

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting: | Engineering & Design Faculty Forum |
| Location: | CB 3.1 |
| Date & Time: | 22/02/2024 13:15- 14:05 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Present: |  |
| Caitlin Grainger-Spivey | Faculty Rep (Chair) |
| Nathanail Georgiou | Faculty Rep & Mech Eng Final Year |
| Carys Macintyre | Robotics Engineering Year 1 |
| Alice Player | Mech Eng Year 2 |
| Emily Maskelyne | Mech Eng Year 2 |
| Rayan Amin | Chem Eng Year 2 |
| Amir Tarzi | Chem Eng Year 1 |
| In attendance: |  |
| Amber Snary | Education Officer |
| Grace Cappy | Engineering & Design Education Manager |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item |  |
| 1. | Faculty Rep Updates  CGS is currently working on model solutions with annotated answers, and this will be brought to the next SUmmit  NG reported on feedback issues, which have been raised separately with the Education team  CGS and NG both report on exam issues, which are being brought up at BoS |
| 2. | Model solutions  CGS – Option provided to CGS was that if students wished for more (detailed) feedback then they would have to have fewer contact hours  CM – Civic Engineering had MCQ (multiple choice questions) where an answer was ‘none’ which made students double guess themselves  AP – Wrong numerical solutions provided  RA – Only numerical answers provided, given coursework prep with exam questions  NG – 1/3 of units gave mark schemes, and one past paper given. Exam different to what was communicated  CM – not enough clarity around exams. Elec Eng just had mocks collated fom past papers that the unit was formed from, and had questions from tutorials in exams.  AP - The current policy is for numerical answers only, which are incorrect, and do not reflect similar provision given at A-Level. 200 response survey taken to DLTQC asking for two similar exams to practice on, and tutorial sheet questions to reflect exams as otherwise people ignore them.  The ‘spoon feeding’ argument was rebuffed as students will have access to models in their lines of work, and that students will collaboratively make these resources if not provided to them.  Students also reflected that those associated with Formula One have access to FormulaStudent which provides past papers etc with worked answers, therefore causing inequality across the board. |
| 3. | Feedback  CM – different markers are causing issues, as different styles provide different marks. Students were provided with a lecture on how the marking works  Students also noted issues with 1 page limit for coursework, which has been taken to SSLCs. They are further requesting greater guidance for each question as marks are unreliable for length.  NG – students are provided with a marking matrix, but this is not provided in feedback sheet. |
| 4. | SSLCs  SSLCs were risen as an issue due to the differences across departments re: conduct, actions etc.  RA & AT – SSLCs are generally productive, students are updated, and actions are undertaken with ease e.g., changing teaching rooms.  CM – call for longer SSLCs. Especially in the context of curriculum transformation, students feel there is not enough time to discuss all that needs to be.  AP – No-one can seem to agree, people with just leave, staff don’t seem to want to be there. There are also systematic issues per year e.g., wrong numerical solutions. AP describes “shouting matches” and that meetings are “like a tennis tournament”. It doesn’t feel like staff are there to clarify or help, there are issues with paper notes, and they are shut down.  Suggested solutions include   * RAG coded action log, as currently seen in EEE * Request a meeting with educational manager GC |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Owner | Actions from Meeting |
| AS |  |