

## IEP Staff Student Consultative Committee (SSCC)

Meeting held on 02 December 2020 at 14:00, online via Teams

### Minutes

Present:

Staff (3):

1. Emanuela Tilley, Director of IEP and Chair (ET, IEP)
2. Riyad Joomun, IEP Teaching & Learning Administrator and Secretary (RJ, IEP)
3. Mourgaud Garance, Communications and Student Engagement Manager (GM, UCL ENG)

Students:

Year 1 (15):

1. Tamas Laufer (LT, BE)
2. Clarissa Sandejas (CS, CS)
3. Samuel McDougall (SM, ME)
4. Gaelic Jara-Reinhold (GJ, EEE)
5. Sujai Nandedkar (SN, ME)
6. Minyi Lei (ML, CS)
7. Mutammim Chowdhury (MC, ME)
8. Bob Dong (BD, MSci)
9. Lianyi Chen (LC, CE)
10. Memoona Fatima (MF, BME)
11. Nabihah Khanom (NK, CE)
12. Yuki Tanaka (YT, BME)
13. Carmen Babecki (CB, CEGE)
14. Argjend Elezaj (AE, CEGE)
15. Joan Koerner (JK, EEE)

Year 2 (6):

1. Yolanne Lee, (YL, EEE)
2. Ali Reyazat, Computer Science (AR, CS)
3. Bingchen Wang (BW, EEE)
4. Agnes Aparte (AA, BE)
5. Tao Zeng (TZ, CE)
6. Mohammad Ali (MA, CE)

Year 3 (5)

1. Tasha Tahir (TT, ME)
2. Rajesh Goyal (GR, CS)
3. Yousef Mahmoud (YM, EEE)
4. Safir Kaya (SK, BE)
5. Oskar Beneton (OB, CE)

## 1. Welcome and intro

1.1. The Chair welcomed all of the attendees and set out the Agenda for the meeting.

## 2. Constitution and 2020-21 Terms of Reference

2.1. The documents were circulated prior to the meeting. The Chair explained who sees the SSCC minutes and how they impact decision making. The constitution and terms of reference were agreed by the group.

## 3. Minutes from previous meeting (11 March 2020)

3.1. The previous set of minutes were confirmed as a true record.

3.2. The previous minutes were circulated prior to the meeting. Chair went through the actions and points of discussion in the minutes to give an update to issues raised at the last meeting. There were no comments or issues raised from the student representatives. The Chair provided an update on the issues raised, and the following was noted in response to these:

- For ENGF0001 Challenge 1, The Chair reported back to the Module Lead and Department Leads to give more guidance to CEGE for the Challenge 1 Report and CE as the categories were too broad. Due to change because of online learning these are no longer relevant, but the department leads appreciated the suggestion, nevertheless.
- For ENGF0001 Challenge 2, Module Lead asked departmental teaching teams to inform students that Challenge 2 is less structured than Challenge 1 as CEGE and BE students felt it was too loosely structured despite this being part of the learning process. The Chair said we may receive similar comments from Year 1 students this year. The Module Lead also reported back to CEGE/ME Challenge 2 deadlines were too structured and demanding due to weekly deadline.
- For ENGF0002, Module Lead was to review information given on Moodle with departments to give context for lecture topics and link to assessments/activities as requested by a CE student. As the course has changed considerably due to online learning, the Moodle pages have been updated.
- Also, a request for preparation materials for ENGF0003 in the summer before students join was not possible due to Covid-19. The Chair asked Module Lead to provide more problem sheets for students who want to progress further and faster. The coursework also for ENGF003 and ENGF004 was revamped to improve the quality of the questions so to better reflect the exam questions asked.
- How to Change the World (HtCtW) was cancelled due to Covid-19 also.
- Intelligent Systems IEP Minor prerequisites and all known pre-requisites for the full list of IEP Minors will be made clearer and students will receive an initial email by the end of term asking them to start thinking about their preferred IEP Minor choice

and more details email in January about how they can find out more information to help them make their final decision.

#### **4. External Examiners Report – Summer 2020**

- 4.1. The report was circulated prior to the meeting as it was still in ‘provisional status’, but the Chair went through the report with the attendees and explained the general role of the External Examiner within the IEP structure.

The report by the External Examiner was favorable and rather different than previous years as it touched on the plans for the following year as a result of the experiences of the COVID crisis at the end of 2019-20. It was highlighted that the emergency exams due to COVID were deemed not effective in testing the students’ understanding and knowledge of the module content. The 24 hour exam will not be used in 2020-21. ENGF0003 and ENGF0004 final assessment as an alternative to the final exam will comprise of a project and an online test which the External Examiner found interesting as this adds variety. The plans put in place due to Covid-19 were highlighted in ENGF0001, the reduced size of the first Challenge and more time that was deemed as needed on team project that would be Challenge 2. An asynchronous Reflection Portfolio for ENGF0002 would help to replace face-to-face teaching and would be completed by students at their own pace in their own time. Work is also required to bring Scenarios Leads together to help deliver Scenarios online and more consistency for students was required for online learning to improve the experience during Covid-19.

#### **5. REPs: Student Matters**

##### **5.1. Matters raised by the Year 3 REPs**

###### IEP Minors

- RG (CS, Year 3) reported for Intelligent Systems COMP0036 that students found the module difficult due to the leap from Year 2 to 3. The coursework was unreasonably difficult and time consuming. This was also echoed by (EEE). The additional material from lectures was unhelpful and they were unable to ask Module Lead questions (as the lead did not engage with any forum discussions with students) and no extension given on an assignment that they students deemed to be too short a time to complete before the deadline given. Comments were made on Uniu: <https://ucl.uniu.co.uk/feedback/ucl-19868>. BENG0095 students also found it hard to complete the coursework and an extension was given, however 2 days after the deadline.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead so to improve the inconsistencies for next year.

- RG enjoyed the Crime and Security IEP Minor but would have enjoyed it more if there were more bi-weekly scenarios. The Chair said this may have not been possible because of Covid-19. RG added IEP Minors are more difficult in Year 3, less students are enjoying it.

The Chair stated the jump from 2nd to 3rd year makes it harder as all year 3 modules are advance level modules.

- RG said the BENG0095: Data Mining Minor module was too theoretical and coursework too hard for the time given. Also, the Module Lead does not check the Q&A forum. The Chair said it is up to Academic leads of a module to decide how they would like to be contacted by students taking their module, however the best practice is to use the Moodle forums. In this case the academic lead had instructed students to contact via email.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead and inform them of the students' discontent, in the hope of improving student experience for new cohort in the following year.

- RG said for the Year 3 Ocean Engineering Module students were struggling to identify which content is for MSc students only.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead to reinforce different learning level for Year 3 and MSc students.

- YM (EEE, Year 3), There were no cases to raise but agreed with RG that the IEP Minors are a lot harder in year 3 as the modules are also given to MSc students as well. Student mentioned that the IEP Minor were 100% exam or coursework which adds to the stress. The Chair commented that some students do choose their IEP Minor based on assessment and it is important that the students understand that MSc students in their shared classes are assessed at a different level.

- TT (ME, Year 3), highlighted workload issues within the department following a survey sent out and stated 68% students had clashes with IEP Minors and core module deadlines. TT encouraged fellow students to reach out to Module Leads. The Chair said for Year 1 we have heatmaps we give to departments to set deadlines on ENGF modules. The Chair added we could do an IEP Minors heatmap or ask them the Module Leads to have more flexibility with setting deadlines.

**ACTION:** Chair to set out process for IEP Teaching Committee to agree to supporting the curation of an IEP Minor module heatmap at the start of the academic year.

- SK (BME, Year 3) collected some feedback mainly on a module from Mechanical Engineering about Bio Fluids; the students were not happy with the structure as it was quiz based and the course was time consuming and demanding. Following emails to Module Lead, small changes were implemented. SK said students were happy they can watch lectures at own time and pace. Lecture recordings more valuable than Lecturecast and more modules could be delivered online in the future.

### How to Change the World (HtCtW)

- RG (CS, Year 3) also mentioned students studying Engineering and Public Policy are enjoying their IEP Minor. HtCtW weighting issue were queried, the Chair confirmed the weighting goes into dissertation project – but HtCtW was cancelled for 2019-20 academic year. The Chair stated the learning outcomes of HtCtW should be considered in the dissertation when HtCtW was cancelled. RG highlighted that students were not given weighting information by the Module Lead.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to HtCtW so that more clarity on where the marks are applied can be provided to students

### **5.2. Matters raised by the Year 2 REPs**

- AA (BE, Year 2) said there has been no major negative issues only long pre-recorded material to go through before the lectures, but no specific classes were mentioned. The students like the forum where questions are answered quickly. The Chair was interested in how the Scenarios went and to receive feedback, but there were no comments as of yet.
- YL( EEE, Year 2) said the general feedback for ENGF004 was positive. The videos were helpful as they can be re-watched and length of the videos were good. It was easy to understand because of the visuals; students could not see the whiteboard last year. The course was easy to follow and the structure was good. For ENGF0002 it was structured well. The Chair highlighted the changes for ENGF0004 due to online learning were to deliver the topics in smaller weekly chunks and this may be better than lectures. The Chair stated we may not go back to lectures and keep a video format with workshops in person only. YL said the weekly format meant students were keeping up with the course better. YL said breakrooms worked better when lead was present, otherwise they would remain quiet.

### **5.3. Matters raised by the Year 1 REPs**

#### ENGF0001

- TL (BE, Year 1) said ENGF001 Challenge 1 was good, but testing in Minecraft for Challenge 2 had many issues, with Mac users unable to use it for a week. The Chair said every department is in similar situations as we are doing simulations with software we do not normally use. The Chair also highlighted if things do not work, that students need to ensure they can still demonstrate they are warranted marks for their learning. NK (CE, Year 1) also added that Mac users also had issue with Minecraft and videos. Also, that it was not working for Windows users at the start too. NK said in the future that software should be available to all students before the release and have a beta testing before. NK said for the Minecraft project that included mixing and heating, and probe were not separate. Probe was not working, students had invalid results and students could not combine results with mixing and heating. YT (BME, Year 1), also added for probe there are no valid results. Students have raised the issue with lecturers and were told they should explain the theory in place.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back on Minecraft testing issues and guidance for students to gain marks when things are not working to module lead who will discuss with departmental leads.

- NK (CE, Year 1) said for ENGF0001 Individual section the grades consist of 60% peer grade and 40% feedback from teachers. Students don't know where teachers' marks come from and a breakdown of grades would be helpful.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead who will discuss with departmental leads.

- AE (CEGE, Year 1) ENGF0001 Challenge 2 work was a bit of a rush such as Numerical Modelling, starting on Monday and submission on Friday. For Challenges 1 video, students would like written feedback on their work.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead who will discuss with departmental leads.

- GJ (EEE, Year 1) asked for ENGF0001 if students in London could meet each other in the Engineering Department.

**ACTION:** The Chair will enquire, but not likely.

- MF (BME, Year 1) highlighted a lack of feedback from the module leads on their ENGF0001 Engineering Challenges plan to know if they were working on the correct lines.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead who will discuss with departmental leads.

- YT (BME, Year 1), mentioned communication and structure of ENGF0001 is difficult as there too many access points. Students have to cycle through different Moodle pages and information gets missed or deadlines are found accidentally. He added a clearer Moodle page of important information and deadlines, and a clearer course structure would be helpful. YT mentioned online it was difficult to gage facial expression of lecturers for feedback of their work and the feedback was usually a Yes or No answer. The Chair added this was something you loose with teaching online.

- SM (ME, Year 1) said for ENGF0001 the structure was good, particularly in timings and submissions as it easy to loose motivation online. Also, the ability to apply different skills from other technical modules. He highlighted online the difficulty for teamwork, it was easy for people to hide in the background and not contribute. ML (CS, Year 1) believed that non-engaging policy would not work due to the peer review and students can give each other low scores. ML stated it was like game theory and the Chair didn't agree stating it reflected real life and in the workplace. ML and CS (CS, Year 1) said there are only usually 2 active people in most groups that do most of the work and more stress placed on them. The Chair said it was important that students reported non-engaging students and in the peer assessment correctly also, so the necessary action could be taken. The Chair added it was important the students highlight who did what in the reports and to inform Academic Leads

of non-engaging students as all marks are moderated and engagement will impact a student's mark.

- CS (CS, Year 1) said it was easy online for students not to engage and in the teamworking students have not heard their voices of some team mates a few months in. The Chair said for students that were not engaging students were moved to different teams, or they may have to do individual work or fail and complete a resit via the LSA period. The Chair added there is 3 strikes rule for non-engaging students and they get zero as final result. Adding for Engineering Challenges 40-50% students said in the early feedback survey said the communications was not good. CS added the extra session by Steve Hailes and Ryan Grammenos helped.

### ENGF0002

- TL (BE, Year 1) said for ENGF0002 students were lost in the first weeks with Technical Communications. The Technical Communications deadline are not in the same place as the other deadlines on Moodle. TL would also like to have more live sessions and more communication is required for the Technical Communications. NK (CE, Year 1) agreed that Technical Communications for ENGF0002 was confusing, a consistent feeling for students and they don't know what they are doing. Videos are too lengthy and students are skipping parts of the video. NK also added clarity of assessments for ENGF0002 and what week they were referring to was required.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead who will discuss with departmental leads.

- SM (ME, Year 1) said for ENGF0002 most of the complaints have been about Professional Skills because of inconsistent deadline and not enough clarity when giving out assignments. Complaints included a debate of a live session was set at 1am, a PowerPoint assignment was given to students to submit after 40 mins after the deadline and the organisation of tutor was not very good. SM added the tutorials were not interactive, students were only given 30mins to discuss vague open-ended questions. SM said the Design aspect was amazing, tutorials session was engaging and students liked the 'Guest of the week' for the main lectures.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead who will discuss with departmental leads.

- MF (BME, Year 1) also said there is a lack of feedback in Engineering Challenges from the Module Leads and with ENGF0002 feedback was from their peers only.
- **ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead who will discuss with departmental leads.

### ENGF0003

- TL (BE, Year 1) said ENGF0003 coursework was hard but expects this. The upload of the coursework 2 is delayed which makes hard for students to manage their time. He also added that ENGF0003 was the most logical site and easy to use which numerous Students Reps agreed. NK (CE, Year 1) also agreed, but more modelling questions was required.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead.

- MF(BME, Year 1) said for ENGF0003 the coursework much harder than sessions, but more guidance required. The Chair added that last year the coursework was easier and the students found the exam harder.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead.

- AE (CEGE, Year 1) said ENGF0003 was fast paced, CB (CEGE, Year 1) agreed with AE comments. The Chair added it was possible to give summer pre-materials to students as some students do not have A-level Maths.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead.

- SM (ME, Year 1) said for ENGF003 students would like an e-book for MATLAB and some advice to find resources as they were not sure where to look. He also added students would like session to move to MS Teams as it works well on ENGF0001.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead.

- (GJ, EEE) said the ENGF0003 the Maths Coursework was not fair as it was based on Mechanical Engineering content and the 3 questions could be divided into different areas. GJ said as he had a Physics background, he was able to answer the questions and the Chair added a leading trigger question may aid to understand the content.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Module Lead.

#### Virtual Common Room (VCR)

- SK (BME, Year 3) said following a departmental meeting, Year 1 student representatives raised the issue that they don't feel part of community or understand how Moodle works and unsure what to do in the modules generally due to remote learning. SK reached out to contact Year 2 and 3 students and created messenger/WhatsApp groups and had online hangouts. SK also proposed Zoom Meetings to Chair to discuss course structure, time management and issues. SK also suggested that this can be an extension to the Buddy Program instead being community driven. SK had passed on her research onto the HOD and they are happy for SK to promote the idea. SK also added the Virtual Common Rooms (VCR) is too formal, not used much by students and communications were not private. They preferred to use WhatsApp first before the VCR.
- The VCR discussion was lead GM (UCL ENG) and she said that returning students do not use VCR as they have systems in place such as group chat. GM highlighted this from the MS Teams Chat for Year 1, VCR on MS Teams was too formal as they were managed by departments. It is another app to download on the phone and not suitable for a casual

conversation. SM (ME, Year 1) said students used WhatsApp as it's widely known. Also 'Discord' as you can structure different groups and have voice chats where you can tune in and out (but not all Chinese students can access it). SM said MS Teams is better for the work environment as you create a comment, reply, or create a thread, but is difficult to have a flowing conversation. SM recommended a Moodle page to interact with the student reps and to conduct reliable surveys. CS (CS, Year 1) said Computer Science had already done this and was a great tool for formal communications. NK (CE, Year 1) added that Chemical Engineering have the Ramsay Society which organises games and activities for students which provides a more "friendly and casual" platform for students to interact than the VCRs

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to Simon Banks about departmental Moodle pages for students interact with the student reps

### VPN

- BD (MSci, Year 1) highlighted the communications issues in China and asked if UCL could produce a good VPN that connects all the time. ML(CS, Year 1) agreed with this and added VPN could be blocked at any time, he added the phone VPN is limited to 10m/b bandwidth which is key for it not working well. BD also mentioned the phone VPN does not work as well on the PC/Mac, which prevents interaction with peers as this mostly done on phones. The Chair said students should tell tutors about VPN issues as they need to facilitate learning. The Chair also added a lot of CS and EEE students are from China and the Faculty would have to look into this.

**ACTION:** The Chair is to raise the issue at faculty level.

### Other issues raised:

- (GJ, EEE) said students could not understand accents of some lecturers . The Chair stated that transcripts were available in recorded sessions and suggested the matter was raised by the student as this was an accessibility issue.
- BD(MSci, Year 1) said the Understanding Management Module has been engaging and 300 questions were answered on the Q&A forum. For Understanding Management, the room leader of a breakout room, their accent was not understandable. Also, on the module case study there is a lack of information on public websites. GM(UCL ENG) added live captioning was available in Teams and a move to Team may be better.

**ACTION:** Chair to report back to the department, as this is not part of IEP module list.

## **6. Any other business**

None

## **7. Date of next meeting**

The next IEP SSCC meeting will be held on 10 March 2021.