Minutes

Staff: Keith Sillar, Justin Ales, Veronica Anderson, Kate Arnold, Daniela Balslev, Eric Bowman, Gillian Brown, Gayle Doherty, Barbara Dritschel, Peter Foldiak, Paul Gardner, Juan Goez, Ines Jentzsch, Wenchang Li, Amanda Lucas, Gareth Miles, Akira O’Connor, Mike Oram, Thomas Otto, Dave Perrett, Gerry Quinn, Sana Sheikh, Dhanraj Vishwanath, Andy Whiten, Colin Bovaird.

Kempnich opened the meeting at 13.10

Some changes were made to the order of the agenda, with Cepukaityte bringing up matters from the neuroscience students first.

Apologies:

Kate Cross

1. 3rd year: neuroscience module choices

Some of the psychology modules that neuroscience students are told they can take are clashing with their biology modules. In practice, only 2 out of 4 modules are available without added inconvenience.

Madden raised a similar issue concerning 4th year neuroscience students, where it was not clear to all students they were not required to take modules in both the psychology and biology department. They wish clear information about this

   Action: Gomez to incorporate these details in the course catalogue

2. 3rd year: neuroscience biology rep

There is a wish for a neuroscience rep in school of biology, as some issues raised to the neuroscience rep in school of psychology concerns biology. Kempnich has been in...
contact with the biology president, and depending on how many neuroscience students there are they will establish a neuroscience rep position.

*Action: Sillar to email Kempnich details concerning the number of current neuroscience students.*

3. **Minutes of meeting held 16th October 2013**

Gomez pointed out that there were some unclarity regarding point 7, coursework and exams.

*Action: Kempnich to correct the wording*

2. **Matters arising from previous minutes**

The E-prime course is running for a second time, and has been well received by the students.

Progress is made on academic achievement on webpages, with 18 staff members responding. The IT department is in its final stages of arranging this, and according to O’Connor this will hopefully be finalised within the next couple of weeks.

The 4040 guidelines (point 3) have been distributed and well received by students.

Feedback on presentations in 4th year (point 10a) is being implemented, with lecturers offering feedback, which the students are pleased with.

Students appreciated that the wish for a teaching module (point 5) was already implemented.

There will be a career event in Lower Parliament Hall, on the 7th of April at 1.30 pm.

The exam/coursework distribution of 3rd year has been changed, and the current 2nd years are pleased about this.

3. **3rd year: JH student per meeting**

The 3rd year JH students have suggested a one-off peer meeting with 2nd year joint students, where they can discuss possibilities in JH. This includes workload and how their specific degree combination works in practice.

*Action: Horster to collaborate with Poynton to arrange the event. Staff will be invited to participate if they wish.*

4. **4th year: senior projects**

Some senior honour students struggle with the review essay and research projects having deadlines just one month apart from each other. According to Madden, the two dissertation-like projects, in different areas, include more research than any other literature review in other schools. She suggests giving the 60 credits research project
more emphasis, also for those not committed to a career in research, as this year some students were slightly discouraged to take this on by their supervisors. Currently, the review outline is due at the end of first semester, resulting in students doing the majority of the work for the review over winter break or during second semester.

*Action:* Bowman to move the outline deadline to an earlier date to allow for more time for the review essay.

Following this point, concerns about the PS 4040 review essay was also raised, where some students are given differing information as to choose the supervisor's topic of expertise or not. According to Oram, it is natural for a supervisor to say they can give slightly more guidance on the topics they are familiar with, without rejecting those who wish to review other topics. Quinn noted that a supervisor should know what constitutes a good review and be able to supervise it anyhow, by consulting the staff more familiar with the area. Jentzsch proposed that all supervisors supervise an area outside their expertise, to make it fair for everyone.

*Action:* the topic will be revisited in the teaching committee on the 2nd of April. 3rd year reps to collect information from students about the various supervisor practices encountered. The 4th years to do the same after their dissertations are due.

5. **4th year: ethic forms**

The Data Management Plan (DMP) document needed to be completed before data collection from human participants is rather unclear and unprofessional. According to Hipps, most of the items are not applicable to their experiments. O'Connor and Jentzsch confess that they are also confused by the document.

*Action:* Brown to bring it to the research committee to revise. She is to email Hipps concerning the confusions.

6. **Master: developmental module**

PS 3033 Developmental psychology is perceived as having too much focus on evolutionary psychology. The students enjoy the evolutionary content, but this is at an expense of learning about developmental psychology. They are required to study evolution at a later point, whereas this is their only offer in developmental psychology. According to Whiten, who co-lectures the module, this is more developmental based than in previous, and it has been approved by BPS as a developmental module. Hjemdahl suggested renaming the module “Evolutionary Psychology” to reflect its content more precisely.

*Action:* Gomez to look at the content of the module.

7. **Master: feedback style**

The feedback is given in various forms, and this can be confusing. The master students don’t always feel that it is possible for them to apply the feedback to their following assignments.

At least three times have the feedback on MMS not been given on time, and when contacted the supervisors didn’t know of this. There seems to be a technical problem.
According to Foldiak, the supervisors need to press the “visible” button after uploading the feedback, or ask him to do this for them. Bowman recently experienced another problem, in that the feedback was given to students after pressing “visible”, but disappeared shortly afterwards.

Action: Katharina to give feedback concerning what feedback is preferred to Quinn.
Action: supervisors and lecturers to be reminded of pressing the “visible” button.

8. Any Other Competent Business

Spindler voiced 1st year arts students’ concern regarding the neuroscience lectures, as some are unfamiliar with the rather scientific approach and the perceived speed of which the material is delivered. They are asking for more guidance. Oram noted that there already are resources including the textbook and Internet resources available to the students.

Action: Spindler, Oram and Li to discuss in private

Meeting closed at 14.10