

**THE HONG KONG UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT**

3rd SBM UG Student Representative Meeting 2014/15

Confirmed Minutes

Date and time of meeting:	Feb 16, 2015, 6:00-7:45pm
Minutes Prepared by:	Vivian Chu
Attendance of SBM UG Programs Office:	Emily Nason, Ka Yee Lee, Sophia Wan and Vivian Chu
CUP Faculty Members	Kelvin Mak
Attendance of UG Student Representatives:	Timothy CHAU, Kelvin CHENG, Aaron CHEUNG, Sylvia CHOI Henry CHU, Zhenghao HUANG, Cherenade LAM, Kristy LAU, Pinky LEE, Harmony LI, Ken SHAM, John SZ-TO, Alex VALET, Cici XIE and Carmen WONG Yuna WONG
Absence with Apologies:	David CHAU, Vincent LEUNG, Ray LIEW, Hugo MAR and Michelle NG

1. Confirmation of Minutes

As no further comment was received, the minutes of the Thank You/Working Lunch Meeting of Dec 5, 2014 was confirmed.

2. Updates from SBM

2.i Major Selection Arrangements

Members were updated that students admitted in 2015-16 would select their majors by the end of the 3rd semester. As there would be different student backgrounds admitted in 2015-16 (such as the first batch of Associate Degree students), student advising would be based on their pre-admission qualifications and arranged by the same group, i.e. different study pathways would be recommended. For example, for students who had less strong Mathematics background (and unlikely to choose the BSc majors), their quantitative classes would be more spread out (both before and after the BSc major selection) in their recommended study pathway.

An information session for ECOF, GBUS and QFIN would be held on April 13, 2015 while the session for the remaining BBA programs would be held on April 21, 2015. For the latter, an overview about the major selection process would be conducted, to be followed by booth counters introducing each program and providing mingling opportunities with faculty, staff, senior students and alumni in the Academic Concourse.

2.ii Consultation on Proposed Award Presentation on the Diploma

In the meeting, Prof. Nason supplemented the proposal by giving the rationales of the change that the new presentation made the first major more dominant and highlighted students' effort on an extra major program. It also cleared the ambiguity that the current presentation might cause (e.g. two majors for BBA in ECON & FINA while only one major for BSC in ECOF). The proposed presentation format used capitalized letters for the first major while smaller fonts were used for the second major.

Both pros and cons on this issue were brought up by students:

- a) For the pros, students majoring in ECOF supported the proposal as it could differentiate their unique major from dual majors in Economics and Finance. In addition, some students did want to differentiate their first majors from second majors as the two programs might not be totally interchangeable, e.g. a student with first major in FINA and second major in MGMT might want to highlight his/her first major in FINA.
- b) Most students were concerned about the new format. Below were their comments:
 - (1) It could hurt students' job hunting and career opportunities when they were seeking a second major-related job. The presentation of the second major in the second line and lower case letters would make it look inferior but the student has in fact equally met requirements of both majors.
 - (2) Some students commented that students would normally present their CV and unofficial transcript (rather than diploma) to employers. Hence, it would be more important to know how the degree would be presented on the transcript.
[Post-meeting notes: Subject to confirmation, the presentation of major(s) in the transcript would be in similar format as the diploma, except that there would not be any differences in font sizes and cases on the transcript.]
 - (3) For those who equally valued both first and second majors did not like the proposed format and they preferred to use the same format (such as letters of both majors to be capitalized and with the same font size) for their second majors. For example, those who had ACCT as their second major put the same effort on completing the requirements as those who had it as first major. The choice of 1st versus 2nd major might also be quota-driven instead of indicating students' stronger interest.
 - (4) Some students suggested that students should be given the option to select their preferred diploma presentation format. Prof. Nason explained that the new presentation format, once approved, would be standardized and used across all programs. However, it was agreed that students should be informed properly and well in advance (upon admission for example) before their major selection exercise as the presentation format might affect students' decision on choosing their first and second majors. Prof. Nason agreed that it would be more appropriate for any new presentation format to only apply to new students admitted thereafter, not current students.
 - (5) Lastly, some students enquired about how the minor programs would be presented.
[Post-meeting notes: The CUS paper included the presentation of minors and the following was extracted from the original paper:

BACHELOR OF (SCIENCE or ENGINEERING or BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION)
IN (FIRST MAJOR)
and additional Major(s) in (additional major(s))
with (class of honors)
This student has also completed the
Minor Program(s) in (minor program(s))

The UG Office would submit all the above comments from students to CUS for consideration.

3. Discussion

3.i Student Voice in Ensuring Teaching and Learning Quality

At the end of their visit, the QAC panel asked whether there was strong student voice in the Quality Assurance process. Prof. Nason would thus like to know if students thought that they had enough channels to share their voice with the University on teaching, learning and curriculum, etc. She also brought up that the Office of Academic Quality & Undergraduate Studies (AQUS) created a central student feedback website to hear students' comment on undergraduate studies and wondered if members were aware of the new platform.

In the meeting, student representatives shared that they had different channels to voice out, for example, students could approach professors and teaching assistants during their office hours or schedule an appointment for an individual meeting.

Further, some departments, like IS and FINA Department, arranged gatherings, namely Student-Staff Liaison Committee's Meeting or SSLC, once per semester to provide casual occasions for both faculty and students to meet and share. Useful feedback from students could be collected via SSLC. Students also appreciated the opportunity to seek advice from senior students and alumni.

A student felt that the UST Student Union was not strong as there was a perception that becoming the executive committees was easy as there was not much competition.

The discussion was then focused on the course evaluation (SFQ). Some students suggested conducting an additional SFQ after mid-term exams besides the one done towards the end of the course in order to provide an opportunity for faculty to improve teaching. Some instructors have been doing this mid-term review informally (to collect feedback regarding the difficulties and pace of the course) and a few even spent time showing the results to students. The additional SFQ would encourage students to give more constructive and reliable comments and increase the response rate as it would have instant effects on them, rather than future classes.

Some students asked if the SFQ results could be posted online and made available to all students. Given the sensitivity of the data, the results could not be disclosed publicly. However, Prof. Kelvin Mak, as a faculty representative, shared that he seriously reviewed the feedback summary of his courses and student surveys conducted by the Center for Enhanced Learning & Teaching (CELT). Prof. Nason added that only the Head of Department had access and reviewed the SFQ results as they monitored the teaching quality of the department. Faculty would be provided assistance and assigned a mentor (senior professor) to help if needed. At the School level, the Committee on Undergraduate Programs was tasked to oversee all the SBM UG courses while the University Common Core Office took charge of all the common core courses. Hence, although the SFQ results could not be shared with students, they were taken seriously by the Departments and Schools.

Last but not the least, paper-form SFQ to be distributed in class for completion was suggested by students to raise the questionnaire participation rate. It was noted that more manpower would be required for processing paper questionnaires and verbal comment. Students also asked if more time could be allocated for the completion of the SFQ.

3.ii Sub-Committees

a) Academic Support

The sub-committee members decided to use a questionnaire to determine the need of re-launching the junior tutor program and other practical questions like what courses and fees, etc. Further, conduction channels were also brought into discussion. Initially, the sub-committee planned to post the survey on Facebook and the conduction period was from Feb 20 till Mar 2. Target respondents were current Year-1 and Year-2 students and target respondent size was around 100 students. Result would be released a week after.

In the meeting, Prof. Nason suggested to utilize SBMT 1111 time-slots/cohorts to reach more Year-1 students and business core courses to reach Year-2 students.

b) Career Support

4 sessions of 2-hour MBTI workshops were arranged in this Spring term, but one was cancelled due to the small student size (only 5 participants). Another one was conducted on the meeting date and 9 showed up. There were so far 10 students who registered for the last one held in late February. There would be sessions conducted in English in March. Student Development and Career Team (SDC) tried to offer different time-slots to accommodate students' different class schedules. SBM

would review the participation rate at the end of this term and decide if MBTI would be kept or replaced by another personality assessment.

Starting from this term, paper-form evaluation was used instead of the online one after each workshop for higher participation rate. SBM valued every single comment and encouraged students to give their feedback.

Some members suggested utilizing SBMT1111 time-slots to organize workshops to reach Year-1 students if speakers' schedule allowed. Videotaping the workshops was also suggested.

Further, collaboration with University Career Center on running different kinds of workshops suggested by student representatives was welcome by SDC Team. Sophia, Head of SDC Team, gave more information on the roles of her team and SAO Career Centre. Her Team organized workshops for specific topics/ career fields whereas the SAO organized general topics. The job bank managed by SDC Team offered business-related positions while the positions posted by Career Centre were diverse. A hyperlink to Career Center was put in SDC website so that students could use both databases more effectively. In the meeting, Sophia sought help from the representatives to share their internship experience to junior students.

Another advice was raised by the student representatives that jobs could be sorted out in weekly Friday job alert and sent to target students. The suggestion might be done by the new online platform which would be launched soon. Criteria could be set while searching for new jobs. Students hoped that vacancies would be more diverse rather than narrowed to finance and banking positions.

c) Class Streaming

Members were informed that the UG Programs Office had reviewed students' Mathematics performances of the past two years and discussed with the Mathematics Department on the class streaming. So far, two decisions were made. Starting from Fall 2015-16, students

(1) without attaining a passing grade in HKDSE Mathematics Extended Module would be placed in MATH1003.

(2) attempted IBSL Mathematics, regardless of the grades, would be placed in MATH1003.

Members would be updated of any further streaming results as they became available.

d) Cohort Bonding

Discussion on the details of cohort bonding was still in progress. Updates would be shared in later meetings.

e) Facility Enhancement

Similar to cohort bonding, more updates would be brought to the Committee later.

f) Student-Faculty Relationship

Harmony gathered the following feedback regarding the captioned topic:

(1) Direct link onto "my portal" or "LMES" on brief introduction of professors, including their fields of research and courses taught so that information would be handy to students.

(2) Invitation to professors to student society activities might help in mutual understanding. For instance, some students got to know Prof. Kam Wing Siu as he joined this kind of activity before. He attracted students from other Schools to take his classes.

(3) Pre-major counselors or faculty advisors could be allocated to students based on their intended major. This would encourage them to seek help more often and to have a more thorough understanding about the specific major.

- (4) More sports activities such as rope jumping or swimming could be held with the participation of students and faculty.
- (5) More talks would be given by SBM faculty so that students could attend.

For point (1) above, LMES would be phased out very soon and the possibility of imbedding new function to the new software would need to be explored.

For point (3) above, there are some challenges to assign students according to their major preference, for example, students might not have any preference when they first started the program.

4. Coming Meetings in Spring Term

Since the student time-tables for spring term were just confirmed, Vivian would check with the availability of the representatives for the coming meetings later.

5. A.O.B.

At the meeting, students enquired about the new system Canvas and wondered if the University changed systems frequently. As LMES was not capable of handling blended learning, Canvas was developed and would gradually replace LMES. One of the strengths of Canvas was that it could combine and consolidate different platforms currently used by different units of the University.