Present: Walid Magdy - UG4 Year Organiser
        Matt Shostak – UG4 Student Representative
        Clara Fraser – Teaching Administrator

1. Introduction

The Year Organiser welcomed the attendees and outlined the purpose of the SSLC.

2. Comments on UG4 Courses

Advanced Database Systems – Milos Nikolic

Some students felt that having no weekly deadlines made it hard to keep up with the course. Negligible percentage deadlines would make students want to do the work. For next year it might be a good idea to add more bi weekly coursework’s, or more quiz checkpoints. The week 8 quiz had a cap of 75/100 for one of the components.

Some students also noted that there was too much content to get through before the lectures. Maybe releasing coursework content earlier, or reducing material would be better.

Extra lab exercises and more support on general would be welcomed.

Algorithmic Game Theory and its Applications – Kousha Etessami

No comments

Automatic Speech Recognition – Peter Bell

No comments

Computing in the Classroom – Judy Robertson

Students reported that this was a great course. They appreciated the teachers and the lecturers. The content is good, and they appreciated the reduced work for deadlines. One point was made to maybe focus on scratch less as a tool.

Honours Project/MInf Part 1

Students have felt that the 40 page limit is good, it sets an expectation to make people more focused.
Internet of Things Systems, Security and the Cloud – Paul Patras

No comments

Introduction to Modern Cryptography – Petros Wallden

No comments

Machine Learning Practical - Pavlos Andreadis / Hakan Bilen

Students reported that the course had trouble giving guidance to groups week by week, which made students confused as to what they needed to do every week. They appreciate having the tutors on board also.

Natural Language Understanding, Generation, and Machine Translation – Frank Keller

The paired programming assignment made it harder working with another person on the work, and could only be done on dice machines in week 4 which was impractical.

A suggestion of making the assignment solo work for next year if we are remote again.

Parallel Architectures – Vijay Nagarajan

No comments

Text Technologies for Data Science – Walid Magdy

Students noted that in Semester 2 there were no contact hours, and had suggested having more support beyond Piazza. There was a final deadline which had no formative pieces throughout.

3. Comments on MInf Project (Part 2) – Year 5

No comments.

4. Comments on other courses

COMN – There were quizzes as well as coursework which was stressful, but helps to keep the course content in your head. Students felt that the coursework was difficult. Next year they suggested to consider distributing the course weighting better.

THF – Students had mentioned they wished the course would focus more on the tools, looking at how to use them, rather than recognising them and their flaws.
NAT – Students felt that the grading was poor, which happened last year also. Better planning for next year has been strongly suggested.

DME – The class test result average was 44%, which is dissimilar from previous years. The test didn’t cover the material, and the grading didn’t fit the common marking scheme. The material was well taught, but the examination portion wasn’t.

5. General issues about the year and specific courses

Students do get email about job opportunities which is good, but if there can be more advertisement and circulated more frequently they would appreciate that.

The plagiarism meetings that were held were good. The situation that happened with the plagiarism email getting sent to the whole school, was dealt with well, and hopefully never happens again.

6. Comments on Computer Facilities, labs, study spaces and social spaces

7. Comments on Computing Support

CS are helpful, and its good students get emails from them about service issues.

8. Comments on ITO Support

Informatics as a school care about when there’s any structural issues, but need to put more effort into making it better as a whole. There are conflicting feelings about the ITO caring about students. Sometimes they try their best, but sometimes students don’t feel it’s enough. They felt that there is always room to improve Student Support.

9. AOB