

**School of Engineering and Materials Sciences
Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Staff Liaison Committee
26th February 2020**

Minutes

Staff Members Present:

Name	Role
Folashade Akinmolayan	SSCL Chair
Angela Jones	Secretary
Daniella Peluso-White	Taught Programmes Manager
Tomas Lukas	Senior TA
Hasan Shaheed	2 nd year coordinator
Saqib Raza Jivani	TA

Student Representative present:

Name	Programme and Level
Anisa Ahmad	Aerospace Engineering Year 1 - Rep
Devika Vasistha	Aerospace Engineering Year 3 - Rep
Karan Mehta	Aerospace Engineering Year 3/4 - Rep
Michael Lilay	Biomedical Engineering Year 2 - Rep
Jannet Mansur	Chemical Engineering Year 2 - Rep
Weronika Lipien	Chemical Engineering Year 3 - Rep
Nicole Wan	Design, Innovation and Creative Engineering Year 3 - Rep
Carol Raphael	Materials Science and Engineering Year 1 - Rep
Serena Sabani	Materials Science and Engineering Year 2 - Rep
Corina Deacu	Materials Science and Engineering Year 3 - Rep
Abdullah Taibi	Mechanical Engineering Year 2 - Rep
Ahmed Mahbub	Postgraduate Student

Apologies for absence (sent through their feedback):

Name	Role or programme and level
Adrian Briggs	Director of Education
Eldad Avital	3 rd year coordinator
Mark Small	Timetabling manager
Leo Huang	1 st Year Biomedical Engineering
Hamza Butt	1 st Year Mechanical Engineering
Mughees Asif	2 nd Year Aerospace Engineering
Ideen Sanei	2 nd Year DICE
Mohamamd Qamhieh	2 nd Year Robotics
Amirthan Mahindan	3 rd Year Materials Science

Part 1 – Preliminary Items	
1a	Welcome, Introductions & Apologies for Absence
	<p>The meeting commenced with introductions by chair Folashade Akinmolayan.</p> <p>Apologies were noted.</p>
1b	Report on matters arising and actions taken
	The minutes of the meeting on 4 December were confirmed as a correct record. There were no matters arising.
Part 2 –Student Reports- Reports from student course representatives	
2(a)	1st Year
	<p>Aerospace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEN4005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Publication of slides after lecturers was requested. ○ Students felt under prepared for exams as they had been briefed for these to be calculations and they included theory. Additionally the exams included helicopters which had not been taught. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 1.1 – FA to feedback to module organiser. • DEN4102 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern was expressed regarding covering the curriculum as content, especially calculations were covered slowly with duplication. ○ More structure was requested and that the slides supported the structure. ○ There were issues with the Mic in the Great Hall causing issues with hearing the content. QReview was also hard to access. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 1.2a – AJ to report issues with Mic and QReview. ▪ Action 1.2b – FA to feedback to module organiser. • DEN107 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Really good module, well taught. <p>Materials Science and Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAT4001 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This module built on knowledge of Chemistry that not all students felt they had. ○ The class had been informed that the average was 50% which they felt didn't reflect results from other modules or the work put into this module. ○ No past papers were available for revision.

- The exam papers were felt to be confusing and unanswerable with a mistake in the formula of propane. The cohort felt anxious about how this might impact their marks
 - Response – FA confirmed papers are checked prior to the exams.
 - Action 1.3 – FA will investigate with module organiser and communicate regarding the examination.
- MAT102
 - SCL was felt to be unorganised
 - Some students had been sent an email from admin.sems@qmul.ac.uk about an upcoming field trip however, not all of the group had. There was no information on whether this was compulsory.
 - Action 1.4 - DPW will investigate and advise re: the fieldtrip.
- DEN4005
 - Many of the marking schemes were incorrect.
 - Action 1.5 - FA to arrange for these to be updated.

Mechanical engineering (Sent via email):

- DEN4102
 - “Lecturer provides good steps on how to solve different questions”
 - “Content is understandable in lectures”
 - “The tutorials are helpful to understand practical applications”
 - “PSC classes are good”
- DEN107
 - “Adrian Briggs teaches professionally and his explanations are brilliant.”
 - “Like lecturing style and noise is kept to minimum by Lecturer”
 - “Really good tutorials”
 - “Good lecture notes, and lectures are delivered at a good standard”
- DEN4108
 - “Slides are good”
 - “Good PSC questions”
- DEN4123
 - “He teaches appropriately”
 - “Good module”

Over the course of the first half of the semester, the main issues raised were:

- DEN4102
 - Weekly tests (weighing 1% of module per test, 10% all weekly tests combined) in PSC sessions means that it is difficult to focus on the problems and not much is learnt. Many students have commented on the unnecessary stress and anxiety due to the tests does more harm than good,

	<p>many have neglected other work/modules to focus on them causing workload imbalance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It was requested that lab groups be more varied as, so far, every module's lab group has been the same. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 1.6 – FA to request review and feedback to module organizers.
2(b)	2nd Year
	<p>Design, Innovation and Creative Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEN5002 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are worried about the coursework. It felt disorganised and not clear. • Some lectures have been cancelled to be replaced by labs. • Further information was requested regarding the lab report. • More structure to the course and topics was requested. • Past papers would not be relevant due to the study of new topics. • MAT5030 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is felt there is too much content and is too in depth. • The appropriateness of this module for DICE students was raised. <p>Mechanical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The feedback on PBL lab reports was praised as sophisticated and self-explanatory. It was requested that this be the standard of feedback and used as a template. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response – Markers could use the PDF template or make notes on the report. ▪ Response by SJ – currently, first year labs all use the Turnitin functionality which marks on PDFs ▪ Action 2.1 - FA to provide feedback to Teaching associates on this preference. <p>Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BIO125 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concern expressed that this targeted at SBCS students. ○ Late enrolment had impacted on access to materials and impacted on assessment outcomes ○ Exams a different style. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 2.2 - AJ to follow up with SBCS • MAT321 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Q Review not working in Bancroft Road 302. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 2.3 - AJ to raise with IT ○ Eng 324 – really really cold <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 2.4 – AJ raise with estates ○ Module very good • MAT5030 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Module really good

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAT308 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organisation was felt to need improvement. The dates were not always up to date and the handouts needed reviewing. Action 2.5 – FA to feedback to module organiser. <p>Chemical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEN5411 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Taught well to make the subject matter clear. ○ Students requested increasing the weighting of Maple based coursework. It was felt that shorter assessments were distracting from understanding the subject area and addressing the larger scale issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response – no changes to assessment weightings were possible within the year, however, this feedback would be passed to the module organiser so it could be considered for next year. ▪ Action 2.6 – FA to advise module organiser • DEN5402 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requested consideration of the lab scheduling as the groups are not allocated and it was felt time was wasted by sitting and waiting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 2.7 – FA to advise Module organisers and Teaching Associate
2(c)	3 rd /4 th Year
	<p>Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAT500 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feedback was outstanding on 'Rationale Aims and Objectives' for some students. This was submitted in November. This impacts on other work for the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.1 - FA to advise module organiser <p>Design Innovation and Creative Engineering (DICE)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAT307 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The module was felt to relate to the course and an enjoyable subject ○ Slides were felt to be poor and researched within the class ○ Articles necessary for the exam were only emailed on the last day of term leading students feeling unprepared for the exam. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.2 - FA to feedback to module organiser • DEN329/327 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Further scheduling for this 4 hour session was requested. Students felt that much of the time allocated was spent waiting to talk to a tutor about their individual or group work. If there are particular issues, sometimes individuals might not

be seen at all. Attendance slots were requested to enable students to have a clearer time of when to present and when they might be seen.

- Action 3.3a– FA discuss with module organiser re time slots
 - Delivery of presentations in a 4 hour slot was felt to be very tiring and students felt their concentration was affected. It was requested that this was split between days.
 - Action 3.3b – FA to inform module organiser of the request.
 - Budget allocated (£50) however, the finance form did not work for students.
 - Action 3.4 - FA to review
 - Students would like to be able to use this in the Print Shop
 - Action 3.5 - FA to check if use of print shop can be covered by expenses and email
- Reading week
 - The week was felt to be positive.

Materials

- MAT311
 - Students felt unprepared for the exam in this module. For 50% of the marks students were asked to prepare an essay to write in the exam. Full instructions were not given until 3 days before the exam leading most students having to research and rewrite a new topic. A request for more information about this for the future.
 - Action 3.6 – FA feedback to the module organiser.
- MAT500
 - There was felt to be inconsistency in assessment of the presentations. This included their scheduling, some students were able to defer these on agreement of their supervisor, whether there was an audience, including the external examiner, the time available to present and answer questions.
 - Further guidance on planning this large piece of work including planning experimental work e.g. how to book labs, risk assessment, induction etc. was requested. As a result, most students started their experimental work after the January exams.
 - Students felt the way of choosing the projects were infantilising as they were not asked to provide a brief, rather to choose key words.
 - Students were not aware of research that was taking place within the school to support their decision making.
 - The allocation of supervisors should be reconsidered as some supervisors don't have the capacity to meet with students.
 - Some supervisors had asked not to be contacted over the summer.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Introductory lecture at the end of second year was cancelled leaving students unsure about their third year projects. ○ There was a perception that students would support a postdoc or PhD rather than doing their own research. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response – Key words were given as a number of students felt intimidated and unable to choose a topic. Other allocation had been tried unsuccessfully. Students can contact academic staff over the vacation. ▪ Action 3.7 – AB to liaise with module organiser regarding options for students to prepare a brief, better communication on the use of key words including which areas or academics might be linked to these. ▪ Action 3.8 – DPW to review communication on liaison with academic staff (see below) ▪ Action 3.9 – FA to ask lecturers to include information on their research within introductory lectures. • MAT6312 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Slides and module content were repeated from Mat4003 – Mat6312 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.10 – FA to feedback to module organiser • MAT601 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overlap in content with MAT602 and an area already been examined on. • MAT602 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Really great module, enjoyable particularly PBL exercises and group work with external companies on a real life issue. Great learning experience. ○ Challenging to work with people who haven't done SCLs and PBLs but great learning experience. <p>Aerospace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEN306 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In class tests scheduled from 5-7 resulted in students struggling to concentrate. ○ Poor QReview. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.11 – AJ to report QReview • DEN6405 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr Motallebi a great teacher with a lot of content to his lectures. However, this can become overwhelming if taking notes and following the lecture. ○ The delivery is scheduled for 3 hours from 9am making this difficult to follow <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.12 – FA to request review of timetable • Timetabling
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Imbalanced timetable with 2 days with no time to eat, one day free and one day with very little. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.13 – AJ to follow up with timetabling. ● DEN307 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Issues with QReview including patchy audio and camera not on the whiteboard (LG3). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.14 – AJ to report Q review ○ There is no mark scheme on coursework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.15 - FA request guidance on what is needed. <p>Chemical Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DEN6410 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students perceived a lack of organisation for the course. This included regular changes. The marking scheme hadn't been published. ○ Ongoing issues with the ASPEN software were reported. Initially there had been problems with installation. Students were reassured that these would be resolved. One tutorial was delivered and students spent time trying to learn the software however, this still doesn't work. It crashes, is slow and fails to save. – third year project ASPEN software – taught by end of first semester – problems installing it. Installed after exams but doesn't work on the University computers, crash or slow, not save. Communication on the issue has been poor. It was only announced that ASPEN was not going to be used week commencing 24 February. This has caused anxiety for students who feel they have not been able to progress their research for the double credited module. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 3.16 – AB to investigate
2d	4th Year/MSc
	<p>Biomedical Engineering MSc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DENM014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grades and feedback haven't been circulated for the assignment submitted on 20 November. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 4.1 – FA follow up with module organiser ○ Submission points aren't set or communicated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 4.2 – FA to advise module leader. ● Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supervisors were allocated late and this has led to a delay in completing work including rational, aims and objectives. ● General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The details of the handbook are not up to date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response – this was recently identified and is currently being updated

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 4.3 - AJ to circulate dates prior to handbook publication. ○ Module changes take over 2 weeks to complete and students have had to make multiple trips to the office to follow up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 4.4 – DPW to review ○ Law modules don't come up on timetable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 4.5 – AJ to review with Timetable Officer. ○ Deadlines reminders only appear if within a week of the deadlines so students rely on lecturer to advise of the schedule in advance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 4.6 – AJ to review with QMPlus ○ Very few modules have QReview. ○ Water fountain broken for weeks next to robotics lab <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 4.7 – AJ to follow up with Estates. ○ Students identified a lack of social activity for those studying on the masters programmes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 4.8 - DPW – provide societies an opportunity to promote activities (see below). ▪ Action 4.9 – FA to encourage programme co-ordinators to promote society activities. ▪ Action 4.10 – Course Reps to circulate details of events. ▪ Action 4.11 – FA to link with S&E representative after elections to promote activities for all. ○ Lack of common room <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response – ground floor of the Engineering Building, next to the People's Palace is being refurbished to make this space one for socialising and group study. ○ The course was felt to be disorganised, for example, it wasn't clear when the deadlines were due.
<p>January based exams</p>	<p>Mechanical (Y1): General feedback on January based exams has been positive. A lot of students feel that doing January exams consolidates their knowledge and prepares them for the next modules (eg. having done DEN4122 and studied for the exam meant sufficient preparation to understand DEN4123 with less friction)</p> <p>Robotics (Y2): The feedback was equal, with half of the robotics engineering students supporting January examination and the other half against it. A suggestion of having a 1 week break after examinations was raised and the majority of students supported it.</p> <p>Materials (Y2): Positive feedback for January exams as students feel the workload is more manageable for summer exams and 3rd Year projects. Students felt that it would be beneficial to have a 1 week break after January exams. Exams were scheduled on consecutive days. Review of coursework deadlines was requested so this lead time to revise and not lead to rushed work after the exams.</p>

	<p>Materials (Y3) Negative feedback on the pressure to complete coursework, semester based exams and job applications simultaneously was acknowledged.</p> <p>Chemical (Y3) There was confusion about when the exam results were due to be released with the School Office advising that these would be released on 24 February. An email was sent at midday to explain this was not the case. Further communication was requested for next year.</p> <p>Masters The commencement of modules directly after the exams was found to be difficult. The lack of study space prior to exam time was reported. This issue was feedback to the faculty and the Library would be increasing the opening hours over the Christmas Vacation in future years.</p>
Part 3 - Programme delivery and other matters	
4	Learning Resources
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The doors were not felt to be functioning properly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 5.1 – AJ to liaise with the library ○ The water fountain in the library is broken <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 5.2 – AJ to liaise with library and Estates.
5	Any other Business
5a	<p>SU Elections</p> <p>The role of School Rep and SU elections was discussed.</p> <p>Some students had been contacted by one of the candidates directly including the use of a personal email address.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 5.3 – DPW to investigate
5b	<p>Surveys</p> <p>The opportunities for students to provide feedback via the NSS/UKES/PTES were discussed. The importance of Peer to Peer encouragement was welcomed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 5.4 – AJ to send a link to the Course Reps with survey details ▪ Action 5.5 - Course reps to encourage their peers to complete these. ▪ Action 5.6 – FA to arrange this to be introduced in lectures. ▪ Action 5.7 – AJ to review access for individual students.
5c	Module Evaluations

	<p>It was requested that the module evaluations move from paper based to online format. Students identified that they hadn't always had an evaluation if the module had been moved or if they hadn't attended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 5.8 – DPW to review
5d	<p>Communications</p> <p>Following feedback from a number of individuals, this was discussed. Students felt that they received a large number of emails from the school office, not all of which were relevant to them. Sometimes these were grouped and sent simultaneously eg 20 emails sent one night.</p> <p>It was agreed that it would be better to consolidate this information into regular newsletters. It was considered helpful to include information on societies as well as content from Student Representatives. Communication on the outcomes of the meetings would also be useful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 5.9 – DPW to establish
5e	<p>Advisers</p> <p>The work to review the role of Advisors was ongoing with Course Representatives asked for their views. A few reps had not been contacted about this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action 5.10 – AJ to Investigate and circulate feedback opportunities.
5f	<p>Industrial experience</p> <p>The practice in EECS of providing a paid internship over the summer was discussed. It was felt that many students would be willing to work for little or no fee in order to gain valuable work experience. It was confirmed that this is being investigated.</p> <p>Corina Deacu was representing the School at the Graduate Opportunities Operations Board. Feedback on issues for this meeting could be forwarded to her.</p>
5g	<p>Peer Review</p> <p>First year and Third year peer review was not felt to be fair with marks not being fairly assigned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response – this was assessed by a number of students and overseen by academic staff for academic rigor.
5h	<p>SSLC Format</p> <p>Course Reps acknowledged the new format was better for raising issues. The minutes were felt to be clearer.</p>
5i	<p>Thanks</p> <p>The Chair thanked the student representatives for their contributions and their time.</p>

6	Date of the next meeting
	The committee noted that the next meeting would take place: Wednesday 25 th March, 2pm in SEMS Seminar room.

Angela Jones
Student Support Officer (SEMS)
2 March 2020