Student Consultative Meeting #1 for 2017

Tuesday 11 April 2017

12noon – 1pm

78-217

Present: Anne Redulla, Millie Macdonald, Qi Wang, James Stuart, Chole Tan, Divyot Singh, Andrew Le, Gabriel Tuntomo, Evan Hughes, Stephen Viller, Ben Matthews, Rahul Sharma, Karen Kinnear

Apologies Joel Bulow, Matthew O’Meally, Michael Brünig, Helen Huang, Mohamed Sharaf, Shazia Sadiq, Jennifer Croud, David Reeves, Jay Prentice

Welcome – Karen Kinnear introduced staff members in attendance before handing over to Gabriel as 2016 Chair.

Carried over from 2016

ENGG2800 (Team Project 1) Grievance – Stephen Viller reported on the recent 3 hour meeting attended by the Head of School, Prof Michael Brünig, himself and involved students. Two of the primary outcomes of the meeting are that students now appreciate that they have a number of avenues to raise concerns hopefully in time to effect positive outcomes before the course ends and for School management to seek feedback from the current tutors in ENGG4810 (Team Project 2) to discuss whether issues exist in that course.

Role of Committee members – aim is to spread the load with members volunteering to take on projects. Attendance fell off towards the end of the year with 2nd meeting in Sem 2 being cancelled. Request RSVP early so that we can manage scheduling of meetings.

Feedback mechanism – William Wu (Deputy 2016) is no longer involved due to his pending graduation and he is to handover that task. Proposal is to set up a working group for feedback and how to communicate matters back to the student body.

Student Introductions – student committee members introduced themselves.

Election for 2017 Chair and Deputy

Nominations from floor for Chair – Gabriel Tuntomo and James Stuart

Election held and Gabriel was elected Chair and James as Deputy Chair.

Agenda Items

Student Feedback

1. ECP publishing – student request that ECPs are published prior to semester start. Assessment items are of particular interest. Planning for deadlines across the semester. Changes from student feedback – students seeking more details so that they are aware where change has been made and shows that previous feedback has been taken on board, even if change cannot be made for a reason.

On the Courses and Programs website is was suggested that course overview could be more relevant.
Stephen Viller advised that the UQ require that the ECP is published a week before first contact and the School is aiming for Monday of O’Week

2. Grades Release before final exam – important for students to know where they stand before sitting final exam. Request that all available grades are released in blackboard before the final exam and certainly after grade release.

Stephen Viller advised that to his knowledge there wasn’t a formal requirement to release grades at a certain time but it was a reasonable expectation for students to be given that information.
Students requested that it was useful if the course coordinator could provide grades for specific components of exams (ie Part A and Part B) as this would be useful feedback.
Breakdown of marks across assessment items. Email to each student with mark breakdown.

Exam Script Viewing – marking criteria, solutions provided, Course Coordinator present.
Scheduling of Script viewing – EOI after 2nd Semester and then advertise schedule for 2 sessions – one in break and 1st week.

Suggestion of Mid Semester Course feedback – mechanism to provide informal feedback to course coordinator on course allowing for tweaking of course in 2nd half of semester.
CSSE1001 could be a trial course. iTALi have provided an instrument for course coordinator to seek feedback outside of SECat. Course coordinators could

All course materials must be made available on blackboard and course specific sites.

Mechatronics Plan query – CSSE2310 is not a compulsory course. METR4202 involves AI, computer vision and programming without any of those skills being compulsory courses.
Suggest that students meet with Mechatronics Plan Leader to drive change in program as required.

Course flowcharts required. Student societies have provided a course guide. Students find it difficult to find relationship between courses – Journey maker will have a student perspective and will show core learning components and how that flows through.

Feedback from 2016 committee member was that committee had little impact.

Other Business
Suggestion regarding tutor selection process – interviews might be a more appropriate mechanism for selecting tutors. Some current tutors are not adequately skilled. Report issues to course coordinators.

Meeting closed at 1:15pm