

<b>Meeting:</b>	Science Faculty Forum
<b>Location:</b>	1W 2.101
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	27/11/2023 14:15 – 15:05

<b>Present:</b>	
Miranda Yafi	Undergraduate Science Faculty Rep (Co-Chair)
Ffion Gould	Undergraduate Science Faculty Rep (Co-Chair)
Meron Habtu	Biochemistry Year 2 Rep
Joseph Jenkins	BSc Computer Science & Maths Year 1 Rep
Akim Komarnitskii	BSc Computer Science Year 1 Rep
Olivia Weiner	Mathematics Year 1 Rep
Robbie Altham	Mathematics Year 3,4 & 5 Rep
Myla Hardman	MChem/BSc Chemistry Year 2 Rep
Theo Moore-Calters	MComp Computer Science Final Year Rep
Kacpet Kruzyna	MPharmacol Year 2 Rep
Sophie Haydock	MPharmacol Year 2 Rep
Sarah Gorst	MSci/BSc Chemistry with Management Year 2 Rep
Neelesh Anpalahan	Natural Science- Physics Major Rep
Emily James	Physics Year 1 Rep
Joshua Basley	Physics w Theory Year 1 Rep
<b>In attendance:</b>	
Amber Snary	SU Education Officer
Georgina Newham	Student Voice Coordinator (Academic Representation)

<b>Item</b>	
1.	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <p>The co-chairs MY and FfG introduced themselves and explained their role as a Faculty Rep.</p>
2.	<p><b>Updates from Faculty Reps</b></p> <p>The Faculty Reps have been settling into their role and attending meetings such as Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee (FLTQCs) and Board of Studies (BoS).</p>
3.	<p><b>Updates from Academic Reps</b></p> <p>To structure this, the Chairs separated the discussion into topics. MY and FfG suggested Reps sit with students from their department also.</p>

### 3.1. Reading Week

OW and RA stated that in Maths, 11 weeks without a break to consolidate is difficult. They currently have an estimated 20 hours of contact time a week with students also having to do problem sheets. This means students often have to work on weekends to ensure work is completed.

The Computer Science Reps share that the reading week in the department is good because there is no new content and opportunities to go to tutorials if needed.

EJ and JB said that Physics does have a consolidation week and while there are still labs, no new content is delivered.

MY and FfG asked what attendees would like to see out of a reading week:

- No labs or new content.
- Tutorials if needed.
- Time to consolidate or catch up.

### 3.2. Lecture Recordings

Attendees discussed the delay in receiving the recordings after the lecture. One attendee mentioned that a friend of theirs in Exeter received their recordings within 2 hours of the lecture. There was understanding that editing for privacy reasons as well as the captions exporting takes time, however, the delay is still irritating. Many students agreed they would rather have the recordings earlier without captions and for them to be uploaded later.

A Rep brought a separate point about the use of a laser pointer which student could not see on the recording. The Rep suggested the user of digital alternatives to this being standardised.

### 3.3. Study Spaces

MY and FfG ask Reps if they would like a leaflet or PDF with all the study spaces available on campus during the assessment periods. SG said that students would still have to visit these spaces to see where is free, so it would not be that useful.

TMC shares that you can look at which lecture theatres are empty using the online system. MY and FfG do clarify, however, this would take time for each student to do.

### 3.4. Feedback

MY and FfG ask if the Reps have had assessments yet this Semester. There are issues with not receiving feedback for an assessment before submitting the next one, especially when they are linked or the same style. This is a frustrating issue for students, with formative assessments not being marked before summative assessments. Even

when students receive their feedback, the quality is lacking specifics of where to improve.

The Chairs ask whether students would like the ability to edit assessments after the deadline if they got feedback late. There was a neutral response to these.

While students understand that it can take time to mark a large volume of assessments, they would like generalised feedback of common mistakes made if the deadlines are grouped so they can improve.

A Computer Science Rep mentions a module, "Systems Architecture," where the marking is good. The feedback includes marks for each criterion and why marks were deducted.

Finally, a Physics Rep spoke to the lacking syllabus in the programme in terms of learning outcomes and details. This Rep expressed desire for a more standardised lecture-by-lecture learning outcomes to be placed on Moodle or the course catalogue page.

### 3.5. Exams & Revision

The Faculty Reps asked about the availability of past papers in different programmes and departments. Some were not aware of how to access them.

There was discussion of how early past papers should be introduced and whether it should be integrated with learning. OW stated that staff should introduce past papers earlier (week 2 or 3) to allow students to get used to the format and structure. Whereas other Reps pushed against this, saying some students would prefer to wait until closer to the exam for revision.

In terms of revision and consolidation support, students with Peer Assisted Learning leaders were grateful for how helpful they were for this period. The chairs asked whether the introduction of further PAL programmes would be beneficial to which the attendees agreed.

## 4. **Any Other Business**

### 4.1. Peer Mentors

Most Reps had negative feedback on the Peer Mentor system. The attending first years spoke about how they had not had contact with their mentor since the first meeting and felt that their mentor had forgotten them. A Rep stated that regular updates would be nice.

5.

**Date and Time of Next Meeting**

To be confirmed.