

Computing Science Staff Student Subject Sub Committee (SSSSC) Meeting

Attendance:

Evan McVeigh

Ismael Sanchez Leon

Silvia Nacheva

Matthew Burt

Albert Jozsa-Kiraly

John Ramsay

Staff:

Dr. Savi Maharaj

Kevin Swingler

Committee Chair: Petra Peterkova

Committee Secretary: Matthew Burt

Date: 15th of February 2017, 2pm, 4B96

Date of next meeting: 22nd of March 2017, 2pm, 4B96

CSCU9A2 – Evan McVeigh

A few students are struggling to understand the instructions on labs due to difficulties with reading, and are struggling to cope with the reading, however it was suggested that things be broken up, making things overall easier to read and tidier, as the sheets feel very cluttered.

CSCU9Y4 – Matthew Burt

Students find that it is a good continuation from CSCU9A3, however some students find issue with the fact that checkpoints are quite long, particularly checkpoint two.

CSCU9V4 – Matthew Burt, John Ramsay

The tutorials are different to what we have experienced before, having students chairing the tutorial allows for even more discussion, with good lectures and practical's, the quality of the tutorials makes this module very well received.

CSCU9T4 – Matthew Burt, Albert Jozsa-Kiraly

Very positive feedback, very satisfied students. Builds on last semester, enhancing our knowledge, Material gets dry but lecturer keeps it interesting. Practical's good, with fitting difficulty. Some of the deadlines on practical documents are still from last year, meaning that they indicate the wrong day.

CSCU9N6 – Ismael Sanchez Leon

Lectures good, students very happy with difficulty. Demo code is good. While the first half was found to be interesting, the second half was considered more boring. Practical's are good. Assignment is also good, very challenging, comes with half the code, with the rest needing building. More practical's requested on time maps, and lecture on the digital telo converter.

CSCU9P6 – Silvia Nacheva

Lectures are slow, not quite interesting to the students. Students feel that the lecturer needs to engage them more. Practical's however are very good, but difficult to set up. People are very curious about the project.

CSCU9T6 – Petra Peterkova

Feedback was not very positive, people are unhappy with lecturer, gets very confused and constantly late to lectures. One of the lecturer theatres is unnecessarily big, and lecturer assumes students know much more than they actually do. There are far too many gaps in timetable. Better tutorial room with a proper whiteboard is also requested. Generally students say the module is quite easy, but request more hardware related modules with more practicals.

CSCU9W6 – Petra Peterkova, Silvia Nacheva

Most of the complaints through feedback were based on the HTML lecture. Students feel they have done HTML enough times before to say that there is no need for it. Marwan's lectures were very well received. People find that the practical's can be quite heavy on the word count, making them take a lot of time to complete. The screen cast tutorials were also broken, inaccessible to students. Some students request face to face time instead. Peerwise has very mixed reviews, some students like it, some students do not. The score system is strange, and people find the Peerwise things difficult but fitting.

ITNPBD1 – Christina Millar

Students feel like this should have been a full module, with BD4 being a half module. BD2 grading very unclear. Grades were back quite late.

ITNPBD6 – Christina Millar

Very positive feedback overall, with good organization of module and interesting content.

ITNPBD7 – Christina Millar

Basic Java at start is good, a good refresher, however a request was made for more practical's on Java. Overall feedback was very good.

ITNPBD8 – Christina Millar

Mixed feedback and opinions on module. Many were questioning the relevance overall, stating that module is too close to D6. People did like that the checkpoints count towards the final grade, but complaints were raised about the timetable. Course improvements have been sent to Kevin already.