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The meeting chair Annabelle welcomed everyone for coming and opened the meeting at 1pm.

**COMP330 - Computer Graphics**

*Len Hamey*
- No student representatives

**COMP343 - Cryptography and Information Security**

*Les Bell*
- Student rep said there were no problems; no issues; really well presented and really good.
- Les said students were forgetting to press the submit button on iLearn, resulting in numerous draft submissions by the deadline. Les marked the drafts anyway.
- Annabelle pointed out that you could uncheck an option in iLearn to bypass the draft stage and take the first submission as the final submission.
- Les asked if the workload in practicals were okay and the student representative (SR) agreed.
- Les would keep watching that.

**COMP348 - Document Processing and the Semantic Web**

*Mark Johnson*
- No student reps.
- Mark had made announcements in all the classes, posted two iLearn messages, re: liaison committee meeting. There was still no present SP, but one student did send an email, suggesting that if they had weekly tasks that were marked, it would quickly show who was struggling and what concepts students needed help with. Mark pointed out that because of reduced funding, assessed weekly tasks were no longer possible. Instead there would be assignments.
- Mike suggested that setting compulsory homework, even if it wasn’t marked, often led to students discovering their own weaknesses and doing something about it. Although Mike also pointed out that it would be difficult to convince students to do tasks which were then ignored.
- Christophe asked if we could think of ways to “make it work” even if we didn’t have money to mark work. Peer review for instance?
- Natalie suggested that the solutions were released two weeks later so students could self-assess. Mark confirmed that he already did that.
- Mike suggested setting work that tied directly to lectures so students found the tasks relevant and useful in a more immediate sense.
- Mark pointed out that it was a slightly “flipped” classroom with slides posted a week in advance and had exercises in the class. The class was from 6-9pm, so students enjoyed the variety as opposed to a straight 3 hour lecture. Only about 25 people turned up to the lecture out of 40 enrolled. The class size was small enough for Mark to have one-on-one interactions with the class.
- Natalie suggested a forum dedicated specifically to workshops.
Mike remarked that having a record of past work, even if its unmarked, was a valuable diagnostic tool for students who needed help. It was possible to trace back and see where the student was missing concepts and having problems.

COMP355
Deborah Richards

- No SR present.
- All going brilliantly

ELEC436
Mike Johnson

- SR said it was a good unit so far: very flexible.
- SR wondered if it was a bad thing that he did not really know what he would be doing in the next 3 weeks. He suggested that it might be useful to have a more solid understanding of needs to be done for scheduling purposes.
- Mike noted the comments but also pointed out that students should schedule at least 9 hours per week for this unit, as per normal.
- For the benefit of others in the room, Mike provided a background of the unit and how it differed from traditional project units. Students were encouraged to look back through their whole degree and work out how it fitted together and its implications for students' working life. This unit was set up very individual oriented and the first few weeks were about self-reflection on a student’s own experience throughout their degree. The goal was to see any missing topics that they would like to know more about. Later parts of the unit would be students doing work pertaining to that, but at this early stage of the semester, students were in an exercise to try and find out what that was for them individually.
- Peter asked how many were enrolled and Mike replied 12. It had been growing exponentially with previous enrolment numbers at: 0, 2, 6.
- SR made a general comment about expectations surrounding “x hours per credit point” and lamented that he had spent far more hours per credit point for his units, not just in this one but others too. He also got the impression that academic staff were indifferent if a student ended up going over the prescribed "x hours per credit point" ratio. He felt it was unfair for academic staff to be dismissive of scheduling problems students might have if they found they were having to spend more hours to try and excel in a unit.
- Mike remarked that academic staff should not make students feel guilty about spending more time than the prescribed hours and should be encouraging instead.
- Annabelle asked if assignment expectations for hours spent and expected results were not properly communicated to the students. i.e. A guideline to spend x hours get grade y.
- David lamented the logarithmic scale of effort for marks in some assignments, where moving from 65 to 67 was two minutes, whereas 85 to 87 would take 3 hours. He felt this was not accounted for in the way that some assignments were designed.
Another SR disagreed with what was mentioned. In summary he believed it was a matter of good time management and scheduling on the part of the student. He also remarked that he had simply ignored any guidance on hours spent for expected marks.

Other SR agreed that she hadn’t had any problems mentioned earlier. It was better to aim for understanding of what a student was doing rather than a mark.

Annabelle pointed out the unavoidable requirement for writing down a mark.

Mike asked about students' personal measure of excellence. Was it about the number or was it about self-satisfaction?

One SR said it was primarily about self-satisfaction for him, but he did realise that a number needed to be put on his transcript eventually and there was an element of “playing the game” for him.

Annabelle suggested for some students it was helpful to have clear guidance as to how much effort reached what mark, which would then allow them to make informed decisions of how to spend their time based on whatever else was going on in their lives.

Mike would like to point out that nearly 17% of the class had come to the meeting.

ISYS302 - Management of IT Systems and Projects
Ian Krycer

SR said lectures going great; engaging. Remarked on relevance of reference to shows and how Ian actually knew about them and not just titles.

SR was slightly confused as to what was to be done in tutorials.

Ian remarked that the tutorials were more unstructured and the assessments were designed to be formative rather than summative.

Another SR complained that they had no communication from their tutor; did not introduce himself; no e-mail; no guidance; class was not doing anything.

Ian would counsel the tutor in question to be more pro-active in class.

Ian also remarked that the loose structure of the tutorials and the practicals were to give students the freedom to learn at their own pace and avoid the problems of a more structured approach from earlier years. 3rd years were expected to be able to handle less structured materials. The tutors and prac demonstrators were there as a guide.

SR said she liked the tutorial videos. She was not able go to the lectures in person and relied on Echo 360, which was “pretty okay”.

Ian pointed out that he didn’t use the visualiser and scribbled on the board, so absent students would miss some things. He would prefer students to attend the lecture and this was somewhat of an incentive.

SR remarked that the practical stuff was quite good. “Some of the material is doing a good job of some bad material”. He also complained that the textbook had problems. The textbook and associated lecture slides were a pain and tedious to go through. Each chapter of textbook chose an example from the real world that was stilted and unrealistic; material was twisted to fit context.

Ian agreed examples were too brief and stilted... he had fun with examples by pointing out what worked and didn’t.

SR complained that the textbook was what was assessable and not the nuances.
• Ian cognizant of the tedium of PMBOC but would be assessable. But later in semester, gears would be switched. The unit would look at Agile and talk about the cloud. Mobile sociable wearable trends. Internet of things.
• Another SR complained about last year’s offering’s assessment more about memorisation.

ISYS358 - Business Information Systems Project
Deborah Richards

• No SR present

ISYS360 - Technology Management
Peter Busch

• No SR present
• Peter said so far so good. Assignment had been released. A couple of weeks of lectures so far.
• The tutorial was the 3rd hour of the lecture which was a question and answer format. The answers were posted the following day.
• Ian would take over in week 7.
• Enrolment was at approximately 120

General Comments, labs, lecture theatres:

• Several people complained about E7B T3 and needs updating. The seats were uncomfortable, the screens were tiny and positioned in uncomfortable positions. E7B T4 had been all renovated and computing got E7BT3; the one that had not been renovated.
• Suggestion to request for a better theatre that was not being used. Put a note on the door of the original theatre to guide late students to the new location.
• Resolve to request a different theatre from the timetabling department.

COMP352 - Video Games Project
Malcolm Ryan

• Malcolm brought in Dan Graf from Half Brick as a guest lecturer to talk about how they ran their teams.
• Remarked about the trouble with group work and that the focus of the unit was to fix group work and get students to work effectively as a team, as well as produce a game.
• Integration of SCRUM and Agile methodologies.
• 10 students. Small and experimental. Okay so far.
• Malcolm would encourage more of them to turn up to the meetings

Meeting closed after 46mins.