

Minutes of UG3 Staff Student Liaison Committee Meeting 10:00 to 11:00 - 16th January 2024, Appleton Tower 8.02

Attendees:

Year Organiser: Steve Tonneau

COs: James Garforth, Myrto Arapinis, Rob van Glabbeek

UG3 Student reps: Mandeep Cheema, Dorna Hamed Barghi, Uma Shah

1. Introduction

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

2. Comments on UG3 Courses

Algorithms and Data Structures

There were no tutorials, only lectures. The students were worried about the lack of tutorials. During exam revision the COs had to organise a few tutorials which created stress for the students.

The content was interesting.

Computational Cognitive Science

This course didn't run this semester. The students are wondering if it will take place next year.

Computer Architecture and Design

Feedback from UG4 shared.

Good feedback: "best course in the whole university, very well organised"

Computer Security

Good feedback, the exam was fair. One comment was that there should be more time spent on cryptography.

The CO recommends to introduce tools early on so that students do not get worried about this.

Piazza is not used for this course.

Elements of Programming Languages

Good feedback, the course was well structured and the CW well designed.

Some students found the rules of the CWs a bit confusing.

The CO answered all questions in Piazza swiftly.

Informatics Large Practical

The CW instructions were vague however the marking was very strict. The CW was autograded however the instructions were to "use creativity" which is not possible if an autograder is used for marking.

The questions in Piazza didn't get answered and the students found trying to communicate with the CO very frustrating and stressful, this created an uncomfortable learning environment. It was mentioned that all of the instructions were contradictory.

Materials related to the CW were covered a week after the CW was due.

SEP should be recommended as a pre-requisite because students feel that this course was required to be able to take and pass ILP.

Students feel that the CO was very ambitious and changed the CW specifications when the CW had already been released and the students had been working on it.

There wasn't feedback on how to improve.

Students would like to know how the school plans to implement changes for this course.

[Introduction to Databases](#)

Feedback from UG4 shared: lecture length was an issue.

[Introduction to Mobile Robotics](#)

The labs were well designed and very interesting. The questions asked a week before the exam were not answered in Piazza.

[Introduction to Theoretical Computer Science](#)

No comment

[Modelling Concurrent Systems \(Level 10\)](#)

Interesting course, "it makes you want to go to the lectures". The CO mentioned that the material had to be scaled down

[Professional Issues \(Level 10\)](#)

Good feedback.

Students liked the tutorials, they were well designed and they liked the discussions in the smaller groups. It was also mentioned that the students had creative freedom and this was appreciated.

The marking of the essays was fair.

[Software Testing](#)

The project runs over Christmas and this doesn't create a good work-life balance.

The lectures and tutorials are all theory, there is no practical testing in the entire course. A recommendation is to take away some theory and add more practical tasks.

[Informatics Experiential Learning \(Level 10\) – Year Course](#)

No comments