

On Summer Schools, Building Student Teams and Linking Undergraduate Education to Research

K.A. Hawick, H.A. James, C.J. James and C.L. James

Institute of Information and Mathematical Sciences

Massey University – Albany, North Shore 102-904, Auckland, New Zealand

Email: {k.a.hawick,h.a.james}@massey.ac.nz, Tel: +64 9 414 0800 Fax: +64 9 441 8181

Abstract

We report on summer student programmes and activities we have run, or contributed towards, for undergraduate students at Universities in the UK; in the USA; in Australia and in New Zealand over the last 16 years. We discuss the aims and objectives of such activities - based around bootstrapping research projects; introducing undergraduates to the research process; and seeding new outreach and collaborative processes from research centres. Looking back, we are able to compare outcomes and different approaches in different research cultures in different national settings. We believe these activities are not so hard to initiate at any University and that they deliver some very worthwhile short-, medium- and long-term outcomes for computer science. We summarise our thoughts on such programmes and provide some advice on how to manage similar programmes.

Keywords: research culture, research training, extramural programmes; seeding enthusiasm.

1 Introduction

Often we have heard students complain that there is little ‘real-world’ component to their Computer Science education. We have found, in four different countries now, that summer scholarship programmes are an ideal way of providing a small number of students a taste of what it is like to be involved in either a research programme or a goal-oriented development programme. In this paper we describe the organisation and execution of our different summer scholarship programmes and the various factors that we believe have made them work successfully. We also discuss the relative merits of these programmes to staff and students.

We see the outcomes of running and participating in summer scholarship programmes as being mostly positive from a number of different viewpoints: two of the

authors are academics and one of us is an administrator who had the responsibility of organising and day-to-day running of our programme in the UK. The academics saw a definite result from the programmes in the quality and focus of new Honours students, while the other authors saw a definite period of personal growth in the student participants.

When one considers organising and running a summer scholarship programme, one must carefully consider the reason for actually wanting to do so. Simply employing a student (or group of students) over the summer vacation does not make a summer programme: this is employing a research student. Nor does organising a number of students to work on on-campus or remote industrial projects constitute a summer programme. We believe that a real summer programme should result in a number of non-academic outcomes to both the student participants and also the staff who are involved. We believe that students should not only be exposed to advanced or state-of-the-art computing technologies but also be exposed to people from industry and required to learn how to talk intelligently about the work they are doing.

Primarily we have run summer programmes as a way of growing the research foundations in newer departments where, while there may already be a lot of research already, there is little in our areas of interest. We used the summer programme in the UK as a way of ‘bootstrapping’ the computing research culture [13] in the department that, in our opinion, was sadly lacking. By running summer programmes we have also tried to “scatter the bread-crumbs” over many students in an effort to seed their enthusiasm for not only our areas of interest but also in research as a worthwhile pursuit in itself. We have found summer programmes as a useful way of pre-vetting students before entering an Honours programme under our supervision and also as a way of raising awareness in the wider undergraduate community of the department’s research activities.

One of the significant challenges we have faced in each

summer programme is attracting and retaining the students that we wish to target. Sometimes, with the more business-oriented students, it is not an easy task to convince them of the immediate benefits of participating in a summer programme that will pay only slightly more than they would earn flipping burgers all summer when they could be earning far more (but having far less fun) in Industry. This is a definite trade-off for the organisers of a summer project: you can't pay peanuts and expect not to get monkeys working for you!

In section 2 we discuss the positive outcomes that have happened to the student participants since their involvement with the various summer research programmes that we have been involved with. In section 3 we discuss the issues and present a checklist that must be considered before embarking on a summer research programme.

2 Benefits

Of the approximately thirty students who have completed summer research programmes with us, we occasionally hear from a third. Several have later become professional research scientists; many are currently employed as professional software programmers, and others have pursued higher degrees in semi-related areas. A small group of students we supervised in Adelaide followed us to Bangor to take up jobs in a local software development. Spending a significant time with students over a summer also means supervisors get to know their students quite well – typically we hear from ex-summer students when they want a reference!

We would assert that completing a summer research programme gives the students a certain edge over those who have not. In the first place, these students have completed an extra-curricular programme in their chosen area of study that others have not. Secondly, the research component of the programmes give the students extra things to talk about during interviews – and seeing that most graduates have not had that much experience worth discussing, the fact that they *have* had some interesting experiences hold them in good stead. Extra exposure to industry throughout the summer programme also helps in raising student awareness of careers that they may have not previously considered – and sometimes helps students decide on career paths they *don't* want to take. We believe we have, in some small way, helped the summer students in their careers, hence the reason for this article.

We have also found participation in a summer programme leads students to be better informed about what is involved in an Honour-level student project. As summer projects are typically on a wide variety of project themes, we have also found that students who partici-

pate in the programmes are more aware of the different areas of research in the department. We have discussed the positive effects of student projects and the benefits of tailoring student projects to individual interests in [16].

Students are not the only group to have beneficial outcomes from the summer programmes. The other two parties with significant investment in the summer programmes are the staff who are directly involved with the programme and the University that speculatively spends the money to employ the students over the summer.

The staff benefit in some quite obvious ways: they have students working with them on projects they feel personally involved with. The staff member is able to have a student under their direction make headway on their project, leaving them to work on another project. However, sometimes this is a double-edged sword – it has happened in the past that a promising student totally fails to fulfil their potential or the project uncovers considerable gaps in the student's knowledge, requiring a greater-than-average investment of time by the supervisor in that project. Furthermore, working closely with a student over summer means the staff member can get to know them – and whether they could work together in a year-long Honours project or even longer on a post-graduate project.

The University also benefits from the programme in two ways, one tangible and one not: any research outputs of sufficient quality can be written up in scholarly journals or presented at conferences as papers or posters. Intangibly, the University also benefits from the students who have completed the programme and come away with positive experiences. The University also benefits from the Industry links that are forged through the summer programme – these also serve to raise the University's reputation in the eyes of local industry. In our experience Industry likes the contact with the select group of students – some of our students joined these companies after graduation. However, as previously stated, there is a definite cost to both the staff and University. Most obviously, the University must spend money to keep the students during the summer period. Sometimes it is possible to get research funding from an external body, but in our experience this is difficult to come by. The University must also accommodate the group of summer students, and we have found it socially beneficial to the summer students and staff (and involved Industrial representatives) to hold weekly morning teas – just to get everyone involved together.

The staff involved in the programme must understand the level of commitment they must make to the programme: they must remember that the typical student entering a programme will be of second- or third-year level – that is, they cannot be expected to be an expert programmer, nor aware of many project subtleties that

the academic is aware of. The staff member will most likely need to put in a fair amount of time, on a daily basis, to help the student. Thus, when organising a summer programme, it is best to get a firm “buy-in” from all supervisory staff *before* the programme is advertised – the extra burden placed on those staff who do participate is quite large if other staff pull out.

3 Common Issues

From the outset we have tried to design and run our summer programmes to maximise the research experience of the student participants. Part of this experience is allowing the students to come to their own understanding of what is involved with their research project; another part of the process is their time management; and the final part has been to invite local researchers, software developers, and associated Industry professionals into the summer programme to talk on a wide variety of subjects centring on what it is like in the real world. Inviting local industry or researchers into the summer programme had the added benefit of fostering industry linkages, not only for the summer programme, but the degree programme as well. This is especially useful in the UK where it is accepted practice to have a group of local industrial partners who provide oversight on degree programmes.

3.1 Results and Expectations

It is crucial to have a realistic expectation of the results that will be produced by the summer students: they are unlikely to produce any earth-shattering results from individual or group projects (although you may be lucky!). There will be a range of results commensurate with the variation in latent student abilities. Most projects will proceed to some sort of ‘good’ result. Some will achieve more than originally expected and others will falter at the first hurdle, either due to a student-project mismatch, staff-student mismatch or some other reason. We have already mentioned that one of the valuable outputs of a summer programme is some sort of semi-public research forum at which the students are required to present either an oral paper or poster (e.g. [22]). After the programme, the supervisor and student can dissect the work completed and make a decision whether to submit it to a conference as a paper or poster.

Some major milestones in the summer programme are important to focus student and supervisors on what is actually to be achieved. Presentation sessions, poster sessions, and a semi-formalised practice conference at the end of the scheme were all useful. It is important to remember just how little is typically achieved on a daily

or weekly basis but how surprisingly much can emerge over 10-12 weeks. We found that the poster material from summer programmes could be used to brighten the departmental corridors and could be re-used as valuable publicity material over the following year(s). Institutions often have publicity budgets - it is worth considering applying for a contribution from your institution’s PR budget to a summer programme. It may well lead to better value for money than some of the other uses to which such funds are sometimes put.

We are fond of the maxim “If you didn’t write it up, it didn’t happen!” and believe it is valuable to attempt editing some sort of proceedings from a summer programme. It may be in practice that some projects will lead to normal publications, but even if not it is certainly useful to have **all** the projects produce a short technical or working note. The writing experience can of course be built into the student programme and forms, we believe, a valuable part of the apprenticeship. We have found that it is a useful learning experience for students to see past years technical notes - they soon learn what is deemed to be a good one and therefore the standards to which they should aspire. In the present enlightened times in which we live, it is relatively easy to archive such material on the Web and doing this does give students valuable CV and job-application material.

3.2 Funding

Possibly the most fundamental difficulty one faces when organising a summer programme is that of funding. Remember students are hungry for CV items; accommodation and minimal cash may be all that is required. What is enough for them to avoid working in a bar or burger joint? However, some money is still required. The financial resources for the programmes we have described vary enormously due to different national and cultural circumstances. Table 3.2 shows the approximate number of students that participated on the various programmes we have been involved with, and the relative budgets.

In general for all the schemes the key resources were staff time and student stipends. The former generally has an opportunity cost attached to it but with the exception of the USA environment usually does not need separate cash to be obtained as staff time will typically be covered through the normal operations of the university or academic institution. It is nevertheless important to consider how much of your own time and your colleagues’ time will go into a scheme and that everyone involved does feel it is worth it. We typically found that one average at least one staff day of input was needed per summer student per week for the 8-12 week summer programmes we describe. Less might be feasible with more co-ordinated group su-

Location (Country)	Students	Approx Budget	Budget Notes
NPAC (USA)	10-20	3 ⁺ yrs grant funded	stipend of a few thousand per student
Edinburgh (UK)	10-25	15 ⁺ yrs variable budget	stipend of a few thousand per student
Adelaide (AUS)	~10	2 yrs @ AUD15,000/yr	only includes stipend
Bangor (UK)	18	1yr @ GBP25,000	included stipends (18K), equipment (2K), catering and symposium (5K)
Massey (NZ)	4	2 yrs @ NZD	only includes stipend

Table 1: Location of each of our summer research programmes, showing the number of students participating and the approximate budget of each programme.

pervision activities and particularly if team activities that can be self supervised by the more experienced students or participants. These are we emphasise not insignificant amounts of staff resource for an institution to invest.

The biggest obstacle for most colleagues who might wish to run similar programmes is obtaining cash for student stipends. While it might be feasible for some better off students to participate in a scheme without a stipend, we believe this will typically be unfair and disadvantage many potential applicants. On the other hand it is not necessary to pay lavish wages either. Our experience has been that good schemes, with competition amongst applicants, need only offer stipends comparable with those great student institutions - wages working in a bar or in the supermarket. In some institutions and circumstances it may be possible to arrange discounted or even free university accommodation. Availability of university accommodation in the vicinity of the Snowdonia mountains was a serious draw for applicants at Bangor. The Syracuse programme had applicants from all over the USA and therefore accommodation arrangements were also important. The attraction of Edinburgh as a city were a draw for applicants across the UK and Europe for the EPCC scheme. The Australian and New Zealand student cultures do tend to encourage stay-at-home-city students and accommodation was perhaps less important in these two cases. As we have described the number of places you can offer can usefully range from just two or three to over twenty. This will be the major financial item to consider.

3.3 Resources

In-kind resources such as computer labs and supercomputer or cluster access cycles will also vary. We have experienced considerable variation in what new specific targeted resources were available - it was particularly valuable to have the economic development resources of the Welsh Development Agency brought to bear on our Bangor programme. At EPCC and NPAC it was relatively easy to make available machine cycles and compute resources. The Adelaide scheme involved a lot of

research specific equipment belonging to the DHPC research group. The host department also generously made space and labs and terminals available without cost.

Like in so many lab-oriented endeavours it helps enormously to have a fund for sundries and small equipment items (components or software or consumables) that can make the difference between getting experiments and equipment delivering useful results in a short time-frame or not. We were able to use discretionary funds (untyped-money) from other research consulting work to finance these items. Some well-funded departments may be able to contribute directly to this.

When we ran the programmes in Australia and particularly in the UK we were essentially starting with no dedicated equipment for the summer students. Thus it was necessary to carefully pre-plan the project themes in order to purchase or borrow the required equipment. It took longer than we had first considered for some equipment to arrive, meaning that some students were not able to immediately start work on aspects of their projects. In Adelaide we used the results of the previous years' summer programmes to scope the following year in terms of lab set up and equipment ordering.

3.4 Administrative Support

It also helps to have good administrative support for a programme. A lot of the time consuming supervision work is actually connected with administration and logistics and can be carried out by non-academic staff. We believe it is important that such staff be included in the planning process and are given a clear idea of what the real objectives of a particular scheme is. Good support staff and good contacts in your local environment can also lead to a surprising number of in-kind contributions of time or other resources. We found that a concerted effort to grab leftover food from other university meetings for the ever-hungry summer students led to discussion and team building opportunities.

In fact, one of the significant hurdles that our friendly administrator faced when we organised the programme in

the UK was that of student accommodation. In the UK most undergraduates move away from their family residence and stay in student accommodation. During the summer months most halls of residence are let out to visiting academics or conference attendees at a significantly higher rate than during semester time. Unbeknownst to us, we faced the problem that our summer students would not be able to afford to stay in halls at the rate we were paying them; it was up to us to put pressure on the accommodation management and we managed to secure a special rate for our summer students.

3.5 Project Design

On an organisational front, we have trailed two distinct types of summer project: individual and group projects. In Australia and New Zealand we ran only individual projects, while in the UK we used a mixture of individual and group projects. The decision was made after the initial interview through which the students were chosen for the programme: some students naturally prefer to work alone, while others prefer to work in small teams. As previously mentioned, we nominated some of the more senior UK students as ‘super summer students’ and gave them the additional responsibility of looking after a group of individual projects with a similar theme. Experience has shown us that the more junior members of the team are more likely to approach their team leader before the supervising faculty. Of course, it is necessary to motivate those older students to take on the extra responsibility of nurturing more junior students: extra money often helps, together with a reminder that this is in some small way “project management experience” that will look good on their CV.

It has been our observation in all the programmes we have described that a team experience, either planned or emergent, has been a significant outcome for many students. Shy undergraduates who would not otherwise have had the opportunity to work in a team of peers or in an established research team of older more experienced colleagues have commented on this value. Indeed particularly at Bangor and Adelaide where we had the opportunity to mix students at different levels it was clear that it helped many mature and develop considerably. Professional bodies in the UK and elsewhere are pushing for accredited degree programmes to include some sort of team project experience. We endorse this with the recognition that it is not always easy to shoe-horn material into an already packed curriculum. Summer programme activities where the team and project experiences are not necessarily formally assessed towards a degree result can be, we believe, even more beneficial towards the real education (rather than assessment) process. Our feeling

is that if the summer programme were to be made an academically-assessed part of the undergraduate or Honours curriculum, it would significantly change the tone and culture of the programme: we fear that it would no longer be viewed by the students as ‘fun’ or ‘a privilege’, but instead yet another form of assessment.

At Bangor and Adelaide a key outcome for us of part of the summer programmes was to establish and equip laboratories for cluster computing and swarm robot systems. It was fascinating to involve the summer students in this process and we believe it was an unusual opportunity for such students to have input into equipment purchase and scheduling. It was insightful to see comparisons between our prejudices and pre-conceptions about what a well equipped lab ought to have and what the students thought was important. We believe the involvement of the students saved us some money and made for more rapid progress and improvisation than would otherwise have occurred.

It was a fascinating experience to watch older students teaching younger ones to solder circuit boards, to install operating-systems kernels, to configure network switches and generally pass on general experiences that do not always neatly fit into modern lab based curricula. We recall ourselves the computing terminal room experience where we ourselves learned so much by “osmosis” from the greater student community. It is a symptom of curriculum pressure and laptop-equipped students who work mostly at home that this learning from your community experience now has to be deliberately nurtured rather than expecting it to happen spontaneously. We believe summer programmes such as we describe can go some way towards this planned nurturing.

3.6 Convincing the Academics

The summer student vacation is often seen by academics as being “their time” in which they can do research unfettered by the demands of undergraduate students. So, it was interesting to see the effect that running these programme had on the authors. We must admit that, while supervising the students did cost us a significant amount of time over the summer, some of the work that was done by the students was useful as a partial research output, and also in some cases, lead to other research programmes in themselves.

What does this investment of time and effort (not to mention money) buy the staff on the programme? Firstly it gives us a set of research assistants for the summer period. The downside to this rather attractive proposition is that we have to train them (sometimes a little, sometimes a lot) in order to get them to a point where they become productive. It’s no good just taking the

brilliant students (even if they will stick around) because many ‘average’ students simply have not had the chance to shine in an ordinary academic teaching environment. If we have an average-to-good student, participating in the summer programme means we (the staff) are able to produce slightly more research output over the summer. Sometimes this is true, sometimes not. The programme is also an excellent forum for the staff to get to know a core group of undergraduates, that might be mentored for an Honours programme, or considered for job placements during the semester breaks. As previously mentioned, many summer students use their supervisor as a job reference.

Lastly, it does let us know, through our day-to-day interactions with the students, where the holes in our own undergraduate curriculum are. Students have proved to be, once their trust has been gained, quite open (and brutally honest) about their undergraduate degree courses, areas of difficulty and shortfalls in programmes. This means we are better able to consider changes to the curriculum to cover those gaps.

4 Summary and Conclusions

We have been involved with, and have run summer research programmes in the US, UK, Australia and New Zealand over the past 16 years. Experience has shown us the summer schools are an excellent way of bootstrapping a research culture in a new area of research or to establish awareness of research activities in the undergraduate student population. We also see the inclusion of an annual summer student programme as being a key differentiator in today’s Higher Education market where all degrees essentially cover the same subject areas. This is one way in which a University or department can show focus on the career paths of students.

Along the way we have learnt a number of quite valuable lessons. Firstly, it is critical to have a clear view of the expected outcomes of any summer programme. Spend some time mapping out possible projects or areas in which projects could be run with and without equipment. Secondly, it is necessary to have the active support of research-active staff who will be around over the summer period. It is also crucial to have an administrator (possibly ‘enticed’ with chocolate) who is willing and able to organise the non-technical aspects of the programme including student payments, advertising materials, accommodation, office space, morning teas, and presentation facilities for students. Thirdly, budgets must be sourced as early as possible so as to ascertain the viability of running a programme. Don’t forget that some student projects will require new hardware, which must

be purchased well before the summer programme is to be run.

We found uniformly across all our programmes that the best projects and student outcomes were closely correlated by how much staff-supervisor time and effort was put in. For this reason we believe it most important to undertake such a programme if and only if you and your colleagues really want to put effort into it and will therefore be able to project the necessary signals of enthusiasm for the student participants. We have had experience running a programme where some of the lesser-involved staff pulled out at a late stage, thus increasing the burden on those staff who were involved. This was not good. It is also important to maintain a low student:staff ratio, so as to be able to devote an appropriate amount of time to the students on the programme.

Running summer schools, in their various guises, has been very beneficial not only to the students on the summer schools, but also to the academic staff that have day-to-day interaction with the students. Primarily, the students are being exposed to new ideas, methodologies and technologies that they would not ordinarily be exposed to. From a staff viewpoint, the summer schools have had a two-fold benefit: firstly they have allowed us to ‘cherry-pick’ the best students to later become graduate students, or at least maintain a watchful eye over, and secondly the interaction allows us to fairly accurately gauge the gaps in our own undergraduate curriculum.

Acknowledgements

We thank all our past and present colleagues who have helped us with the activities described. It continues to be a great pleasure to hear from past students too. We especially thank Paul Coddington and Francis Vaughan for discussions on some of the rants we present in this paper. Thanks also to the various funding organisations involved and to the Welsh Development Agency in particular.

References

- [1] The Allan Wilson Centre and Massey University, The Helix Parallel Processing Cluster, 2002, available at <http://helix.massey.ac.nz>
- [2] Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) 2004, *ACM Homepage* Available at <http://www.acm.org> last visited 26 August, 2004.
- [3] ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Curriculum Task Force, *Computing Curricula 2001*. IEEE Computer Society.

- [4] ACM/AIS/IEEE-CS Joint Curriculum Task Force, *Computing Curricula 2004, Strawman Draft*. IEEE Computer Society.
- [5] Bastian, J., Modelling the Perceptual Effects of Lens Distortion via an Immersive Virtual Reality System, Honours Thesis, Computer Science Department, The University of Adelaide, 2002.
- [6] Bogucz, E.A. (Ed.), *Journal of Undergraduate Research in High-Performance Computing*, Volume 4, NPAC Technical Report SCCS-632, August 1994. Individual papers are available from the NPAC REU '94 Abstracts and Papers.
- [7] Coddington, P.D. (Ed.), *Journal of Undergraduate Research in High-Performance Computing*, Volume 5, NPAC Technical Report SCCS-747, December 1995. Individual papers are available from the NPAC REU '95 Abstracts and Papers.
- [8] Dawson, C. W., *The essence of computing projects a student's guide*, Pearson Education Limited, 2000.
- [9] del Fabbro, S., Developing a Distributed Image Processing and Management Framework, Honours Thesis, Computer Science Department, The University of Adelaide, 2000.
- [10] Fox, G.C. and McCracken, N.J., Northeast Parallel Architectures Center Research Experiences for Undergraduates Program, 1991, Available at <http://www.npac.syr.edu/REU/>
- [11] Gan-El, M. and Hawick, K. A., Parallel Containers: A tool for applying parallel computing applications on clusters, in *Research Letters in the Info and Math. Sciences*, Vol 6, May 2004, Massey Univ.
- [12] Hawick, K. A., *Distributed and High Performance Computing Group Summer Student Project Webpage*. Available at <http://www.dhpc.adelaide.edu.au/education/summer/index.html>.
- [13] Hawick, K. A. and James, H. A., Bootstrapping Computer Science in Old North Wales in Proc. Fifth Aust. Comp. Edu. Conf. (ACE2003), Conf. in Research and Practice in Information Technology, 20. Greening, T. and Lister, R., Eds., Aust. Comp. Soc. (ACS), Adelaide, 2003, pp. 25-34.
- [14] Hawick, K. A. and James, H. A., *Student Project Webpages* Available at <http://www.massey.ac.nz/~kahawick/student-projects.html> and <http://www.massey.ac.nz/~hajames/undergrad-projects.html>.
- [15] Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) Computer Society, *IEEE-CS Homepage* Available at <http://www.computer.org>.
- [16] James, H. A., Hawick, K. A. and James, C. J., Teaching students how to be Computer Scientists through student projects, in A. Young and D. Tolhurst (Eds), *Proc. Seventh Aust. Comp. Edu. Conf. (ACE2005)*, Aust. Comp. Sci. Comm., Vol 42, Number 5, pp 259-267.
- [17] The Lego Group, *Lego.com Homepage*, Available from <http://www.lego.com/eng/>.
- [18] The Lego Group, *Lego Mindstorms*, Available from <http://mindstorms.lego.com/eng/products/ris/-index.asp> last visited 26 August, 2004.
- [19] Minty, E.M., First 10 Years of the EPCC Summer Scholarship Programme. In *IEEE Comp. Sci. and Engineering*, Jan-Mar 1988, pp. 6-9.
- [20] Phillips, E. M. and Pugh, D. S. , *How to get a PhD A handbook for students and their supervisors, 3rd ed*, Open University Press, 2000.
- [21] Shackelford, R., Cassel, L., Cross, J., Impagliazzo, J., Lawson, E., LeBlanc, R., McGettrick, A., Sloan, R. and Topi, H., *Computing Curricula 2004: The Overview Project*, in Proc. SIGCSE'04, March 3-7, 2004. pp 501.
- [22] Toon, J. A., Intelligent Systems: Practical Data Mining in a world saturated with data, Summer Research Programme Report, University of Wales, Bangor, 2002.
- [23] Ultimate Real Robots, *Real Robots*, Available from <http://www.realrobots.co.uk/> last visited 26 August, 2004.
- [24] Waite, W. M., Jackson, M. H., Diwan, A. and Leonardi, P. M., *Student Culture vs Group Work in Computer Science*, in Proc. SIGCSE'04, March 3-7, 2004. pp 12 - 16.
- [25] Wilson, G.V., MacDonald, N.B., Thornborrow, C. and Brough, C.M., The Development and Operation of Edinburgh Parallel Computing Centre's Summer Scholarship Programme. In *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM/IEEE conference on Supercomputing*, pp. 134-143.
- [26] Zschech, R. Computer Network Visualisation, Honours Thesis, Computer Science Department, The University of Adelaide, 2000.