1. **Meeting Attendance**

**Present:**
- **Staff** – Dr Marcus Gallagher, Ms Karen Kinnear, Dr Mithulan Nadarajah, Ms Alexandra Peake, Dr Marius Portmann, Mr David Reeves, Dr Philip Terrill,
- **Students** – James Stuart (Chair), Elias Blanch, Jack Caperon, Alexandra Crawley, Ella de Lore, James Gover, Evan Hughes, Matthew O’Meally, Luke Stinger, Joshua Sutton, Digby Tilse, Brae Webb

**Apologies:**
- **Staff** – Professor Michael Brünig (Head of School), Ms Erin Hulme (School Manager), Dr Gianluca Demartini, Mr Matt Luscombe, Mr Richard Newport, Dr Stephen Viller (Director of Coursework Studies)
- **Students** – Shyui Chen, Harrison Cusack, Da Han, Guoxiang Li, Jenna Macdonald, Ariane Mora, Frank Mudole, Ryan Phelan, Daniel Ward, Jason Weidner

2. **Confirmation of Minutes – Meeting 2, 2019**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2019 were taken as read and confirmed.

3. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

3.1 **Vending Machine**

Matthew O’Meally reported that EBESS has a new executive who are not interested in running the vending machine and floated ideas for moving forward including a staff student partnership or a student society with fees going towards stocking the vending machine.

Phil Terrill said that, historically, the UQ Union has required each club/society to be distinctly different and that running a vending machine is unlikely to meet the requirements. Phil suggested that other options might include incorporating an organisation outside of the University but students would have to consider all of the advantages and disadvantages and weigh up the practical details of stocking, managing (money & parts) and effort vs the benefit. Phil also suggested considering other alternatives to a vending machine (ie a pop up shop to run the weekend before Team Projects are due).

There was a general discussion about the history of the proposal and the suggestion from an earlier meeting of approaching the soon-to-be-launched Maker Space.

Action item: Matthew O’Meally and Alex Crawley contact the Maker Space.

3.2 **ITLC furniture feedback report**

Discussed the need for additional power points in the room. Karen Kinnear emphasised the need to prioritise the furniture and refurbishment of the room to better reflect its role as a learning centre due to the pressure to allow teaching and other activities to take place in the room.

Action item: Evan Hughes and Jack Caperon to gather fresh data and provide report asap.

3.3 **ITEE Update**

Karen Kinnear gave a brief ITEE update:

**News from the last Executive Meeting:**
- **School Structure:** One of the recommendations from the School Review was for the School to review its management structure. Following this recommendation, the School unsuccessfully advertised for a Deputy Head. The School further considered the structure and plans to create two Deputy Head roles focussing on the different streams: Teaching & Learning and Research.
• **Space:** Space is at a premium so spaces in the Axon and Hawken buildings need to be rearranged to accommodate a Siemens teaching lab - changes will affect teaching and thesis labs.

**News from the Teaching & Learning Committee:**

• **New Program:** A new Program, Master of Cyber Security, has been proposed and is going through the approval process. It will be a comprehensive program with streams across the EAIT, BEL, Science and HASS Faculties.

In line with the new Program a new Cyber Security research group has been formed within the School.

• **Student Partnerships:** The School is utilising a Student Partnership to help redesign the Bachelor of Information Technology.

Phil Terrill reported on the main points from the recent EAIT Teaching and Learning Meeting primarily that the Faculty is concerned with providing more study spaces for students including more outdoor covered space. The members advised that one of the main concerns was access to power in study spaces.

3.4 **Teaching hours (evening classes)**

The Chair reported that students had provided further feedback about late teaching hours and the lack of support (IT, lab manager, access to components) for evening classes. Karen Kinnear advised that timetabling and evening classes are controlled by Teaching Space Management and were a result of lack of capacity due to increasing student numbers. The School will continue to feed back to Teaching Space Management.

Evan Hughes stated that some courses require students to use specific software that is only available on lab computers. Extended teaching hours often result in computer labs being booked 8am to 8pm – limiting student access outside of class time. David Reeves reminded students of the remote desktop option and said that remote desktop capability would increase over time as ITIG is working to increase resources; but that software licensing is one of the major limiting factors.

4. **Matters for Consideration**

4.1 **Feedback Box / Facebook Page**

Evan Hughes advised that the feedback from the feedback box related to

- 6-8 pm classes
- Furniture for the ITLC (78-217)
- The water tap in the ITLC – Evan is to follow up with P&F regarding the tap.

4.2 **Items from Representatives**

4.2.1. **Fostering Student Staff Communications**

Matthew O’Meally referred to a textbook in the UQ Library that details a UK/China student engagement study and queried whether UQ looks at these studies. Phil Terrill confirmed that studies such as this are considered and that the active learning labs in courses such as ENGG1300 and CSSE2010 were designed based on literature of that type.

Phil also referred to the current Engineering Curriculum Review and said that one committee is looking at the structure and how the courses fit together, a second committee is looking at the pedagogy, student experience and referring to literature.

Karen Kinnear added that there are central divisions focussed on student experience and engagement (ie Careers and Employability) and the School itself is currently running two programs: one redesigning the Bachelor of Information Technology and another redesigning courses in line with a UQ initiative for blended learning. Karen advised that one of the big challenges the School faces
is getting students to become engaged and encouraged the Committee to provide suggestions for increasing student engagement.

4.2.2. Provision of feedback on academic progress and 4.2.3 Availability of final exam marks
The Chair referred to student comments about the importance of proper feedback (including Course Coordinators adding final marks to Blackboard and providing content specific feedback [for example common misconceptions in answers]) and stated that this is handled more effectively by courses offered by other Schools and to greatly varying degrees by courses within ITEE.

There was a general discussion about types of feedback and the value of providing details of where assessment has been answered well/poorly so that students can judge how well they know the content and where they have placed within the cohort.

Karen Kinnear advised that all Course Coordinators are reminded to add final marks to Blackboard and that the feedback would be passed along to Course Coordinators.

4.2.4. Quality of examinations
The Chair referred to a previous year’s discussion around the quality of final exams and the lack of facility for feedback on poor final exams as they take place after course feedback is submitted.

Karen Kinnear explained the School’s process for checking exams and the difficulties faced by academics (including competing deadlines and the need to complete exams well ahead of the end of semester). There was a general discussion around the processes of other Schools and the lack of feedback from students to the School once they have passed a course.

Karen strongly encouraged students to provide feedback to Course Coordinators if they felt that final exams were inadequate or, if necessary/preferred, to her personally stating her open door policy. Karen also mentioned the difficulty in obtaining alumni feedback for accreditation and encouraged students, once they become alumni, to provide feedback based on how they feel they have been prepared for their working lives.

Jack Caperon advised that UQCS have strong links with alumni and industry and offered to seek feedback when needed.

4.2.5. Timely availability of assessment information
The Chair sought an update on a point from previous meetings regarding ensuring all assessment information (including marking criteria and submission information) is available at the same time as the assessment description; querying whether the School was able to demonstrate improvements in this area. Karen Kinnear advised that she did not have any information in this regard and that Stephen Viller may be better placed to respond; suggesting that the matter be held over to next meeting.

4.2.6. Teaching & Learning Leadership
The Chair referred to student feedback received about disparities between progressive courses (ie CSSE1001 → CSSE2002 → CSSE2310). Phil Terrill discussed the ongoing Engineering Curriculum Review and, in particular, the process of curriculum mapping.

Karen advised curriculum mapping for all programs had been one of the recommendations from the School Review, referred to the BInfTech Staff Student Partnership which is currently assessing the BInfTech and stated that the School leadership had been strongly promoting greater leadership from Program Directors and Plan Leaders.
Phil emphasised that the whole process was very complicated due to courses sitting across multiple different streams, programs, plans and years.

5. **Other Business**
   
   5.1 **Student Engagement**
   
   Digby Tilse raised the issue of student engagement and the difficulty in finding out about opportunities and students’ general lack awareness of how/where to appropriately provide feedback. Digby also advised that many students are reluctant to have their names associated with bad feedback.

   5.2 **Increasing Representation**
   
   Phil Terrill advised that Stephen Viller (an apology) had asked him to raise the need to increase representation (program, year level, gender) on the Committee and suggested that the Committee think about this. Members mentioned that the “formal application” for admission to the SCC was intimidating and the process may need to be less formal in future.

6. **Next Meeting**

   The next meeting is due to take place in Week 5, Semester 2, 2019.