Faculty of Computer Science and Technology
Meeting of the Tripos Management Committee

Monday 16 October at 13:30 via Zoom
https://cam-ac-uk.zoom.us/j/81444636483?pwd=Z0ZMTXZQMEpVL1BNN3p6UFdsYWtXQT09

AGENDA

Members

Prof Robert Harle (*Chair; Director, undergraduate teaching*) (RKH) ✓
Prof Paula Buttery (*Advisor)* (PB) ✓
Prof Anuj Dawar (*Advisor*) (AD) ✓
Ms Helen Neal *(Undergraduate Teaching Administration)* (HN) X
Prof Thomas Sauerwald (Deputy HoD) (TMS) ✓
Caroline Stewart (*Departmental Secretary)* (CS) ✓
Becky Straw (*Undergraduate Teaching Administration Manager)* (BS) ✓
Joy Rook (Postgraduate Education Administrator, Deputising for Lise Gough) (JR) ✓
Dr Jamie Vicary (*Chair of Examiners)* (JV) ✓
Dr Damon Wischik (*Deputy Director, Part II undergraduate teaching)* (DJW) ✓
Dr Jeremy Yallop (*Deputy Director, IB undergraduate teaching)* (JDY) X
Dr Carl Henrik (CH) ✓
Dr Rafal Mantiuk (RM) ✓
Professor Frank Stajano (FS) ✓
Dean Dodds (Minutes) (DD) ✓

1   **Apologies for Absence**

         JDY apologised for being unable to attend. Lise Gough was busy with another meeting and sent
         JR. RM apologised he would need to leave early.

2   **Notification of AoB**

         FS wished to make courses subscribeable on moodle by default. Asking every UTO to speak with
         admin about doing this.

         DJW looked at an action for Mobile health which was not on the Agenda. RKH would come back
         to this when discussing exams.

3   **Approval of the minutes of the meeting of 30 June 2023**

         All happy to approve the previous minutes.

4   **Action from the meeting of 30 June 2023**

4.1   **Discussion with EAMC about Unit of Assessment choices for intermitters (item 4.1.1). Status: Dr Damon Wischik is scheduled to meet with EAMC team on 7 July and so will report back after this date shortly. (action: DJW).**

DJW summarised intermitters and completing units of assessments. The guidance was to not allow people resume part completed work. DJW will circulate guidance. **(Action: DJW)**.

4.2   **Discussion about whether 25% penalty for a UoA was too harsh. It was confirmed that no progress had been made on this yet and that it would be rolled over to the next meeting of TMC. Meanwhile, it would be discussed between RKH and HPA in their weekly meetings Status: Action still outstanding. (action: RKH/HPA).**

RKH will discuss with BS. **(Action: RKH/BS).**

4.3   **Increase of four more lectures in Concepts of Programming Languages - RKH to discuss with Neel and circulate for email approval (item 6.1.1). Status: Rob to follow-up accordingly (action RKH).**

TMS believed concepts of programming was supposed to be extended, but had not been. RKH will follow up with Neal. Believed it was eight hours as twelve was too much. Will look at to see if this needs to be bigger and a tripos issue. **(Action: RKH)**.

4.4   **3. Software and Security Engineering. Martin Kleppmann suggested replacement, seen as an excellent suggestion (Frank), and if someone will restructure the course (ie software with a bit of security), then Martin is a good person to do exactly that. Action: RKH to talk to Martin.**

Ross will take software and security this year, next year will be a complete revamp from Martin.

4. Interaction Design. Hatice to submit a proposal on how to move the Interaction Design issues forward, to be discussed at the next TMC. Action: HPA to speak to Hatice.

Difficult to find demonstrators and we were almost unable to run this course. An interim solution was found. RKH asked if this could be used long term. Currently dependent on one person who could no longer do it. FS agreed it had been difficult to find supervisors. RKH agreed that supervisors were hard to find.

Some discussion about not running this course, but currently it has a one year reprieve.

7. Concurrent and Distributed Systems. The option would be for Martin Kleppmann to take over second part of course, or for Tim Harris to continue from last year. Action: RKH to speak to Martin.

10. Machine Learning and Bayesian Inference. If we run this course as online (video) only then will Sean be in a position to write and submit (late) exam questions? Action: RKH to speak to Sean.

Taught via video. Will be available next term but online only.

4.5   **Issues with DNN were discussed, in terms of the late changes with the course in 22-23, thus resulting in students working on the assignment over the late vacation. There should be some official discussion with the course leaders regarding the issues that arose. Action: RKH.**

RKH explained that there was a problem with the assignment, a part was impossible. Extensions were given without following guidelines. Students intend to complain and expect an investigation into this. Will discuss it next time.

4.6	**Part 1B progression and Part II 'unclassed' boundaries in the 'Marking Scheme and Classing Convention' document.**

Part 1B progression and Part II 'unclassed' boundaries in the 'Marking Scheme and Classing Convention' document.
Question regarding whether a student was either unclassed or failed, so do they get a degree regardless?
Previous to now, it has always been examiner's discretion. Action: Jamie/Rafal to devise a proposal to approve for early Mich 2023-24.

Already discussed.

4.7   **1A and 1B exam Moodle submissions (FMS)**
The Moodle exam submissions for students who took in-person exams under special circumstances were a mess this year. Often the submission was one bundle per paper, in some cases without page breaks. Helen confirmed that all our issues with missing marks or scripts thiS year are directed related to these submissions, without exception. The plan is to contact the exams office with details of the issues. Frank offered to add a paragraph of support. Action: HPA.

Already discussed.

4.8   **Assessment criteria for dissertations**
This item was not on the agenda but the 23-24 Chair of Examiners raised for discussion. The examiners would like to revise the assessment criteria for dissertations. It was suggested that the examiners draft a proposal for review at the next meeting. Action: Jamie to bring to first TMC of 23-24.

RKH asked if this proposal had been drafted. JV had revised this and circulated. Walked everyone through the old version and examples of unclear wording in it. Some markers did not refer to the criteria and instead used MPhil criteria, giving incorrect marks. This has led to remarking in the past.

JV then showed the new version and walked everyone through the changes. Intended this to be clearer, simplified and more consistent.

AD responded to this. In the past there was a course in professional practice which has been incorporated into other courses. Did not wish to eliminate this from the marking scheme. AD spoke about historical marking statistics, which in the past had been normalised. The marks given by individual examiners was insignificant. Now using UTOs, can't be processed in the same way.

JV responded that there was a new equivalent to professional practice without using the same name. Asked if AD was happy. AD thought this was a significant change, asked if this should be reworded.

JV stated that marks were not normalised as marks were assigned by field, although there were moderation meetings.

RKH liked this changes and the clarity, although noted the 'contribution to the field section' was contentious as we do not require students to make a contribution to the field in order to obtain full marks, just an example of good work. JV stated that examiners had misinterpreted this and believed we required a contribution to the field. JV considered deleting this statement to settle the matter. RKH wanted to retain it and explained it was to inform students that they could make a contribution, but did not need to. JV will revise accordingly. **(Action: JV)**.

TMS liked the new version, but had a few comments. Missed extensions, asked if that could be introduced. RKH thought this was covered by challenging goals. RKH believed this was a good thing to say to the student but not the marker. TMS noted that weighting had not been changed

between implementation and evaluation. JV stated that a purely theoretical project was not allowed. RKH questioned this. JV opened the part 2 project webpage and read the text, felt that purely mathematical work was not allowed. RKH stated that examiners could redistribute marks based on the project. JV believed this wording may have been removed.

DJW liked TMS' comments about implementation and execution. DJW would like to see contribution to the field thought about more broadly, not just publishing papers but software creation for example. Felt mitigation was part of a good professional approach. Disagreed with clarity being only featured in the evaluation section, needs to be throughout. JV thought the first section should be entirely professional practice and clarity throughout.

RKH wished to take this offline as more work was needed. Great work and thanked JV but wished for this to be made available as a google doc so people could comment. **(Action: JV, ALL)**.

RKH noted that IBs had most likely already seen the marking scheme, so can't make changes for this year. RKH will figure out of the changes can be made this year or not. Felt it was a good idea and would change if possible. **(Action: RKH)**.

5   **Other matters arising**

6   **Exams**

RM explained the situation regarding exams. All students have confirmed results and discussed the examiners report. RM was happy with the process and believed marking was thorough.

RM spoke about the approach taken towards ChatGPT. Complained about emails from UIS not reaching academics. Unhappy that blind grades are issued late as this creates a messy situation. Wished for marks to be stored in a standard way as lecturers are currently using their own proprietary approach.

RKH asked if anything should change if there is another marking boycott takes place in the future. RM didn't think anything could be done differently.

RKH asked if anything would need to be improved with the marking scheme. RM stated that when the supervisor was also the examiner, the average grade went up three percent which was an advantage but not statistically significant. RM noted multiple possible reasons for this, but RM and RKH agreed it was not statistically significant. RKH suggested monitoring rather than taking any action at the moment.

RKH looked at ChatGPT. RM suggested asking students to sign the text regarding ChatGPT earlier. Some lecturers in favour of an outright ban. Could be used as an intelligent search engine but not as part of the work. RM wishes to look at the wording and to improve it.
RKH asked JV to look into this. JV wished to look at the Russell group statement on AI. JV will deliver this at the next meeting or before. **(Action: JV)**.

FS had seen a lot of creativity from ChatGPT. RM considered it hard to police. RKH suggested we needed to get the wording right as this was a struggle.

RKH looked at the change of email. Agreed it was a pain but no need to discuss further.

RM spoke about unclassing. No provision for unclassing in documents. JV expanded on this and how older documentation regarding this had been discarded. JV was unsure what a student had to do to be considered unclassed. CS clarified that examiners were independent of TMC and the document had been approved by the faculty board. The document had errors.

RKH asked JV and RM to improve the document and bring it back to this meeting. **(Action: JV & RM)**.

FS was not sure what unclassed meant. RKH explained. AD stated that to be a candidate for part II, students needed to obtain honours in IB. JV and RKH disagreed as both had students without honours. FS pointed to this as an example of unclassing being unclear. BS will look into this. **(Action: BS)**.

CS informed everyone that Nick Lane is the incoming IA examiner.

FS looked at people completing exams on Moodle and not in a hall. Considered it to be a mess. They had unrestricted freedom to submit scans, unclear which page referred to which question, difficult for an examiner to find the relevant question. RM will look, thought this was handled centrally. **(Action: RM)**.

RKH looked at stricter guidance on submission. BS will look at this. **(Action: BS)**.

DJW asked about blind marking and if the grading was considered fair. RM said it was fair and there had been extensive analysis.

6.1   **Tripos Examiner Report 2023**

Already covered.

6.2   **Examination plans for 2024**

RKH stated that all papers are written this year, except for students with SSDs, back to pre-covid examination structure.

7   **General Teaching Matters**

BS had no comments.

7.1   **Report on start of term - including feedback/discussion points from briefing lectures**

RKH had briefed all students, was pleasantly surprised with attendance.

7.2   **Coursework extension policy (paper)**

RKH stated that self-certification was quietly announced, a draft had been circulated. CS stated this had been approved by faculty. Students can assign themselves two extensions per year except for dissertations.

DJW asked how lecturers will be informed about extensions. RKH said that an in house policy would need to be developed. BS explained that google forms had been created and lecturers would be informed. DJW suggested a private section on the Moodle page, only seen by teaching admin and the lecturer, had used this in the past and thought it worked well. RKH asked BS to do both. **(Action: BS)**.

7.3   **Guest lecturer policy (paper)**

RKH explained there had been questions regarding guest lecturers, travel expenses and so on. Policy had been written. If the lecturer used more than one guest lecturer then approval was required. DJW asked if this had been developed in conjunction with courses which frequently use

guest lectures? RKH stated that it had been developed top down and without consulting them and hoped it would not be too controversial.

7.4   **Generative AI usage in the Tripos**

RKH did not think the policy had changed, would like to see more positive uses of generative AI.

DJW believed the policy had to be in place at the beginning of the year, so already set in stone for this year.

DJW was happy to show how he used it in teaching. Would do this offline. **(Action: DJW)**.

7.5   **Sabbatical request – Simon Moore (Paper)**

No objections. Approved.

7.6   **Teaching arrangements for Denotational Semantics**

JV spoke about Denotational Semantics. Did not have a lecturer this year, short of UTOs for lecturing. Meven Lennon-Bertrand agreed to teach. There has been no agreement or discussion about the compensation Leonard will receive, nothing written about it. Meven believed his research funding would be extended in exchange for this work. RKH asked if CS knew more, CS did not other than Meven would be paid, contract change was not an option.
RKH asked for this to be taken offline. RKH was Grateful to Leonard for taking this on. **(Action: JV, RKH, Neal and Meven)**.

8   **Any Other Business**

FS agreed with what Andrew Moore said about all UTOs having access to all course material. RKH considered this to be sensible. DJW said this had been done with Stewart two years ago but not done by postgraduate. JR will take to PEC and asked DJW to send policy documents. **(Action: JR & DJW)**.

DJW gave an update on mobile health, had concerns about the mobile health unit as it looked like another data science course, spoke with Cecilia which was an unhappy interaction, Cecilia said she would stop teaching if asked to change. RKH believed there was more behind the scenes, not the most satisfactory outcome. She has agreed to teach it for this year, but will speak to Ann. Covered for this year. Current outcome is, course proceeds as it did before.

TMS wished to speak about the tripos, RKH agreed there was less engagement and not much feedback from everyone in the department, RKH will write things to get responses. DJW thought there would be a discussion groups in each theme. RKH will update at the next meeting, large section. **(Action: RKH)**.

RKH noted that out of 150 PhD students, only ten were supervising. Surprised by this. Wondering if we are encouraging students. Supervisor pool is dwindling but student population is increasing.

Date of next meeting: 20 November 2023 14:00.