

Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science

Date: Tuesday December 11th, 2018
Location: Carre, Room 3244
Time: 10.45 – 12.30 hour

Minutes of the 130th meeting of the OLC-IT

Present: Ammerlaan, Bolding, Boschma, Havinga (chairman), Heerlien, Van Grinsven, Langerak, Myśliwiec, Molenkamp, Molenwijk (minutes secretary), Padberg, Rensink (program director), Vonk.
Not present with notification: Sperotto

1. Opening and Determining agenda

The meeting is opened at 10.44hr.

There is one missing agenda point as mentioned in the last meeting's action points about the 3+2 programs. It was discussed beforehand whether or not to put this on the agenda but in the end it was not because at the moment there is nothing concrete to discuss.

2. Announcement PD

Update: Number of actions started in regards to the name change of the bachelor

The name change for the Bachelor is approved/about to be approved by the University Council (decision announced by the university board). This will then go to NVAO to implement it and they will decide to further consult universities Delft and Eindhoven, who currently share the name Computer Science Engineering (Technische Informatica) with us, if they wish to change name as well. If they choose not to change the name then this will result in a separate CROHO label. That is the state of affairs up until now. The name will still be used, as it has in the last few years, but the official name on the diplomas is affected. The official name on the diplomas has to wait until a decision has been made.

Internet Science and Technology(IST)/Computer Science (CS)

The update about changing Internet Science and Technology (IST) from a separate master into a specialisation of Computer Science (CS) will be discussed at agenda point 6.

- 10.48 Ammerlaan enters the meeting. -

Investigating numerus fixus (NF) voor bachelor CS

This year about 200 students enrolled. General consensus is that this number can be accommodated but not for instance 300 students. At the moment there are no means of control over the influx. Eindhoven already has NF of 250 for this study year (increase to 300 next year). Delft did not have a NF which resulted in an enrolment of about 880 students this year. In response to this they will impose NF of 500 for next year, 2019. This means that in 2019 the UT will be the only university out of these three that do not have NF.

There have been some debates on NF with the PD. Most of those involved concur that preparation should be started for NF for 2020. However, there are severe objections from the University Board, backed up by a position from the minister. The University Board do not want NF at all, especially not for CS because society needs these students. It is therefore difficult to defend a NF decision. A discussion has been opened up about the topic but this should first start with the Faculty Board before getting to the University Board. Minister has announced she doesn't want to allow NF anymore for programs of whom the alumni can easily get jobs or are needed. Open a discussion about NF and on how to enable us to allow more student if you wish a larger enrolment.

There are some stringent constraints on the motivation for not being able to accommodate the numbers. Currently is it unknown what these restraint are but the Dean has asked the PD what would be needed to accommodate say 300 or 500 CS students. At the moment there is no number for NF in mind yet.

The increase in CS students is both due to larger influx in foreign students and due to an influx in Dutch students.

The expectation on what is going to happen in regards to NF is as follows:

1. The process for NF can be started up.
2. It will be too late to start the process. Given the resistance to the idea, this will most likely be the case. Many board and councils have to make a short term decision.

Currently the position of the Faculty Board is that the discussion won't be brought to the University Board until the discussion has been held fully within Faculty Board. It would be a good idea to ask advice from the PC to use as argument in the discussion. If you could get a good calculation on what the programme would be able to handle in regards to the students, backed by the programme board, then this could support the argument for NF. **AP** Boschma will assist PD in this calculation. **AP** This will be discussed further during the next meeting. **AP** Ask people who have done this in the past for arguments *numerus fixus*, how this was achieved. Create for instance has some experience with this process.

Language policy

PD believes that the consequences of having an English programme have not been fully implemented. It should mean we abandon Dutch as spoken (means speaking English all the time) and written language for the study (no longer offer Dutch versions of teaching material when it is available; teachers refuse or do not realize that Dutch students might have an advantage over foreign students this way).

Announcement working groups

Further on in the meeting there is a progress report.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence

Respons to mail about complaints from the course SOA

Boschma states that the information stated in the mail is not too concrete. The suggestion is to see how it goes, plan some more evaluation/feedback sessions and a meeting to see whether changes reach their target. At the moment a more concrete plan is not expected to be coming.

It is a promising plan without concrete steps. PD suggests to trust in the intentions and experience of the teacher; plenty of grounds to monitor but for the moment it can be observed where they are taking everything. The course level questionnaire provides a good opportunity to question and watch for improvement. This course level questionnaire is there for the master courses and will be implemented as a measurement. The idea is to get a response from students as well as reflections from teachers. Do the same thing as for the Bachelor. The evaluation together with the teacher's reflection should end up at the PC. Not to be discussed in full detail but in essence for your information. There it can be decided to do more. The PC will get this information..

The mandatory book for the course will become recommended instead. This seems a bit odd. The course information in Osiris however states that the book is no longer mandatory. The old version of the book can be found online.

4. Minutes of the 129th PC-IT meeting d.d. November 13th 2018

Page 2: There is some information about renaming PC-IT to PC-CS. The question arises if a decision has been made because it has not been mentioned. The decision is stated at the end of the minutes in the decisions list (decision 4.1). It should however also be noted on the second page.

Page 4: Questions of whether or not IST students should get a CS diploma. Is IST content more CS oriented or EE oriented? Conclusion is not stated but it was decided that IST content is sufficient for CS on diploma.

313: Done.

321: The Osiris team was contacted. Shifting to English is difficult because Osiris can only deal with one language and would need to be rebuilt. Therefore, approval from the whole university is needed and approval for the exact terms that are going to be used. This is in process. If only the text on the diploma supplement were to be changed the university can do this itself with approval of all the programmes. If it was the intention to

also change the grade part of the supplement (O for insufficient and V for sufficient), then there is a big rebuilding needed because all historical data will be changed. This is probably not going to happen. It would be nice to see it changed in the future but at the moment it is still in progress. Done.

329: Removed. Nothing concrete to discuss.

330: There was a meeting with the programme director but not yet with Cynthia. The point of the mentioned meeting is to get an idea of what the policies are faculty wide, to get CS policies in line with faculty and to discuss and see what faculty has. Remains.

331: Langerak talked to Reisdma about this topic to clear up some misunderstandings and clarify parts of the report. Information in the syllabus versus the manual. The manual does not contain all the details, which is quite usual. Done.

332: Done.

334: On agenda. Done.

335: Also on agenda. Done.

336: Done.

337: Some read the bylaws but not everyone. Remains.

338: Done.

339: Done. It is on the agenda so it will be discussed.

340: Done.

341: Done. Answers were received. It will be discussed in agenda point 3.

5. Evaluation module

A Progress report workgroup Quality + B Course reflection for coordinators

It is mentioned that one problem with the evaluation is perhaps that specific modules have separate parts to them. However feedback is for the module in general instead of for one of the parts but this does not come back until the comments. A suggestion is to add points to evaluation so it can be more specific, resulting in a longer evaluation.

PD remarks that questionnaires consist of standard blocks depending on how the module is organized. There has been a discussion about allowing non-standard blocks (customizing) and the outcome was that it should be allowed but not at the cost of the standard blocks.

It is decided to change anything at the moment and park this discussion for now. It should first be decided what to do with these evaluations and course reflections. Experience and try out the reflection first before making any changes. At the moment it is lightweight and fast. If there is a part missing then this should come up anyways. Teachers should be invited to reflect and react so to keep them in the loop and do something with the evaluation. It is an invitation and not forced to react. It can then be observed if teachers do this reflection and if not, to motivate them to do so. At the moment a few of the teachers that were asked have replied. Not all the reflections (module 1 and 5) have been received yet. It would be a good idea to put evaluations on Canvas page.

C Module Pearls of CS

There were many negative remarks on the Haskell week and Intelligent interaction week. In the Haskell week it is more likely due to the difficulty of the final project. The Intelligent Interaction week has been a problem for a while and there has been no improvement. Last year there were no improvements due to a teacher switch. It is stated that it was changed this year.

PD remarks that he received a reflection that acknowledges that intelligent interaction needs improvement from the ground up. There were numerous complaints directed at every components of the Pearl. PD was contacted on how to improve the various parts of this Pearl. Bucur is aware of this problem. It has taken up a lot of attention and will be taken seriously. Good improvement for next year is expected.

One of the students remarks in the questionnaire that there are too many sign offs.; what makes the Crypto Pearl so good is that they are not pushed; there are no sign-offs and their entire attention could be focused on learning. Conclusion to this is that sign-offs for the first module would be good to keep. Not a lot of problems with it. It is stated that the teachers and module-coordinators will also see the evaluation and most likely incorporate this feedback.

Students also stated it was loud during lectures which resulted in lectures being hard to follow. There were 221 students and whether or not they are talking depends on the lecture. The teacher should be able to deal with this so responsibility lies there.

D Module Computer Systems

Students do not have to be signed-off by the teacher but most of the students are signed off by TA's. There is apparently a difference in checking between TA and Teacher. PD suggests that this is a method for module-coordinator to resolve. The evaluation has made the Module-coordinator aware of this. The PC has not yet received a reflection from the teacher on this module. Move to next meeting. Kokkeler informed Padberg that this reflection would be finished in January. After receiving the reflection from Kokkeler this can be discussed further during the January meeting. **AP** Ask Kokkeler to provide the course reflection before the next meeting.

E Smart Spaces incl. course reflection

The course reflection states that in particular CS students have difficulty with programming and do not know any programming language except for Java. Response to this is that it is quite a harsh statement especially considering the low response rate of 4. Evidence doesn't justify the very strong statement. It is questioned if it is a trend or a single case and response is that it seems to be a singular case. There were no problems with this last year. Difference seem to be linked to the fact that this is a minor so it might be due to the difference in disciplines.

Two students filled in the open ended remarks for improvement. One student remarked on how mobile focused the module is. However, seeing that this is only one opinion you can't really generalize this.

You get more information due to the teachers course reflection form, which is a good thing. The feedback was sent to teacher with course reflection form so they could take this into account. The teachers is becoming a part of the process. This is still a work in progress and more experience is needed with this way of working.

Another part of the process would to focus on positive feedback and not only on possible improvement. It would probably be appreciated to thank teachers for their reflection and send positive feedback to the teacher from the PC. **AP** The Teaching Workshop Quality can send this lightweight feedback.

6. Master Internet Science and Technology

Advice on admission as a specialisation at the master CS

There is a question of why to put IST in a CS specialization while it is content wise very close to EE. Response to this is that it is an unfortunate choice of words. It is related to EE but content wise it is different. It is more CS. **AP** Give advice (in a written letter) to approve the continuance of M-IST as a specialization of CS and sent this to the faculty council.

7. Module 7 Discrete structures and Efficient Algorithms

A Letter teacher + B Update learning goals

There is a proposal for some minor changes within the Discrete Structures and Efficient Algorithms module that starts in February. The context has to do with the assessment. Students do a project writing code at end of module and write research paper on any topic. Discussion was started by the fact that the paperwriting was difficult to accommodate for the number of students due to giving feedback. This also started a discussion on how to evaluate. The papers put a big strain on students in a period where especially CS students have difficulty finishing due to for instance Algebra. There was a division of labor in project teams with 5 students. A part focusses on programming and a part on writing the report.

The suggestion is to focus on programming and write small report instead of large paper. This would be a watered down version of the paper but documenting scientific software. Instead of ticking off they get a grade for their software programming and groups could be smaller. Everyone is happy with that but it means a slight change in learning objectives. For CS there is a learning objective on scientific writing which is not the case for the mathematicians. However, CS students were doing the programming and mathematicians the scientific writing. This is late for an official report so instead now a letter was sent to PC for approval though it's pretty late in cycle. It is an observation as a supervisor. There could be smaller teams of 4 (with if possible 1 math student per group) and there would be no escape to divide work because the small report will be on the programming part to substantiate what they have done. They will get grades for this based on criteria rather than just ticking off criteria. As result math students can no longer just write report and CS write code.

PC agrees that is a good, helpful proposal and there do not seem to be any negative implications. **AP** The PC gives positive advice in a short letter or email. The learning objectives are not on Osiris yet but an update of the learning goals (change in scientific writing) will have to be put in Osiris. The module coordinator can take care of updating the learning objectives..

C Evaluation report

No comments on the evaluation report.

8. Documentation PC

Report 2017-2018

General consensus is that the report covers most of it. There is however a question if the title (name) is right. PC-IT is correct.

AP The report is approved and can be placed on the website.

Annual cycle

Plan is not very detailed yet.

Report quality insurance and reflection can be done every quartile instead of every half year.

The following months are decided on after some discussion on what would be the best month to do this:

1e quartile: December

2e quartile: March

3e quartile: June

4e quartile: September

For the preparation for TER the months below are decided on. This should also be changed in the annual plan. It is unknown what input there would be at this moment so it might not be possible to start. It is agreed to start early and then to see what happens.

April: Preparation TER B-CS R&G

March Preparation TER M-CS/IST R&G

Mei should be changed to May.

Date for the annual report:

It is more reasonable to discuss the annual report in October instead of September.

AP Correct the annual cycle with aforementioned changes.

When to have the course program ready should be discussed further during the next meeting. **AP** Agenda point for the next meeting. The course program is needed for the TER.

By-laws

Another point to discuss is a practical thing for the PC. What are the rules for sending in documents. At the moment is it stated in the 'huisregels' that this should be done one week before the meeting. The question is do we need these bylaws. **AP** It needs to be looked at in the next meeting. The action point from last meeting on the by-laws should remain.

9. Visitation process

Self-reflection-team

AP Agenda point for the next meeting.

10. A.O.B and Proposal item next meeting

11. Questions and Conclusion

The meeting is closed at 12.25hr.

Action Items

#	Meeting	Description	Person	Deadline
330	November 2018	Schedule a meeting with Cynthia Souren and PD	Quality assurance working group	January 2019
337	November 2018	Read and review the by-laws (in Dutch)	Everybody	January 2019
342	December 2018	Calculation on the amount of students that the programme would be able to handle (for argument <i>numerus fixus</i>)	PD and Boschma	January 2019
343	December 2018	Add calculation (see 342) to next meeting's agenda	Padberg	January 2019
344	December 2018	Consult others that have (had) <i>numerus fixus</i> about the process (for arguments)	PD	January 2019
345	December 2018	Ask Kokkeler to provide the course reflection before the next meeting (so it can be discussed)	Padberg	January 2019
346	December 2018	Send thanks and feedback to teachers on their course reflection	Quality assurance working group	January 2019
347	December 2018	Write a letter with advice to approve the continuance of M-IST as a specialization of CS (to be sent to the faculty council)	Chairman	January 2019
348	December 2018	Write a letter/email with positive advice for changes within the assessment of Module 7	Chairman	January 2019
349	December 2018	Download report 2017-2018 to the website	Padberg	January 2019
350	December 2018	Make changes to annual cycle as discussed in the meeting	Padberg	January 2019
351	December 2018	Add to next meeting's agenda: when to have the course program ready, by-laws and visitation process	Padberg	January 2019

Decisions

- 5.1 Teachers will receive positive feedback on their course reflection. This will be provided by the Quality assurance working group.
- 6.1 The PC has approved the continuance of M-IST as a specialization of CS.
- 7.1 The PC has approved the minor changes within the assessment forms of module 7 Discrete Structures and Efficient Algorithms. The report will become a small paper on substantiating the programming students have done. Learning objectives will have to be updated.
- 8.1 The PC has approved the report 2017-2018. This will be placed on the website.