

**School of Engineering and Materials Sciences
Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Staff Liaison Committee**

22 June 2020

Via Collaborate

Confirmed

Minutes

Staff Members Present:

Name	Role
Folashade Akinmolayan Taiwo	SSCL Chair
Angela Jones	Secretary
Daniella Peluso-White	Taught Programmes Manager
Adrian Briggs	Director of Education
Eldad Avital	3 rd year coordinator
Jun Chen	4 th year/MSc Coordinator
Yousef Zawahreh	School TEF lead
James Soderman	Faculty Liaison Librarian, Science and Engineering
Tomas Lukas	Senior TA

Student Representative present:

Name	Programme and Level
Devika Vasistha	Aerospace Engineering Year 3
Karan Mehta	Aerospace Engineering Year 3/4
Leo Huang	Biomedical Engineering Year 1
Michael Lilay	Biomedical Engineering Year 2
Jannet Mansur	Chemical Engineering Year 2
Weronika Lipien	Chemical Engineering Year 3
Ideen Sanei	Design, Innovation and Creative Engineering Year 2
Nicole Wan	Design, Innovation and Creative Engineering Year 3
Carol Raphael	Materials Science and Engineering Year 1
Corina Deacu	Materials Science and Engineering Year 3
Hamza Butt	Mechanical Engineering Year 1

Abdullah Taibi	Mechanical Engineering Year 2
----------------	-------------------------------

Apologies for absence:

Name	Role or programme and level
Hasan Shaheed	2 nd year coordinator
Mughees Asif	Aerospace Engineering Year 2
Kenneth Ezeiruouma	MEng/MSc (feedback below)

Part 1 – Preliminary Items	
1a	Welcome, Introductions & Apologies for Absence
	<p>The meeting commenced with a welcome. The meeting had been called to gain student feedback on alternative assessment although other feedback was still welcome.</p> <p>Apologies were noted.</p>
1b	Report on matters arising and actions taken
	<p>The minutes of the meeting on 6 May were confirmed as a correct record. There were no matters arising.</p> <p>Actions confirmed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the format for alternative assessment for individual modules were published. • Learning Technologists had remedied the issues for accessing past papers. • MAT601 – additional revision lecture scheduled.
Part 2 –Student Reports- Reports from student course representatives	
	<p>Summary</p> <p>The alternative assessment period was well organised. Some students reported preferring this method of assessment to exams. Students had initially been anxious about the assessments but felt reassured by the School. Student representatives advised preparing for alternative assessments was similar to that of an exam and all revised.</p> <p>Whilst having the 48 hour window was felt to be useful for students with caring or other responsibilities, the time period was felt to be draining with one person reporting that they felt it necessary to check and recheck answers because of the stress of knowing this was equivalent to an exam. The majority reported that it wasn't possible to undertake the work in the 3 hour period identified. It was felt that the questions required more thought than usual and, in some instances, were too open ended.</p>

	<p>The upload procedure was similar to that of coursework which was useful. Having email confirmation of submission was reassuring.</p>
2(a)	1st Year
	<p>Aerospace Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No feedback
	<p>Biomedical Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People found the assessment upload procedure similar to the coursework which made it easier, and the confirmation email when submitting was also reassuring. • The 48 hour window was felt to be good for those with other responsibilities. <p>DEN4123 and DEN4102</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessments were as expected. <p>MAT4004</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people found the MAT4004 assessment questions different to the topics that were covered in class, and some questions were considered unclear. It also seemed that some people got their questions answered on the forum whereas other questions were not. More guidance and examples in a similar format to the assessments was requested.
	<p>Chemical Engineering</p> <p>No feedback</p>
	<p>DICE</p> <p>No feedback</p>
	<p>Materials Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People thought that everything went smoothly and it was well organised. • Most students mentioned that the 48 hours were draining, they recommended a shorter assessment sat in 24 hours • One module was 100% alternative assessment which was stressful. • Tuition fees for next year were queried if the courses are delivered remotely. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response – there is no information that fees will be different at this time. • When can students expect their results?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response – provisional results are likely to be due on Monday 20 July with confirmed results on 4 August (10 August for postgraduate students). ● Clarity was sought on the no detriment policy 1.3.6/0.3.6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response, it was confirmed that, when determining the degree classification in the final year, the higher of the two marks either with or without the marks for this year would be taken to calculate the classification.
	<p>Mechanical Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Feedback confirmed that the confirmation of submission email had been valued.
	<p>Robotics</p> <p>No feedback</p>
2 (b)	2nd Year
	<p>Aerospace Engineering</p> <p>No feedback</p>
	<p>Biomedical Engineering</p> <p>No feedback</p>
	<p>Chemical Engineering</p> <p>DEN5200 and DEN 5208</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students were happy with the time given for alternative assessments and with the level of difficulty. <p>DEN5411</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students found the alternative assessment to be quite difficult. The questions were felt to be harder than the coursework and requiring more than 3 hours to resolve. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response – all modules were reviewed by External Examiners and were felt to be appropriate for the module. ○ Action 1.1 - AJ to feedback to MO
	<p>DICE</p> <p>No specific feedback from DICE students.</p>
	<p>Materials Science</p> <p>No Feedback</p>

	<p>Mechanical Engineering</p> <p>No specific feedback from students</p>
	<p>Robotics</p> <p>No feedback</p>
2(b)	3rd /4th Year
	<p>Aerospace Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative assessment was felt to be draining and not able to be completed within 3 hours. Alternative Assessment was felt to be better than standard format exams. <p>DEN307</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mistake in the question paper and a delay in responding to queries on the forum had led to difficulties for students. <p>DEN306/DEN6405</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students found the alternative assessment more difficult than exams where almost 48 hours was spent completing the questions <p>MAT5030</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students appreciated having a longer time to complete the assessment, compared to the 3 hours that would normally have been allocated although some questions were quite open ended. <p>DEN318</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the final report included in no detriment policy? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response – the project is required for the degree to be accredited so must be passed. However, the degree classification can be calculated based on the other credits at this level.
	<p>Biomedical Engineering</p> <p>No feedback</p>
	<p>Chemical Engineering</p> <p>DEN326</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good paper, it was organised and well-structured with good briefings on what to expect. <p>DEN320</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper was lengthy and took longer than the time allocated. <p>DEN6440</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a new module with no past papers. Tutorial questions did not include solutions. The paper was lengthy and the questions open.

	<p>Students felt that not all of the module had been covered by the paper.</p> <p>DEN6410</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ice project had been considerable work and, with extensions to deadlines, students were concerned that this had continued after the alternative assessment period when most students were tired. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response – it was acknowledged that delaying the deadlines had impacted on this piece module. • Group work had been difficult to coordinate remotely. Whilst most groups had used WhatsApp, short time frames and internet access had made it necessary to rely on text messages across time zones making it difficult to organise. • The weighting of this report for the work required was questioned. • Issues with the allocation of marks for group work compared to independent work was queried. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response – working as a team an essential skill for an engineer. ○ Action – 1.2 - AJ to raise issues, including deadlines with MO
	<p>DICE</p> <p>DEN327</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment was via whole day presentation rather than alternative assessment. The Programme leader was praised for good organisation including scheduling regular breaks, practice sessions and use of technology. WebEx was chosen as the best option after other technology had been tested. • Group work had used WhatsApp and set regular meetings. Time zones had been an issue. • The sponsor's briefs were felt to be very different with differing amounts of guidance and scope. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action 1.3 - AJ to feedback to Programme Lead and MO <p>DEN329</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example project briefs would have been useful. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action 1.4 - AJ to feedback to the MO
	<p>Materials Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial anxiety about assessment but reassured by the School that it was going to be fine. • Assessment style differed by module. <p>MAT601</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The format was the same as if it had been a formal exam • Following the last SSLC, online feedback was provided, however it did not adequately cover what to expect. <p>MAT6312DEN6311</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students felt underprepared and struggled understanding the questions and what was expected of them.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These were felt to be 24 hours of work. • They covered areas not covered on the course and use of external materials were required. • The cohort had queries on why questions on alternative assessment were different to those on previous exams and whether this meant the answers should be of a different format.
	<p>Mechanical Engineering</p> <p>No feedback</p>
	<p>Robotics</p> <p>No feedback</p>
2 (d)	Masters
	<p>Feedback by email</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues • Confirmation on date of release of results (see above). • Is there a limit on how many people can attend the online graduation event per graduate? When may the physical ceremony be?
Part 3	Programme delivery and other matters
	<p>Learning Resources</p> <p>Library Developments to provision would support blended learning next Semester including new information and website changes.</p> <p>There was currently no information on return of books.</p>
	<p>Module evaluation</p> <p>Following discussion at SSLC, Module Evaluation had been trialled as a Quiz on QMPlus. It was felt to be easier to respond to than use of the paper version. Wider circulation and increased publicity was recommended.</p> <p>Results would be provided to the first meeting of SSLC next academic year along with changes made as a result of the feedback reported to second and third year students in their welcome back events or first lecture.</p>
	<p>Black lives matter</p> <p>There had communication from the Principal, Students' Union and Head of School on institutional racism. Student representatives were asked to</p>

	<p>provide feedback on mechanisms for discussion within the School as well as on actions to be taken.</p> <p>A number of issues were discussed including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A School Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee • Circulation of the EDI Committee Action Plans • Communication of the action plans to address the attainment gap • Ensuring Black students' experience was considered in place of BAME so the experience of different students could be adequately evaluated • Decolonising the curriculum is not as necessary within Engineering, however, more can be done to showcase the work of Engineers. • Academic preparedness sessions for new students eg academic English, advice on lectures and other teaching, academic writing, preparing lab reports, reading scientific articles • 'Come and discuss your fears before starting University' event • University of Sheffield programme following denouncement of institutional racism. • Information/skills provided in Adviser groups • Personalised response from School appreciated. <p>Students can email SEMSstudents@qmul.ac.uk, d.peluso-white@qmul.ac.uk or angela.jones@qmul.ac.uk to provide further feedback.</p>
	<p>Thanks</p> <p>Dr Akinmolayan expressed thanks to the Student Representatives. Their feedback was valued and of great importance to the School.</p>
	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>The SSLC would reconvene in the Autumn.</p>

Drafted by
Angela Jones
Student Support Officer (SEMS)
22.06.20