

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

School of GeoSciences

Staff/Student Liaison Committee Meeting

Wednesday, 6th November 2013
Room 304, Crew Building, 12.30pm

AGENDA

- Present:** Dr Andy McLeod (Convener), Dr Barbra Harvie, Prof Richard Ennos, Dr Gail Jackson, Prof Paul Palmer, Prof Mat Williams, Dr Kyle Dexter, Dr Ron Wilson, James Murphy (EMP), Andrew MacLaren (Field Ecology), John Godlee (2nd Year EES), Joe Boyle (1st Year EES), Stephanie Wolff (1st Year EES), Lily Asch (1st Year EES w/ Mgmt), Ewan Cole (PoE)
- In attendance:** Prof Sandy Tudhope (Head of School), Sarah McAllister (Manager of the Teaching Organisation), Meredith Corey (Programme Secretary)
- Apologies:** Emma Latto (Student Support Coordinator), Lisa Kopsieker (2nd Year EES)

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Convener welcomed everyone to the first Student-Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) Meeting of the year and noted the apologies sent.

He invited S Tudhope to say a few words. S Tudhope said that he was attending the SSLC meetings in order to get an insight into issues raised and to look at items from a School level. He wanted to ensure that items were addressed across all levels of the School and to find out whether there were generic items which needed to be addressed across GeoSciences.

2. Minutes of the SSLC Meeting held on 6th March 2013

The Convener asked if the Committee wanted to review the Minutes from the previous meeting. The Committee declined and the Minutes were approved.

3. Earth Modelling and Prediction (EMP)

Course Organiser: Prof Paul Palmer

Class Rep: James Murphy

The Convener invited the class rep to make any comments regarding the course. The class rep reviewed the items raised by the students:

- Some students asked for better Excel training because they have not used it before
- Students felt some lecturers assumed that the students had studied certain Maths topics before, but the students were doing the course because they didn't have a Maths background. The lecturers sometimes went quickly and students had to review the theory on their own
- Students felt under pressure because there was a lot of material covered in little time
- Students wanted more detailed lecture notes to help them to understand the concepts better when they reviewed the notes on their own
- Students said the tutorial material was more complex than the basic material covered in the lectures

- The textbook was a general Maths textbook and did not directly help with the tutorials
- Students requested to have page numbers referenced in the notes, so they could find material in the textbook more easily
- The class rep noted that, on the students' request, a weekly drop-in session had been set up and he hoped that many students would take advantage of this

The Convener invited the Course Organiser to comment on any of the issues raised.

P Palmer reminded the Committee that the purpose of the course was to introduce the Maths that students were expected to be familiar with for the Geology and Ecological and Environmental Sciences (EES) degree programmes and that, therefore, there was a lot of material to cover quickly. He said that the course aimed to get students doing applied problems using the Maths foundations. The textbook was there to support the foundation principles. The role of the lecturer was to teach the overarching concepts and the tutors were there to provide support and application of the material covered in class. P Palmer said that the lecture notes were all uploaded online in advance of the class.

P Palmer noted that he had been quick to respond when asked for additional support by students: the tutorial sessions had been expanded to 2 hours/week and they had added the additional weekly drop-in session after the Monday lectures.

J Godlee, the 2nd Year (EES) rep, had taken EMP in 2012-13. He said that the EES students on the course had found the statistics covered during EMP to be unrelated to work they had done since in other courses for their degree. He felt the material covered in EMP was more suited for Earth Science students. PP said that the course would need input from EES staff, in order to tailor it to those students more. A McLeod explained that many EES students were now being encouraged to take Quantification in the Life Sciences (QIULS), as the material was more targeted for the EES degree.

J Godlee also said that the students had only been told the date of the resit test two weeks in advance and said this was too little time. M Ciorey and S McAllister explained that, as the test was not an official examination and was, therefore, not scheduled by Registry, they needed to wait until Registry published the resit exam timetable in order to find a time to schedule the EMP resit test that would not conflict with any other resits that EMP students had.

There were no further comments about the course.

4. 1st Year Ecological and Environmental Sciences (with Management) Year Reps: Lily Asch (EES w/ Mgmt), Joe Boyle (EES), Stephanie Wolff (EES)

The Convener invited the 1st year reps to make any comments regarding the degrees.

S Wolff said that for QUILS there was a flat deadline for all students to submit lab reports; however, this meant students in the later lab groups had less time after their lab to complete the work. She said that other courses set the submission deadline based on when the lab group met and thought that QUILS could do the same.

In Origin and Diversity of Life (ODL), the evolution lectures were scheduled for the day after the essay on evolution was due. Some students were not sure whether this was intentional, but felt that having the lectures in advance of the submission would have been helpful. E Cole (the Principles of Ecology rep) said that the same issue had been raised the year before and that the course team had said they wanted in future to offer a varied selection of essay topics, rather than just evolution, but apparently the change had not yet been made.

The 1st year reps wondered if students were able to select their own tutorial group for ODL, as some students had been allocated a tutorial which conflicted with other activities. A McLeod said that students were allowed to change their tutorial groups, but there was a cap on the group size and students who needed to change to avoid course timetable conflicts

were given priority over students who needed to change in order to attend extracurricular activities.

[R Wilson arrived at the meeting]

L Asch said that she was the class rep for Industrial Management and that course had not been addressed at all during the Business School SSLC meeting. She was, therefore, not sure about where to raise the issues about the course. R Wilson, as coordinator of the EES with Management degree, said that he would speak with the Business School about the course and find out why the rep had not been allowed to raise the points about the course at the SSLC.

AP 1: RW to speak with Business School about Industrial Management
Secretary's note: RW spoke with Janet Ellis in the Business School. She had been Minute Taker for their SSLC meetings and she said that the Business School held two SSLC meetings - one in October and one in November. L Asch had attended both meetings. Due to the high number of items at the Oct. meeting, there had not been time to discuss a number of courses, including Industrial Management. The course was discussed at the Nov. meeting and L Asch was able to raise her points then.

Regarding QUILS, J Boyle said that some students found it very difficult and others found it easy. Students felt that they were not learning a lot in the tutorials. He noted that there were a lot of timetable clashes with the lab sessions. R Ennos noted that students could often approach to Course Organiser directly to discuss changing a lab session. A McLeod noted that, with so many course combinations possible, it was difficult to tailor timetables to suit all possible requirements. Regarding the difficulty level of QUILS, A McLeod said that one of his tutees had told him that the level of course was very good; he noted that the course team had extended the tutorial groups to accommodate student needs.

There were no further comments about 1st year items.

5. 2nd Year Ecological and Environmental Sciences (with Management)

5.1 Principles of Ecology (PoE)

Course Organiser: Dr Gail Jackson

Class Rep: Ewan Cole

The Convener invited the class rep to make any comments regarding the course.

The class rep reviewed the class feedback by lecturer:

- M Mencuccini - students occasionally found it difficult to hear him; the lectures were mainly graph-based, which M Mencuccini explained well, but the students could find it difficult to review the lecture notes at home on their own; students had found it difficult to find some of the recommended reading; the timing of the lectures fitted well with other 2nd year courses
- P Walsh - there was not much feedback, as the lectures were well received thought-out
- C Ellis - suggested that maybe he split the one lecture on Lotka-Volterra into two lectures, as it was a difficult topic; the hand-outs for the lectures were good, but students asked if they could be available at the start of class, rather than the end; the students had enjoyed the homework task and suggested all lecturers do something similar
- G Jackson - students felt that there was a lot of information contained in the lectures and they were not always clear on what information would be included on the exam; students asked for hand-outs for the lectures and further reading recommendations
- C Nichol - she had only given one lecture so far, so there was no feedback

General feedback about the course:

- Some students said that lab-based projects or field excursions would be better than small group projects
- Some students felt that they could carry out the stats practicals in their own time
- There was overlap in material with ODL and BEE
- Some students wanted a hard copy of the course handbook, as they felt they would read it more thoroughly
- Regarding the projects - students said that there was a lack of guidance and communication from some demonstrators. Some of the equipment for the projects was missing and students had had to buy some material themselves; finding the missing equipment was especially difficult as the demonstrators were not around

G Jackson requested that issues, such as the missing project equipment, be raised with her as soon as they arose.

A McLeod said that each issue would be dealt with individually following the meeting. There were no further comments about the course.

5.2 Field Ecology

Course Organiser: Dr Barbra Harvie

Class Rep: Andrew MacLaren

The class rep said that students had loved the course. The days out were good. The only day that had a mixed response from students was the bird identification day.

He noted that some students had chosen to attend the course so that they had one fewer course to do in 2nd year and suggested that entry be limited to only those it was compulsory for, but BH noted that because Biological Sciences students did not choose their degree programme until the end of second year, it was not possible to limit the course to EES and Biol Sci (Ecology) students.

Some students suggested the course be moved to the end of 2nd year, as they wanted to use material from PoE on their projects, such as the statistics. A MacLaren suggested that one day of the course could be used to cover statistics.

Other comments about the course were that some students asked for more guidelines on the report, such as a word/page count; BH said that there was a page limit provided. Some students felt there was inconsistency with the project marking.

One student had complained about paying for the equipment and others had raised the issue of having to pay for accommodation while the course was running. The class rep asked if it would be possible to run the course as a residential field trip. BH said that the cost to students would increase if the course was run as a residential one, with the accommodation costs increasing and the way the course was currently set up was the least expensive option for students. She said that the money the students paid for equipment was a special allowance made for this course, which they paid instead of contributing to the cost of transport.

E Cole felt that it was not fair that students should have to pay for compulsory field courses. S McAllister noted that the School subsidised half of the cost for all field courses. S Tudhope said that he was aware of the changing context of financing student fees and was looking at ways to cross-subsidise or find other possible sources of funding.

There were no further comments about the course.

5.3 Year-wide issues

Year Rep: John Godlee (EES)

J Godlee said that some of the feedback he had received had been similar to the points raised by A MacLaren and E Cole. Some additional points on the courses above were that students requested to start working on the PoE projects earlier and some groups had said that their data collection did not always work. Some students had asked for more variation between the Field Ecology and PoE projects, but J Godlee noted that he did not agree with this point. Some students had also mentioned to him about taking Field Ecology after PoE, in order to use the stats from PoE, but he noted that students were not expected to know stats for their Field Ecology project.

A McLeod said that all year reps had been asked to get feedback on the Personal Tutor (PT) group meetings and he asked J Godlee what the 2nd year students had said. J Godlee said that, on the whole, students liked the meetings and found them useful. Students valued their PT's advice in choosing courses and some appreciated that their PT talked about academic progress. Many said that they wanted to meet their PT more than once per semester. Some students were not sure what the role of the PT was and they were not always comfortable approaching their PT in case their question was not something they should raise with their PT.

S McAllister told the students that they should have one personal and one group meeting with their PT each semester. She asked what could be done to improve student attendance at the group meetings and J Godlee said that his PT did not hold group meetings and he was not sure he would want to attend one, as he was not sure what the point was. A MacLaren said that he had attended a group meeting and, as a feedback session, it had been very useful.

J Godlee noted that there were a number of course clashes, especially between courses that ran on the central campus and KB and meant that students did not have sufficient time to get from one location to the other. A McLeod said that this issue was one that arose every year because there were so many course options for students. He said that re-scheduling certain courses would, unfortunately, only throw off the timetable for other students.

There being no further comments regarding second year courses and issues, the Convener thanked the student reps for their comments, noting that they were very useful. He noted that this portion of the meeting had run longer than planned and in future it might be use splitting the pre-Honours and Honours courses into two separate meetings.

6. AOCB

There being no further business regarding first or second year EES, the Convener adjourned the meeting for a brief break at 1:25pm.

Present: Dr Andy McLeod (Convener), Dr Barbra Harvie, Dr Gail Jackson, Prof Mat Williams, Dr Kyle Dexter, Dr Ron Wilson, Dr Margaret Graham, Dr Saran Sohi, Gary Chan (NRM), Lilia Dinchiyska (NRM and EEA), Ivan Paspaldzheiv (3rd Year EES), Cameron Brown (3rd Year EES w/ Mgmt), James Watt (Ecol Measurement), Robin Wild (4th Year), Anja Liski (4th Year), Sarah Greenwood (4th Year)

In attendance: Sarah McAllister (Manager of the Teaching Organisation), Meredith Corey (Programme Secretary)

Apologies: Emma Latto (Student Support Coordinator)

7. Welcome and Apologies

The Convener welcomed the student reps to the first SSLC Meeting of the year and noted the apology from E Latto. All student representatives were present for this portion of the meeting. He apologised for the late start to the second portion of the meeting.

8. Minutes of the SSLC Meeting held on 6th March 2013

The Convener noted a copy of the Minutes from the last meeting had been circulated for all to review. He asked that if there were any items to raise from the Minutes, that these addressed under AOCB. The Committee agreed to do so.

9. 3rd Year Ecological Science

9.1 Ecological Measurement (EM)

Course Organiser: Prof Mat Williams

Class Rep: James Watt

The Convener invited the class rep to make any comments regarding the course.

J Watt had circulated a questionnaire to the class and 74% of the students had responded.

General comments about the course were:

- Students strongly agreed that the course was relevant
- They had enjoyed the field course
- Students asked for more time on the field course to exchange their data and write up; it was suggested this could be done by having slightly shorter lectures
- The success criteria M Williams had developed were greatly appreciated
- The lectures complemented the field course
- Overall it was a very successful course

Regarding the Rannoch assessment - students appreciated the peer assessment feedback, but also wanted feedback from M Williams or a demonstrator, in case the peer they were paired with had not fully understood the exercise. It was also suggested that the Rannoch assessment should count as part of the coursework mark, rather than the report counting for the full mark. M Williams thanked J Watt. He said that the peer assessment was new this year and he really appreciated the feedback on it and that it may need changing for next year. M Williams suggested it could be adapted as a group feedback activity, rather than pair.

There were no further comments about the course. [M Williams left the meeting.]

9.2 Ecological and Environmental Analysis

Course Organiser: Dr Saran Sohi

Class Rep: Lilia Dinchiyska

L Dinchiyska reported that the overall feedback for the course was positive; it was enjoyable and well-organised. The comments about the course were:

- Students liked being given a hand-out of the lecture notes and they were okay with the exam being held in May.
- Some students felt the feedback on the first assessment was vague; one student had asked for one-on-one feedback with the marker.
- There was a suggestion to move to course to pre-Honours.
- The lectures were well-organised and helpful, but sometimes dry. The students wanted more applications for EES. Overall the teaching was good, but some lecturers were not clear on the objectives for each class.
- Richard Nair had been good at covering MM's material
- The students liked having the practicals right after the lecture, although sometimes there was confusion about what work was supposed to be done in the practical. There was also overlap between some of the practical sessions. Students suggested adding objectives/outcomes to the practicals. Some students had said raised concerns about the tutors and how much help they could provide in the tutorials, but other students had found them very helpful.
- Students felt the Carbon Stocks assessment was useful

S Sohi thanked L Dinchiyska and said that members of the Teaching Committee were looking at where the course fit best in the degree and that this issue was under active consideration. He agreed that lectures and practicals needed to have clear objectives and learning outcomes.

I Paspaldzhiev said that it was an abstract subject and was concerned that if the course was moved to pre-Honours that students may not put in as much effort because the marks would not count towards the degree classification.

C Brown said that statistics were introduced in PoE and it would be useful to have a link between the background in PoE and third year courses and moving EEA might provide the link.

There were no further comments about the course.

9.3 Natural Resource Management

Course Organiser: Dr Ron Wilson

Class Reps: Gary Chan, Lilia Dinchiyska

G Chan said that the course feedback was positive. He summarised the main points:

- Students felt the course was relevant and the information and content was relevant and interesting.
- The teaching packages were useful, but sometimes students wanted more information on the background of the practicals, especially CBA.
- The trip to the waste management site had been one of the highlights of the course.
- Students felt there was a lot of information in the lectures and suggested that clearer objectives might help.

L Dinchiyska added that:

- Students wanted more background information on the issues discussed in class
- Some students said that the course name was misleading, as they had expected more lectures on 'natural resources' and more case studies. The course was more business-related than they had expected

R Wilson said that he would follow up more directly with the class reps on the specific items raised.

C Brown said that students were not sure how to relate all of the information they were receiving in class to the key concepts.

G Chan said that students wanted more guidance on the structure of assessments and C Brown noted that issue had been raised in almost every 3rd year course. R Wilson said that he had given students a 2-page hand-out on the assessments and covered them at length in class. He was concerned that students wanted to be told what to do and encouraged them to be brave.

There were no further comments about the course.

9.4 Year-wide issues

Year Reps: Cameron Brown (EES w/ Mgmt), Ivan Paspaldzhiev (EES)

The year reps had circulated a survey to the students and 21 of the 28 had returned the survey. The year reps summarised the results:

- Most agreed/strongly agreed that the compulsory subjects were relevant
- Some said they were not interested in certain courses, which C Brown noted was probably due to where student interests lay
- Most neither agreed nor disagreed with the choice of subjects available
- The Honours Handbook was useful
- The feedback on assessments was good
- In general, the students in the year were finding the workload high, but they knew that this was Junior Honours.
- Regarding PT group meetings - 12 out of the 21 respondents had not had a group meeting yet. All of those who had had a meeting said that it was useful and they have received good advice.
- Extra-curricular items - students wanted more careers advice and felt that when the advice was given, it was too late in the term. He noted that there was ecology-related careers advice, but nothing environmental. Students also asked for more workshops, i.e. scientific writing.
- Regarding the degree structure - there were 3 compulsory Sem 1 courses for EES students and 4 for EES with Management. These courses had 9 coursework submissions in Semester 1. He noted the imbalance with the very few submissions in Semester 2, especially for students attending the Environmental Geoscience fieldtrip.
- Computer practicals - students felt there was not much support in practicals across every subject. Students wanted other stats packages, like R. It was useful to have the programming component. With Maths it would be better to learn what they were doing and how the components worked rather than a mechanistic approach. Many students felt that statistics was a difficult subject and the reps noted that introducing more packages might make it seem even more so for certain students; however, they noted that students needed to familiarise themselves with the packages before they covered it in class.

[S McAllister, SSohi, L Dinchiyska left the meeting]

A McLeod told the reps that the Teaching Committee was looking at moving around the 3rd year courses or dropping Population and Community Ecology as a compulsory, but noted that there was no way to implement such changes immediately. He reminded the students that EEA was examined in May and this would lighten their December exam schedule. C Brown noted that both the workload and the amount of reading were much higher in 3rd year. A McLeod said that one option being looked into was moving EEA to 2nd year.

C Brown noted that in his year there were only three EES with Management students left (one was abroad at the moment). Two students who had started on the with Management degree had dropped it because they thought it would be environmental management, not business management. He suggested that more environmental management/consultancy subjects be offered. He also noted that there was a gap in second year when there were no compulsory courses specifically for the with Management students, so they had to take Business School courses. R Wilson, as co-ordinator of the EES with Management programme, said he was not sure why students had a different impression of what was covered on the programme. It had been a College-wide initiative and had been set up to give students access to the Business School that they would not have had otherwise. R Wild suggested a community-based resource management programme or course.

I Paspaldzhiev also noted that some students were requesting specific forestry courses. R Wild, a 4th Year rep, agreed and said that the one Ecol Sci (Forestry) student in 4th year had raised the same issue.

In summary, C Brown said that access to careers information was key for students in 3rd year and requested more talks for consultancy firms and that careers development talks be given to EES directly, not all students across the College. It was also noted that it was important for students to have talks on funding options and internships. I Paspaldzhiev noted that students were keen for more environmental options.

10. 4th Year Ecological Science

**Field Courses / Professional Skills / Land-Atmosphere Interactions /
Land Use and Water Resources / Land Use Policy / Conservation Management
Year Reps: Sarah Greenwood, Anja Liski, Robin Wild**

The year reps reviewed the feedback from students:

- Students were happy with the amount of contact time and individual study time
- There had been a complaint about a deadline clash between Conservation Management (26th November) and the 4th Year Field Course (29th November). R Wild noted that students had very few hand-ins in October and suggested that the Field Course hand-in could be moved to then; however, he also noted that students had a lot of time to carry out the work for both courses and so it was probably more of a time management issue on the students' part. Students felt that at the start of semester it would be good to have the chance to review all hand-in dates and asked that the lecturers communicate more about submission deadlines.
- Students were disappointed that they had not been able to enrol on Animal Biology courses due to limited capacity. M Corey noted that this was a problem every year because Biol Sci restricted the number of students on the courses and first choice when to their own students. This year there had been particularly high demand from Ecol Sci students to take the courses, but unfortunately only some had been able to get a place.
- There had been a problem with students enrolling on a Business School course, A Global Problem? Climate Change and a Low Carbon World. The CO had been happy to allow students on the course, but in the end only one Ecol Sci with Management student

was allowed to take the course and all the others were asked to un-enrol. The students had not been given any explanation.

- Students felt some Professional Skills classes may have been more relevant in 3rd year, especially if the students were doing a summer dissertation. A McLeod noted that some information covered in Innovative Learning Week, such as interview practice, might be moved to Professional Skills
- The students felt there was a disconnect with how Innovative Learning Week was branded - was it supposed to be fun or an integral part of the degree?
- Students said that some lecturers and PTs did not answer emails. A McLeod noted that there was a way to request a meeting with PTs via EUCLID and it would automatically be flagged up if the PT did not respond to the student's request. I Paspaldzhiev said that students found it easier to use email, rather than EUCLID, and that many students did not know about the EUCLID function. A McLeod encouraged the students to use EUCLID, especially the 'confidential' option.
- There was positive feedback from students about the 3-hour class sessions for 4th year courses.
- Year reps noted that there was a lot of positive feedback or no feedback from students. Generally the comments were positive.

R Wild requested to see the Minutes from the SSLC held a year ago (covering the same courses), rather than the Minutes from the SSLC held in the other semester. A McLeod said this would be noted this for future meetings.

The year reps asked about the weighting of 3rd and 4th years for Honours classification. A McLeod said that this item had been discussed by staff, but it was a School-wide policy, not one of just the degree programme, and staff had varying opinions on how Honours years should be weighted.

The reps reviewed the feedback for specific courses:

- Field Courses
 - Ecol Sci Field Course: generally positive feedback; the new marine day was well-liked; some suggestions to move the final hand-in date to earlier in the semester
 - Env Sci Field Course: students said M Graham had done a great job with the course; there was a lot in it and it was all very useful. M Graham had organised extra tutorials, which were very much appreciated.
 - A McLeod told the students that, with students on the new degree streams entering 4th year in 2014-15, the two field courses would be merged. The 3rd year reps asked whether students would be able to specialise and A McLeod said that there was a working group currently looking into how to set that up. The 3rd year reps expressed concern that with a merger there might be dilution of the separate ecological and environmental aspects, but A Liski said that with so much emphasis on the project, which students could choose themselves, students would still be able to do a lot of work in their area of interest.
- Professional Skills in Ecological and Environmental Sciences
 - Good feedback on the course content
 - Students asked for better structure on the course Learn page, with dates on the lecture slides.
 - Some introductory classes had been the same as EEA and some material had been covered in 2nd year. A McLeod said that there was a working group of teaching staff to look at the statistics teaching across the degree.

- Students said that K Dexter's teaching was well-structured and there had been positive feedback about the R tutorials.
- The social studies session would have been good to have in 3rd year, perhaps as part of EEA.
- The year reps suggested that it would be useful to allow 3rd year students to view some of the lecture slides from the course.
- A McLeod said that sometimes the repeat of material was necessary and items were specifically repeated to ensure that students learned the material.
- Conservation Management
 - Students found the content interesting, but some felt it was Scotland-focused.
 - Student thought the discussion-based classes in Conservation Management and Land Use Policy were very good.
 - R Wild suggested more overlap between Conservation Management, Land Use Policy, and Natural Resource Management in order to cover community-based management.
- Land Use and Water Resources - there was no student feedback
- Land-Atmosphere Interactions
 - Only a little feedback from students, but it was positive
 - It was noted that some attendees for the seminar that ran immediately after the end of the lecture sometimes came into the room early and disrupted the class. M Corey said she would put a sign on the door in future telling seminar attendees that a class was in session.
 - A McLeod asked how much of an impact there would be on students if the course did not run. S Greenwood said that there were 18 students in the class and that not having the course would really impact on the Environmental Science students.
- Land Use Policy
 - Students thought the course was very good.
 - They said some lectures were hard to digest because there was a lot of information.
 - R Wild noted that the room the class was held in in the Crew Annexe could make the students sleepy, as it was so dark.

Regarding PT group meetings, the reps said that

- Some students did not know what the meetings were/that they happened
- There had been requests for dissertation support meetings and meetings to discuss 'what's next'
- Some students asked that the meetings be held in small groups, rather than whole year groups
- It was suggested holding a big meeting at the start of the year when students could ask any questions they had
- Students thought that PTs could suggest to 4th years that they provide support to the 3rd year students
- K Dexter suggested that group meetings were a way to encourage more inter-year interaction. He asked the reps to tell their classmates to students that they should attend the group meetings and provide feedback on them

There were no further items regarding 4th year courses.

A McLeod thanked all of the student reps.

11. AOCB

C Brown raised a concern students had with word/page limits on assignments. There had been different opinions amongst students about how strict the limits were and whether tables and figures counted. Some students handed in very different length reports for the same assessment. It was agreed that word limits were preferably to page limits. A McLeod said that the staff members just needed to be clear in their instructions to students.

A McLeod noted that, due to the length of the meeting, especially the pre-Honours portion, it may be necessary to divide the meeting into two. He suggests holding two 1.5 hour meetings - one for pre-Honours items and the other for Honours items. The student reps agreed and said that this was a good time in the semester to hold the meeting(s).

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 3.00pm.