

Minutes of the meeting (CSE Teaching Committee 15/4) of the **COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING TEACHING COMMITTEE** held at 1:00pm on **Friday, 3 July 2015**, in Room 103 (HoS Meeting Room), Computer Science Building.

---

<b>Present</b>	AProfs R Buckland, M Pagnucco, F Rabhi Drs E Martin, J Shepherd	
<b>Absent with Apologies</b>	Drs A Blair, B Gaeta, H Paik Miss C Nock	
<b>Absent</b>	Prof J Xue Drs H Guo, H Wu Mr O Tan	
	Present / Quorum:	Not Set
	Attendance Rate:	5 / 13

---

## **1 APOLOGIES AND WELCOME**

## **\*2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

## **3 REPORT FROM COMMITTEES OUTSIDE CSE**

Richard reported on the discussions in the Academic Board on issues in the UNSW Green Paper. There was discussion on the benefits/disadvantages of using external material for our courses, or even using entire courses from elsewhere. Richard is strongly of the view that we should continue to run our own 1st/2nd-year courses to build a strong CSE ethos amongst our students. Also discussions on the possible changes to semesters (3 same-size semesters?) and introduction of teaching-only positions.

## **\*4 CSE CORE SYLLABUS REVISION**

More discussion on the process and the outcome of the Working Group. There is still not agreement among Program Directors (and probably others around the School) on what constitutes Core.

Sri thinks current syllabus is quite good. Richard noted some points that had been identified as lacking (e.g. concurrency). Discussion between Sri and Fethi about what is core and how the core concepts could be incorporated into the syllabus. Is it realistic to include all of the material identified as core by the working group into the already packed first two years of the programs? Some say "No", some say "Yes".

HoS wants the outcomes of the working group to be put up to the school for discussion, get it sorted out, and then move on to re-designing the follow-on courses (e.g. 2-3 courses per research group).

Development of new courses for Core Syllabus revision put on hold until the University decides on what it will do about semester lengths.

## **\*5 COMP6733 INTERNET OF THINGS EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN STUDIO**

Since there was nobody from the Networks Group at the meeting to explain the proposal, it was deferred to the next meeting.

## **6 CSE ASSESSMENT REVIEW PROCEDURE**

Current practice: results come out, distributions analysed, LICs of "anomalous" courses contacted

Faculty doesn't follow up on courses which are anomalous in one semester, to see if any identified problems have been rectified. Perhaps CSE should do this itself.

Fethi suggested having an external assessor for exams. Practicalities make this problematic. Eric queried what would be the advantage of doing this.

Richard suggested that he (as first-year director) should more closely examine all first-year courses. Also, that program directors might monitor core courses in their discipline.

Suggestion: Examiners' Committee: Identify courses, have a small committee to more closely investigate these courses (e.g. collect examples of borderline students to see whether PS/FL boundary is reasonable), discuss with LiCs and plan for improvements, if warranted, then follow up in later semesters.

John noted that exam examples are needed for Accreditation. Richard asked whether the examples had been retained. We should do this more systematically.

## **7 CURRICULUM MAPPING**

John Shepherd reported that he was developing a curriculum mapping tool for the Faculty to use in accreditation.

Eventually, all lecturers will be asked to use this tool to ensure that Learning Outcomes and Assessment information for their course is complete and correct.

## **8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

## **9 NEXT MEETING**

The next CSE TC meeting will be held on Friday 31 July.