Present: Paul Anderson, Max Larsen, Irina Gubaciova, Eve Bogomil, Tudor Finaru

1.   Introduction and overview of SSLC

Paul opened with a brief introduction the purpose of the meeting, which is mainly to gain feedback to help enhance student's experience for the next academic year.

There was also a discussion of past meetings and actions taken.

In discussing pre-arrival material, it was mentioned that none of the reps were aware of Don's programme for trying Haskell.

Action: Paul to email Don to discuss this – where can students find this? Can it be advertised more effectively?

There was also a discussion about pre-arrival materials for maths. The reps suggested that it would be good to know what students are expected to know before arriving to university. Heather has extra math classes and there has been a very positive response from the students regarding these classes.

Action: would Heather be willing to make an information sheet showing the kind of math knowledge expected/needed for the course? Email Heather to discuss.

2.   Comments on UG1 Courses

INF1A-FP – There were many comments on the recent FP exam. Reps suggested that there was a general thought amongst students that the three sittings of the exam were not equal in difficulty. It was suggested that the first exam was difficult whilst the third exam was relatively simple. As well as this, it was suggested that the third exam was similar to past papers whilst the first was more original. Due to the similarity to past papers, the third exam was again easier.

It was also noted that there were two mistakes in the first question in the first exam. The interruptions caused by this were seen to be very distracting and the wording of the exam paper was confusing. Students were extremely unhappy about this.

Action: Paul to contact Arvind to discuss this further.

The functional programming lecturers and tutorials were good and there was a good feeling overall – no complaints about the course or course content. Only complaints regard the exam.

INF1A-CL – The reps suggested that the CL tutorials are difficult to understand and that there was a general confusion in the first four weeks of the course. It was also raised the students believe that CL has too much Haskell. The connection between computational logic and Haskell is not seen as fine-tuned enough.

Students suggested that comments be added to the code they are given to explain what it does/what it is doing/whether it is something they need to know or not. Furthermore, computational logic requires Haskell beyond what they are up to in Functional Programming.

The CL notes on Learn were praised as being very useful – more useful that lecture slides for theoretical knowledge.

3.   Comments on other courses

No comments

4.   General issues about the year and specific courses

No comments

5.   Timings of future meetings – later or earlier?

Dates were discussed. It was noted that having a meeting at the end of semester one is inconvenient as it is during exam time. Beginning of semester two would be better as it would be a less busy time for the students and they can talk about all exams sat.

Action: have future first meetings at the beginning of semester two

6.   Comments on InfBase

Previous actions to have InfBase staff wear some kind of uniform were discussed. The current reps agree that this would be useful.

Action: Paul to follow up with Stuart Anderson.

It was also discussed whether some kind of record of attendance should be taken an InfBase – record of question types would be helpful to see what areas students in general are struggling in.

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

Reps think the facilities are good and that they have good support on DICE.

8.   Comments on Computing Support

No comments

9.   Comments on ITO Support

Some confusion was expressed on the change to centralised timetabling but reps say the new system works fine despite early confusion.

It was noted that the FP exam room allocations are not on central timetabling and therefore not on their personal calendar. Some students found finding out which room/time their exam was in for FP difficult as it was not the same as any other exams.

10.   Responsibility of taking minutes at meetings

Reps were asked whether they would like to chair/take minutes at the next meeting – will be discussed further by email if there are any volunteers.

11.   AOB

No comments