MINUTES

MEETING RSCS Convenor Meeting
MEET No. Meeting 2, Semester 2
VENUE N101 Seminar Room
DATE/TIME Thursday 16th October, 1-2pm
CONTACT Sam Slater

1. Welcome
1.1 Attendance: Steve Gould, Steve Blackburn, Tom Gedeon, Peter Strazdins, Scott Sanner, Weifa Liang, Qing Wang, Peter Christen, Patrick Haslum, Rajeev Gore, Eric McCreath, Sebastian Fleissner, Lynette Johns-Boast, Natalie Young, Bindi Mamouney

1.2 Apologies: Mark Reid

2. Minutes from the previous meeting
The minutes from the previous Course Convenor Meeting (28.8.2014) and the SRC Meeting (9.10.2014) were circulated via email before the meeting.

3. Matters arising
3.1 New structure of the SRC and CC meetings.
A number of the course convenors have concerns with how the new system will work, especially with no face to face contact with the SRC. The new structure relies on the Associate Director relaying information between the SRC and the Course Convenors. Concerns that this may then lead to ‘chinese whispers’. Requests were made for opportunities to provide feedback from all parties on how this new system fares at the end of the semester.

3.2 Course Reps.
The course convenors raised concerns regarding the course reps not being able to directly talk to the course convenor. It was explained that the SRC also wanted to make sure that the course reps can meet directly with the course convenors and that this will be encouraged. However, there also must be opportunities for students to remain anonymous if they wish.

4. Course Reports
4.1 COMP1140
Steve Blackburn responded to comments about COMP1140 not being advanced enough. He explained that COMP1140 has fundamentally changed from previous years. The students apply software construction to an advanced topic, as compared to the COMP1100 students. They also are grouped into
different tutorial groups which explore more advanced topics. Steve will follow up with the tutor about how this was progressing and will talk to all the COMP1140 students.

4.2 COMP2600

Raj Gore responded to the comments raised in the SRC meeting about the course moving too quickly (only spending one or two weeks on a topic) and that it was very hard for some students. He stated that these are the comments raised every year in the course. The SRC had brought up that having COMP2600 as a necessary part of the Computer Science major was a problem as there was no alternative course. Peter Strazdins commented that COMP2600 was the only course that met the learning objectives for the major. It must remain as it is. Raj agreed with this and said that the course teaches the students the basics that they need.

4.3 COMP2610

John Slaney, as the second examiner, spoke to the comments from the SRC regarding the assignments being no longer too challenging, but now being very long and tedious. He said that they could incorporate all the aspects into future assignments and make sure that they were challenging, long and tedious.

4.4 COMP2130

Sebastian Fleissner was happy to hear that there were no complaints with his course.

4.5 COMP2310

Peter Strazdins addressed the concerns from the SRC regarding the ‘fuzziness around the assignment specs’. He said that the issue was addressed two weeks before the submission. Unfortunately some students chose to not take the new information on board. Peter also addressed the issue regarding students not thinking that JAVA or C+ are appropriate for the course. He gave students the opportunity to submit their assignment in ADA and only one student did. However, students will get ADA in COMP2310 from 2015 thus removing the problem.

4.6 COMP3600

In response to the comments about deadlines changing for submissions, Weifa Liang was able to show in two places online that they have not changed. Possibly a mistake on the student’s part (Raj Gore thought that it might be confused with COMP2600 where he changed a deadline?)

4.7 COMP4650

The SRC appreciated the changes that were made to the assignments. Scott Sanner spoke to the assignments and the changes that have been made to make it easier for students. More guidance is now being provided in the tutorials. Regarding the questions that were not answered in any detail on Wattle, the questions posed by students were yes or no type questions. So the answers provided were yes or no only. The SRC rep had made special mention that Marian-Andrei Rizoiu was a very good lecturer and
that the students really enjoyed their teaching. Ramesh thanked Scott for all that he did in teaching COMP4650. He will not be teaching at ANU in 2015.

4.8 Honours
The incorrect deadline was changed and students ended up with an extra day to submit their theses. After some discussion regarding the number of copies that students should submit to the school to be bound, the decision was to make it 1 copy instead of the 4 currently being done. The bound copy will be stored in the school.

4.9 SELT
Ramesh asked course convenors if they thought they should email their students to remind them to complete their SELT surveys. This lead to a discussion about if we are overwhelming the students with such requests. PPM sends out separate emails to the students for each course and each lecture, lab and/or tutor that is to be assessed weekly and then daily closer to the deadline. This means that some students receive 8 emails or more daily with SELT reminders. A more positive approach would be to speak about SELT reviews in the lecture time and encourage students to do them.

4.10 CSSA
Caitlyn McLeod is the new president of the CSSA and a new committee is now in place. The CSSA is still requesting representation on the committee for the program restructure when it takes place. There was a lot of discussion regarding this. Steve Blackburn said that it would be misguided to have the strategic view of where the computer science programs are going to be influenced by undergraduate students. We need their feedback and input but not as a part of the committee. Asking students to design our program is not right.

CSSA Study Events – these are going well but there has to be consideration about who is paying the tutors that help out. Raj said that he approached the director with the number of hours needed to pay the tutors and Alistair was willing to give the money for it. It was also mentioned that running these events is a lot easier when PAL is involved. Peter Strazdins said he could not see the benefit of these events to student grades but it did seem to help some students. The problem is that students may come to rely on these events instead of going to their tutorials.

5. Other Business
5.1 Raj wanted to discuss a case where a student had written “I got help from X” on an assignment. The assignment outline clearly stated no collaboration. Consensus was that the student shouldn’t be punished as they were honest, but that they should lose marks where they collaborated.
6. **Next Meeting**

   Not discussed.