

Date November 13th, 2018

Minutes of the 129th meeting of the OLC-IT

Present: Ammerlaan, Bolding, Boschma, Havinga (chairman), Heerlien, Hillerström (minutes secretary), Langerak, Myśliwiec, Molenkamp, Padberg, Rensink (program director), Sperotto, Vonk.

Not present: van Grinsven (ill)

1. Openings and determining agenda

Meeting is opened at 10.43.

Point 7 (3+2 programs) is removed from the agenda, since the PD did not have time to prepare and there is no urgency to discuss it this meeting. It will be put on the agenda for next meeting.

The agenda is approved.

2. Announcement PD

The PD has 3 announcements.

1. The PD informs the PC about state of affairs regarding the name change of the bachelor.

The faculty counsel has given a positive advice on changing the name. This is subscribed to by the dean.

Next it is proposed as decision to the university board. After that the university counsel has to agree. When that is all positive the NVAO has to agree. So far everything is positive, but there are three more stages to go through.

2. The PD informs PC about the start up of the visitation process. The PD will hire an external advisor, in case the finances for paying the advisor can be worked out. The advisor will start with a quick scan and constitute a small team of people to write a critical self reflection. In the quick scan a number of parties involved, including the PC, will be interviewed. There will also be a sounding board. The PD wants at least a student and a staff member of the PC in this sounding board.

The date for visitation is not yet decided upon, but will be towards the end of 2019.

3. The PD also has news on TEM. The rector has proposed to change the university wide 15 EC rule of TEM. This is likely to be changed from September 2019, but it is not yet decided. In the future it should be possible for students to receive less than 15 EC for a module, in case the student only passes parts of the module. This will have an influence on how the study is perceived and how the students go through their study. The big question is how to proceed after the 15 EC rule has changed. How should the program be organized if there is no university wide rule any more? This should be discussed in the PC as well.

The PD thinks that a first approach should be to ask the module coordinators what they see as viable options.

Announcement working groups

The quality assurance group had a meeting to discuss their ideas and get on one line. They are planning a meeting with the PD and Cynthia Souren, the quality assurance coordinator of EWI, as soon as possible.

No further announcements.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence

- Letter name change bachelor Computer Science

No further comments.

4. Minutes of the 128th PC-IT meeting d.d. October 9th 2018

No comments or discussion points on the minutes.

Discussion action points:

313: Not done

316: Done

317: Done, mentioned in module board.

319: Done. The UT wide facility management is made aware of this. They are seriously looking at improving the climate control in existing rooms and thinking of new ways of using the building, now that it will not be demolished. If the PC has any suggestions on how to use the rooms, the PD can pass this on. Atlas will move out of the building, so there is more space available.

321: Not done

322: Done

323: Done. The FC does not need any advise from the PC.

324: Done

325: Done

326: Done. Boschma declined for the quality assurance committee.

327: Done. The name has been changed and everything is up to date.

328: Done

The PD brings up that it was once brought up to change the name of the PC-IT, but nothing has been decided on this so far. PC-IT could logically only stand for PC- Interaction Technology and therefore another name is more suitable. Langerak suggests PC-TC. PD thinks PC-CS is better, since the master is only called Computer Science, instead of Technical Computer Science (like the bachelor).

The PD has another announcement, that he forgot to give. He emailed the PC 15 minutes ago with the request to give advice on discontinuing the master Internet Science & Technology and making it a specialization of CS.

The advice of the PC is necessary, since this decision has to go through the same process as the name change of the bachelor. First the PC gives advice, then the FC approves the discontinuation and then the university board decides.

This will be further discussed at point 7 in this meeting.

5. Module 6 Intelligent Interaction Design

-Comment PC workgroup, response Reidsma

- new module description

The curriculum committee of the PC looked at the module description of module 6 and sent their comments to Reidsma. Since the module started this week the comments were directly given to Reidsma, instead of first being discussed during the PC meeting. Reidsma responded satisfactory on all comments. He had a question to the PC:

In the module description Reidsma added a section on the evaluation and improvements of the module last year. Reidsma asks the PC advice on whether or not to keep this section in the module description. Reidsma would like to have it there, because it gives transparency to the students.

The PC thinks it is good to have transparency, but this section could be confusing for the students this year. Molenkamp mentions that the document has been published to the students already.

PD says that it shows the students that they are taken seriously and therefore students may respond more to questionnaires. However, the module description is not the best place. A separate announcement on Canvas with this section is more visible and will not pollute the module description.

It is not very clear to the PC how many manuals there are for this module and if other manuals are also important for the PC to read.

Therefore, Langerak will answer to Reindsma that the PC understand his point, but does not have a strong opinion on whether to keep it or not and will ask for clarification on the number of module manuals.

6. Assessment form Design Project and Research Project -Old and New assessment forms module 11 and 12

Langerak is the module coordinator of the design project module. There is an assessment form which was established and agreed upon with the PC a while ago, but the form is in Dutch. From the up coming design project module onwards, the form has to be in English. Therefore, Langerak made a proposal for a new form in English. He also made a proposal for a new research project assessment form. He thinks there is currently no real assessment form for the research project, instead Easy Chair is used.

Padberg mentions that BOZ would like to have all the forms in the same style, since it improves the workflow.

The PD mentions that the forms serve two functions.

First of all they are used to give the students feedback.

Secondly, the forms are used for administration purposes.

The PD says that ideally there would be 1 form that serves both functions, but that this is not necessary.

Langerak adds that in the design project the form is also used to give a second opinion.

Havinga adds that in the research project the form is used for peer reviews as well.

The PD has some comments on the assessment form for the design project.

He wonders how well the teachers understand the form.

Langerak explains that an explanation to the form is given when handed out. Langerak wants to make sure the form is not cluttered with too much text and explanation.

The PD also asks how official the examiner of the form is, there need to be at least 2 examiners. Are all supervisors also examiner?

Langerak answers that all supervisors are at least Msc.

It is decided that to make sure the supervisor is also an examiner, the name on the form should be examiner instead of supervisor. Supervisor will be added in between brackets, for clarification. Langerak will adjust this on the form. Furthermore, Langerak will capitalize (the first letter) of the titles of the assessment parts.

The PD also has a question about the research project assessment. He wants to know what is being archived and what the assessment process is.

Havinga explains that the review of the track chair will be printed and signed by the track chair and supervisors. After this there is a cross check by another track chair. When this is in line with the grade nothing happens. If the difference is too much than Havinga will have a look at the form and discuss about the final grade. In the end there will be a complete list of all grades and Havinga will sign it on.

It is concluded that there should be stronger guidelines about the layout of the assessment form for the research project, to make sure all forms look more alike.

The PD suggests that both the proposed assessment forms for the design project and for the research project are approved by the PC and that these new forms are taken over.

7. Discontinuing master Internet Science and Technology

The current situation with the Internet Science and Technology master is that there are not a lot of students enrolled. This year 2 new students enrolled. The name of the master was recently changed from Telematics to IST, to get more students. This did not work. Currently in total 11 students are enrolled. This is not enough for a viable master studies.

Therefore the PD has discussed with several people (a.o. with Geert Heijenk, Havinga, Faculty Management) to discontinue the IST as a master and make it into the 4th track of the CS master. So far everybody has responded positively on this proposal.

The difference caused by this change is the diploma that the students receive (CS instead of IST). The content will be very much the same. The process to arrange this is that the PC has to either give advice or agree with making IST a specialization of the CS master. After that the FC discusses it and then the university board discusses this.

The students that now study IST have the right to finish their study in a reasonable time. How much time is defined by law (maybe 5 years, the PC is not sure). The PD will try to convince the students to switch to the CS master, but he does not want to force anybody. Vonk says that most students are in the second year (at least 7 out of 11 students have more than 60 EC).

The current accreditation is until april 2020. The question is what to do with a new accreditation. It could be possible to extend the accreditation, so that the students have time to finish the study. If the accreditation ends, the students cannot get a diploma any more. Extending the accreditation would also save a lot of money and hassle, since no new accreditation has to be done.

In case a new accreditation is necessary, than it would be best if it can be at the same day as the accreditation of CS.

The PC has two concerns with making IST a specialization of the CS master.

First of all, the admission requirements (toelatingseisen) for the CS master and IST master may not be the same right now. When IST becomes a specialization it is not possible to have a difference between the two. The PD will inform the PC about whether there is a difference currently in the admission requirements of the CS master and the IST master.

Secondly, the students will get a different diploma. Now the IST students get an electrical engineering degree, but with the CS master they will get a computer science degree. Is this something the students want?

Molenkamp mentions that the open days will be held this week and asks if this will be mentioned there.

The PD says he wants to explain that IST is more a track of CS than a separate master. It will be made clear the master is likely to be discontinued. This may also give new comments on how people feel about changing the IST master.

Off topic but related to the open days: on the open days for the bachelor nothing will be mentioned about the change in TEM, regarding the 15 EC rule, as mentioned in agenda point 2.

8. Documentation OLC and yearly report

The PD would like to see more documentation of the PC and a yearly report. The PC has the legal obligation to produce a yearly report. For the years 2013-2017 this has not been done. The PD wants to see yearly reports for all the years it was legally obligatory. Havinga believes that this is the first year it is obligatory.

The PC agrees that the yearly report should not be a write only document, as it used to be. It should be a reflection on the performance of the PC. With the yearly report the PC can look towards the future and be

ambitious. It does not make sense to write a yearly report and reflection of the previous years, therefore it will be stated on the website of the PC that there are no yearly reports from 2013-2017.

The PD adds that it is also good to use the year circle again. Padberg will look up the year circle and this will be discussed next meeting.

Molenkamp says that it is good to write a year report for 2017-2018, since this can also be used for the visitation. Langerak volunteers to make a draft of the year report. He was not a PC member last year, so he can give an outsiders view. After this Molenkamp will comment on the draft and forward the draft to Heerlien. She will then take a look at it, before bringing it up in the next PC meeting. The year report should be about 2-4 pages.

There are also by-laws (HR) on the website of the PC. These are from 2015 and they are in Dutch. The PD suggests to either translate the by-laws to English and to update them or to decide not to have any by-laws. Every PC member will look at the by-laws in Dutch for next meeting and see if there is a benefit of having them. In case the PC agrees to keep the by-laws, they will be translated to English.

The yearly report, year circle and bylaws will all be discussed next meeting.

9. A.O.B. and proposal item next meeting

No A.O.B and no items for next meeting.

10. Questions and Conclusions

Boschma has a question:

There are were a lot of complaints about the Service Oriented Architecture course, for quite some years. However, so far no steps were taken to improve the course. The PC has asked for an improvement plan but there was no answer yet. The course is given in quartile 3, so should we ask again for an improvement plan?

The PD will approach the teacher of the course and ask about the improvements.

Meeting closed 12.05.

Action points

#	Meeting	Action	Person	Deadline
313	June 2018	Remind the teachers and module coordinators of the possibility to send students appreciatory flower bouquets	PD	September 2018
321	October 2018	Ask what the status is on the discussion about a shift from Dutch (Voldoende, Niet Voldoende) to international terms on diplomas	PD	November 2018
329	November 2018	Add 3+2 programs to agenda of 130 th meeting PC-IT	Padberg	December 2018
330	November 2018	Schedule a meeting with Cynthia Souren and PD	Quality assurance working group	December 2018
331	November 2018	Reply to Reidsma that PC-IT does not have a	Langerak	December

		strong opinion on the evaluation in the course manual		2018
332	November 2018	On the assessment form TCS Design Project: change name from supervisor to examiner (and put supervisor in between brackets)	Langerak	December 2018
333	November 2018	On the assessment form TCS Design Project: Capitalize (the first letter) of the titles of the assessment parts	Langerak	December 2018
334	November 2018	Inform PC about the difference in admission to IST master and Computer Science master	PD	December 2018
335	November 2018	Make proposal year report of the PC-IT for the year 2017-2018 and send it to Molenkamp	Langerak	December 2018
336	November 2018	Review the proposal year report of 2017-2018 made by Langerak and send it to Heerlien	Molenkamp	December 2018
337	November 2018	Read and review the by-laws (in Dutch)	Everybody	December 2018
338	November 2018	Add to agenda of next meeting the by-laws, year report 2017-2018 and the annual cycle	Padberg	December 2018
339	November 2018	Look for the annual cycle	Padberg	December 2018
340	November 2018	Review the proposal year report of 2017-2018 made by Langerak and Molenkamp	Heerlien	December 2018
341	November 2018	Approach teacher of master course Service Oriented Architecture to ask about improvement plan for the course this year	PD	December 2018

Decisions

- 4.1 The PC-IT has changed its name to PC-CS.
- 6.1 The name of the person that signs, on the design project assessment form, must be examiner (supervisor can be put between brackets).
- 6.2 There should be strict guidelines for the layout of the assessment forms for the research project, to improve the workflow for BOZ.
- 6.3 The PC has approved the suggest assessment forms for the design project and the research project and from now on these forms will be taken over.
- 8.1 For the years 2013-2017 no yearly reports will be written. On the website of the PC it will be stated that these yearly reports do not exist.
- 8.2 A year report will be written for the year 2017-2018. It will be about 2-4 pages.
- 8.3 In the 130th PC-CS meeting the yearly report draft, year circle and by-laws will be discussed.