I assigning tutorial groups by topic, as was done in previous years, would be better as, while my tutor is generally helpful, it is hard to get specific feedback on some aspects of the review when the topic is not close to his research interests
- More direction towards relevant papers and possible directions to follow

What is good?

- Small group
- Our tutor gives us an example to analyze.
- Lectures are okay

- It's forcing us to read papers and think about specific candidates for research topics. The extended deadline (Jan 23rd) is helpful given all the other work this semester.
- Tutorials; I like my tutor and they give helpful advice and feedback
- it really helps me to improve the ability of reading and writing English papers
- The final assignment is interesting
- Very close supervision.
- Bjorn is a great speaker and his lectures were absorbing despite the very subject of them.
- Small tutorials was helpful, our tutor was great. The lectures were useful for those of use without undergraduate research experience.
- This module encourages you to work independently and engage with current research to a much greater extent than any other module this semester
- Small tutorial groups

What is bad?

- Irrelevant lectures/labs. The labs are also just lectures. It would be better to talk about personal research topics in the labs.
- More helpful can be given. (Like phases bank)
- Lectures and tutorials are uninformative; the content is painfully obvious and very dull
- different tutorial groups seem to have different goals/tasks. some better than others
- Support in tutorials is not that good.
- Not very well organised with the tutors.
- The content of the class is largely irrelevant to anyone who has taken a degree in English before
- Tutor doesn't know much about my field of study and can therefore not give very deep feedback.
- Everything
- Lectures were somewhat disorganized, and in some cases the lecturer was just reading off the slides.
- The lectures were so bland that every week there were significantly less people in the lecture hall.
- Very limited content in lectures that is helpful for students who have good English and have done any significant academic reading/writing before
- It feels like tutorials are repeating over the weeks

Any additional comments?

- Should not be mandatory because it is the least useful lab.
- Useful but couldn't find time for it due to other assignments

There was a lot of talk amongst students about the inconsistency of tutors – some wanted something returned to them every week, whereas others more lax. Perhaps what tutors expect of students could be standardized?

B. Franke: This is a hard course to organise, but this year I tried to get more lecturers involved (as opposed to PhD students, who are (in some instances) still learning and lacking the experience), but lecturers are already overloaded as is. It's a tricky subject to teach in a way that is useful for everyone, as it addressing native and non-native speakers.

IPPO

No specific comments reported regarding this course

IAML

What can be improved?

- Hope more details of Cw can be offered.
- The feedback session for assignment 1 was poor. Would have liked the solutions to be distributed as they were for the labs. I had many small detail questions that could have been answered by seeing the programmed solutions.
- There are some errors in the slides / videos that are mentioned / corrected in the real-life lectures or corrected in Piazza after a student queries them. The otherwise excellent material being presented has clearly been developed over many years - you'd think the errors could have been corrected and eliminated in the slides / online videos over the years. It feels a bit insulting / inefficient that each cohort has to re-discover some subset of the same embedded errors every year - it's a waste of time for everyone involved.
- No feedback yet and two weeks before exams. Upload system for submission puts a lot of onus on students to organise their work for markers - why have pages divided amongst questions only to then make students allocate them? If you're going to make it complicated for students when they are likely stressed out meeting deadlines, then there needs to be a prompt on this submission that it is not complete until this is done as well. More tutorials to support new exam / CW split. shorter coding assignment.
- The organisation of iaml onto the new timetabling system was a total shambles and not being able to quickly get access to materials, labs and tutorials has impacted my ability to learn. A better system is need between tutor sign-up and course organisation so that MSc students are able to access materials from the start, not 1/5 into semester. Iaml change to 50% in exam should also be better supported with more tutorials. Having to page mark questions on CW submission was also not good.

What is good?

- The course is an excellent introduction across the subject - really good and enjoyed it immensely.
- Amos is excellent
- The quality of iaml in person lectures has been excellent and a very useful tool for understanding what is expected in exams. 2/3 tutorials were also excellent. The breath of material to use is also good, if not a little overwhelming.

What is bad?

- Why make an "applied" course primarily assessed on a theoretical exam. Take our tutorial fees and pay more markers to mark the coursework for the course we are paying for. This is now just a mini mlpr with way more coding to have to keep up with.

Any additional comments?

- I really enjoyed this course but the above aspects of the delivery and shambolic start have made it difficult to keep up and I feel at the end I will not get the grade that reflects my understanding or ability to apply the theory, which is frustrating for me as this is why I chose it. Less labs and more tutorials and rename the course if you want to go with this structure.

B. Franke: Different academics have different ideas of what "theory" and "applied" is than what students may have.

SPT

No specific comments reported regarding this course

RSS

No specific comments reported regarding this course

3. Comments on Other Courses

MLP

What can be improved?

- Lectures are barely enough to get an idea of what the material is (the names of things covered). None of the complicated concepts or derivations are explained well enough to make the lectures worth the time. Maybe I'm the problem, maybe I don't understand, who knows. But if more people have the same issue I'd suggest revisiting the way things are explained.
- The first coursework contained mistakes that had to be fixed by the authors after being pointed out. This meant that doing the work earlier would require to go back fixing the mistakes and doing some extra work, rewarding students who would start later after the fixes were done. Hopefully the quality of the code is now improved enough that the future years will have it better.
- Need more engaging, better quality lectures. Teaching support is ok during labs, however this is overshadowed by the extremely poor organisation of course material. Support code for many tasks has allegedly not been changed for a number of years. Numerous bugs were found in the support code, which caused major issues and led to a lot of time being wasted to address these nuances. When concerns were voiced

on the support forum, the teaching assistants tried to somehow justify this. In addition, the code and assignment spec were changed numerous times after the assignment was released, and oftentimes, this was not reported.

It doesn't help that all the support code for this course is delivered in a convoluted way and requires advanced knowledge of Git which degraded the experience for me and many fellow students.

These issues should simply not be present in the course.

- lectures are worse than average online content found on the matter
- Feedback felt very copy and pasted and not useful
- The assignment deadlines were too short for how disorganized their administration was. In some cases the TAs responsible for the assignment were changing the unit tests the week before the deadline. The instructions for the coursework 2 google cloud setup were outdated until 2 weeks before the deadline. The feedback for coursework 1 was also very sparse and so quite unhelpful. It tended towards "explain more", without going into further detail. For the many students without a background in writing technical reports, this is not enough.

The lectures were okay, but somewhat too fast. Having tutorials would be extremely helpful because of how applied the focus of the course is.

- MLP feedback is particularly poor. It is not detailed (1-3 3 or 4 word sentences in each section), nor specific enough to actually be actionable for the next coursework. Really poor tone used. It has not improved since last year, so the feedback clearly is not taken on board by the course organisers. Feedback is also very inconsistent between markers having compared feedback and marks on the same tasks. Mlp lectures are difficult to follow and more time could be taken to make the slides easily digestible and more well rounded to provide intuition.
- My MLP assignment 1 grade was lower than expected and in the feedback it was clearly indicated that I lost marks for not doing a handful of things, this is fine, though classmates who explicitly did none of these things either were able to score 20% higher than me. It is clear that there was no marking rubric for this assignment and feedback was simply copied and pasted.
- Worst feedback ever had. Specification should be clearer, marking is subjective. Too much work for the time given, and for the credits. This generates little learning too.
- The feedback is not particularly good and sometimes contradicts what had been though in other courses.
- The tests for coursework 1 were too broad. I passed all the tests and got zero automatic marking points, which should not happen.
- Everything
- The coursework feedback is a little bit unclear, and it seems unfair as someone got extremely high grades while someone got 40 or even 30. However, there doesn't exist such a big gap between the quality of the submitted report. As we treated the coursework seriously and work hard on that.

The lecture can be more detailed and prepared well, not just repeating the information in the slides.

What is good?

- Lab notebooks, coursework 2
- Labs and Coursework instructions are great. The MLP library is great. Introduction to PyTorch very nice.
- CW2 was very interesting
- The lab instructions are well structured. It is great that we have tests to see if our results are good.
- The quality of the coursework, well-designed and have open questions allow us to explore.
- Mlp labs are designed well.

What is bad?

- Lectures are quite pointless. Coursework is vague, often pointless, its feedback is given in bulk and mistakes are all over the place. In coursework 1 the tests were wrong and were fixed midway...
- Lab staff frequently unhelpful and dismissive
- labs were not visited, tutors (2! for a small group, as no one came) came late, few people are spread out over a huge room
- Lectures are a bit dry with unclear direction
- The lectures were un-understandable, the labs didn't clear up any doubts even after having finished them, the assignments were vague, the feedback was not specific and the answers on piazza were either sassy or just plainly wrong (such as saying that convolutions are inner products)
- The lectures are very complicated for people who have not had a deep learning course before.
- Not enough support within labs and there is not enough time to work on labs that really helps your understanding of the coursework for mlp. The second coursework for mlp has a terribly confusing structure making it incredibly difficult to follow and easy to miss important details when working across so many sub-sections and sub documents. Also linking to stackoverflow solutions and not considering edge cases in instructions mean that some students waste huge amounts of time on setup - which is really not testing learning of lectured content.

Any additional comments?

- I hope MLP semester 2 is better than semester 1.
- Interactions with staff in the labs and on piazza often felt like we were discouraged to stray from the beaten path or ask more theoretical questions about the underlyings of things.
- I spend a lot of time on the coursework. Which is fine, because it was interesting.

The feedback for this course was a big issue amongst students. There was no “real” feedback in the view of many, beyond it telling you what you did; it felt like the markers were looking at the rubric. Issues with the courses were not admitted until too late, and even then it wasn't so much an apology but just the staff doing more work. Is this an issue with the University not giving adequate time to the markers to give adequate feedback? Also, there being only two tutors in labs (who often weren't there) wasn't enough.

B. Franke: The feedback issue could be an issue of communication. With IRR, the aim is to get all the markers in one room to look at rubrics, and feedback, and give explanation as to what is expected in feedback. However, you don't always catch all the markers, and consistency across feedback can be lost.

MLPR

What can be improved?

- If the lectures were one hour later, it would be amazing

What is good?

- Great teaching and support
- Lectures were great, coursework wasn't excessive, my tutorial group tutor was great and gave additional insight instead of repeating stuff from the lectures. Overall amazing course.
- Iain is an amazing lecturer

What is bad?

- Very fast-paced course - not much time to absorb what's going on

This course felt like the opposite of the MLP; Iain Murray runs a really tight ship.

TTDS

What can be improved?

- Restructure the way the coursework instructions are given. Put all relevant information there, not on Piazza. Better feedback on Coursework1.
- More detailed explanation of what the requirements are in the coursework.

What is good?

- Parts of the coursework are interesting. Usually these are not the parts we spend a lot of time on though.
- Interesting topic and area

What is bad?

- The coursework is written in a very unstructured way. We have to regularly go to Piazza to find out what exactly the task is. Feedback on Coursework 1 was very minimal.

4. General Issues about the Year and Specific Courses

- More personal support would be nice. My personal tutor took only 10 minutes for me, although I had a lot of questions prepared.
- The lack of effort put into courses directly relates to high stress caused to students. Please improve course organisation.
- It would be nicer to have more time after lectures finish to prepare for the exams. Perhaps cover slightly less content and do one or two revision lectures.
- work/life balance is out of whack. quality of teaching isn't always as high as the school may believe it to be.
- I need more time on the coursework, and a break between the mid-semester may be good to let us take a breathe.
- More pressure on tutors to take responsibility to signing up students quickly on learn. Better organisation between lto and timetabling.
- 1. Pay staff properly so that they stop striking.
2. The workload is so big that it is little surprise that a lot of students have mental health problems. Instead of telling students to make additional time to do sports and "relaxing activities" and hosting events like the "Mental Health & Wellbeing week" that no-one has time for anyway, reducing the workload might be more effective. This could also lead to students actually learning more because they are not continuously so stressed that paying attention in class and memorising new information becomes impossible.
- Just the timing of the deadline all concentrated around the mid of November. IVC coursework did not help at all.
- Please consider students welfare. Putting students under pressure kills them
- The Image and Vision Course single-handedly took up almost all my time during the last two and a half weeks, and massively interfered with my study time and the time I dedicated to the rest of the assignments.
- I feel that having deadlines set to be in the middle of the days encourages me to loose sleep in the preceding night. My previous Uni had them set on midnight, such that the last entire day could be used to fix mistakes in the report and give time to format it better. In this setting however I don't feel confident enough to leave this work for the last day (since the deadline is in the afternoon) and I find myself finishing up the report overnight more often.
- It would be nice if assignment deadlines were more spread out between courses, but I realize that is very difficult to achieve so it's understandable. Giving more time to work on the assignments would be an easy way to reduce the workload.
- The social side of the AI course deteriorated rapidly after the first few weeks once the lecturers started giving coursework, despite the fact that, in my opinion at least, the workload did not become too extreme until around the start of November. I feel like I have a very poor work life balance and have little interaction with my coursemates outside of a work environment. I have gotten the impression from others have similar feelings about this.

There is an issue with Personal Tutors, in that the contact is minimal; you speak to them once at the start of the year and thereafter they don't get back to you. Perhaps having more time with the Personal Tutors could help alleviate stress that little bit.

It's easy to single out MLP as a bad actor for stress; students spent a lot of time on it, and the credits earned does not match up. There seems to be this thought that students think they have to spend more time on it than they do.

It's also a shame there are no dedicated DICE labs that aren't also used for classes, labs, or tutorials. Nor is there any specific MSc place, so it's hard to meet fellow MSc students.

More information for Reps on what they can do would also be helpful – it's not entirely clear what a rep is/does. Perhaps an information pack for new reps, as well as a meeting with N. Heatley at the start of the year.

Learn is also an issue, mostly for its lack of consistency. There needs to be better integration, especially if Course Organisers are using external websites. As a first point of contact, there are instances where the Learn pages have absolutely no useful information on them.

B. Franke: I did warn everyone at the start of the year during the introduction lecture that the workload would be very heavy. This is a 1 year MSc degree, so there's a lot put into a short amount of time whereas other universities in the world would offer the same over 2 years. There is only so much we can take out before we can no longer call this a full MSc degree.

It might be worth reviewing the credit weighting for MLP. One issue is that students may be spending too much time trying to get a mark of 70+, when it is clear in the Common Marking Scheme that to get this requires exceptional work beyond what is already expected. A course like MLPR is very clear about what is required to get a high mark, whereas MLP could perhaps have clearer indicators.

With regards to flexible coursework deadlines, we want to keep them during working hours so if help is needed, then staff are available. This also discourages less working until midnight and so forth.

The school could do more to build communities amongst MSc students, and to make being a rep be more important (as well as letting them know about what they can earlier on in term). I would advise that reps come straight to myself, N. Heatley, or S. Anderson for assistance in setting up events, as EUSA can be problematic.

The Personal Tutor system is a bit a lottery, but is soon to be overhauled. Feedback on the system would be welcome, so we know what students want and need.

5. Comments on Computer Facilities

- Dice machine on 7th floor often do not allow access. You try to log in and it says incorrect password. Multiple people will try and they won't work. Current know machines are two on far left of left 7th lab.

- Not enough, or maybe poor signposting/room listing
- the lack of a dedicated all purpose room with dice computers is very bad. the fact you can be moved on from the labs at any time is worrying when you are trying to do coursework and run experiments and the labs can get very crowded even at non peak times. I've taken to working during the night so I can get a guaranteed space
- Some computers randomly disallow access, but other than that quite good
- Coming from another university, the submission system seems unnecessarily complicated
- DICE is great, sometimes machines get a little crowded though
- Some machines weren't working, quite often. Most machines are in huge rooms where it's not that great to work if silence is necessary. Mostly a spot in the small rooms is available, but when that's not the case it's disappointing.
- maybe there are so many people, sometimes I cannot find a machine to use
- It's unfortunate that masters students do not have dedicated study space as there is always heavy competition for dice machines
- 30GB of dice storage isn't enough
- In some cases I have been unable to login to computers on an entire floor of Appleton Tower, only to find that I could on other floors. I'm not sure if this is done on purpose or not, but it was confusing.
- There should be a map or something of the building so that we can know which floors are accessible and which have what
- Maybe a ticket system for if you plan to leave a computer, so people know if you're coming back
- Screens to plug laptops into would be useful. not everyone uses DICE

6. Comments on labs, study spaces and social spaces

- An allocated room for postgrads in Appleton would be nice.
- The chairs are horrifically unergonomic; no backs, not adjustable, or unmovable
- Lack of space for postgraduate students
- Appleton is often crowded, not even mentioning the library
- There are not enough spaces in the library or Appleton Tower, frequently I spent a long time to find a place to study during busy times. Also people are using "recreational spaces" like cafés to study and it is hard to sometimes find a place to have a break and just hang out with people.
- No microwaves? Really? Please give us the microwaves back.

- Some more vegan options in the Appleton cafe would be nice, but not a huge deal.
- Facilities are substantially better than my undergrad university, but it could still be improved on if there was more structure about where is for silent work/collaboration and there was a more organised system of booking smaller rooms for short periods for group projects
- Some study rooms in Appleton Tower are occasionally being occupied for tutorials, so we need to move at least once. Some common areas are left dirty, especially after the weekend.

7. Comments on Computing Support

- quite responsive!
- Could be more thorough information and examples for using GPU clusters.
- Spyder3 just closes randomly sometimes, even when not running any programs

8. Comments on ITO Support

- Need better communication; went months without knowing they exist
- ITO is very very good!
- The tutorial group assignment for IAML fiasco at the beginning of term could have been better handled by ITO instead of the denial of responsibility by everyone involved.
- Just would like to know when lockers will become available haha they keep ducking

It would be good if there were more people wishing to take account, especially in regards to timetabling issues. More advocacy is needed. It's also worth repeating certain things especially about points of contact (like where the ITO is a better contact point than a PT).

B. Franke: Perhaps an ITO presentation at the start of year, as well as a short presentation from Computing Support; maybe a practical session might be useful too. We should aim to put this information in the handbook too.

I keep an open door policy myself in my office, but it might be worth both letting other students know this, and also encouraging more academic staff to follow suit.

9. AOB

No other business

Meeting adjourned.