Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science

Date   October 9th, 2018

Minutes of the 128th meeting of the OLC-IT

Present: Ammerlaan, Bolding (arrived at 11.13), van Grinsven, Heerlien (substitute chairwoman), Hillerström (minutes secretary), Langerak, Myśliwiec, Rensink (program director), Sperotto, Vonk

Not present: Boschma, Havinga, Molenkamp, Padberg

1. Openings and determining agenda
The meeting is opened at 10.47.
Heerlien is chairwoman this meeting, because Havinga is absent.

Myśliwiec would like to discuss the website of the PC-IT. The website will be discussed at point 8. A.O.B.

2. Announcement PD
The PD has invited Huisman to this meeting to thank her for being a member of the PC-IT since (at least) 2009. She was a very dedicated member, who delivered high quality work. This all is much appreciated. Therefore the PD hands Huisman appreciatory flowers. Huisman thanks the PC, she enjoyed her time as a member and wishes the PC lots of luck.
Huisman leaves the meeting at 10.52.

There are no further announcements

   Announcement working groups
No announcements.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence
- Mail Vonk – programme specific OER/TER

There is incoming correspondence from Vonk about a few corrections made in the programme specific TER. The email is for information. There are no further comments about this email.

4. Minutes of the 127th PC-IT meeting d.d. September 11th 2018
Langerak points out that in point 6 (page 3) it says that Langerak will be asked during the 128th meeting to be the new president of the curriculum workgroup.
Heerlien asks Langerak if he wants to be this president and Langerak says yes. Langerak is now the president of the curriculum workgroup. Langerak will ask Huisman (former president) for information on the tasks.

At point 4 (page 2) in the discussion of AP 313 it says that Langerak will be asked to take over Huisman's tasks regarding the appreciatory flower bouquets during the 128th meeting.
Heerlien asks if Langerak wants to take over these tasks. Langerak will do this and ask Huisman what these tasks exactly are. Langerak is now responsible for organizing the appreciatory flower bouquets.

Action points
307: In progress. The PD says it is not clear what the status is, he has not yet heard back about the status of the key-users of Osiris. The PD will ask what the status is.
313: Not yet done. The PD is working on a good way to involve the teachers of the program more. He thinks of sending an email, so he is collecting all email addresses of the teachers.

1

316:    Havinga is absent today. Status will be asked next time.
317:    Not yet done. The PD is collecting email addresses, after which he will send an email.
318:    Ammerlaan has discussed this. The conclusion was that a lunch lecture is not the best way to go. They have come up with the following alternatives:
- A discussion information lunch will be organized. An informal lunch in which the tasks of the PC will be explained and discussed.
- An interest lunch will be held. This lunch will be promoted in advance and only interested students will show up. There will be informal talking and opportunity for questions.
- Sending an email containing information about all the bodies involved and their tasks. This might be perceived as spam, but the interested students will be reached and show up at the interest lunch.

The PD thinks these are good ideas and when possible he will join the information lunch.

319:    The PD has brought this up with the managing director, whom has asked the building facilitator. He has not yet heard back from the building facilitator.
        The PD points out that the construction of the new Citadel has been put on hold and therefore it is important that the rooms will be improved.
320:    Done. The PD announces that 1.5 years before implementing a numerus fixus, an announcement should be made that there is the intention to get a numerus fixus. This means it should be announced in march 2019, if you want to implement it for the year 2020/2021.
        The PD wants to make preparatory moves to make this announcement. Once the announcement has been made, it is not obligatory to get a numerus fixus.
        Furthermore, the PD has heard indirectly that the UT does not want a numerus fixus. It is unclear if this is true, but that will become clear along the way. The PD will start the process to announce a numerus fixus. When this is set in motion the PD will bring this up in the PC again.

There are no further comments about the minutes and the minutes are approved.

5. IELTS score
EE has changed the passing score for the IELTS test to 6.5 (former: 6.0). All PCs have discussed changing the IELTS score, except for the PC-IT. The faculty counsel asked if PC-IT can discuss raising the IELTS score.
The IELTS is one of the exams all foreign students need to pass before they are accepted at the UT. The pas mark of only this exam is in question.

The discussion was already started a few meeting ago with Heijenk (former PD) and he wanted to gain insight in the number of students passing/failing the IELTS and in the received scores, before continuing with the discussion

Until thus far there is no more insight in these numbers. Langerak thinks it is not necessary to get these numbers, since he believes that the PC-IT should not decide on changing the IELTS score. This should be decided at a higher level in the organization.

Van Grinsven believes that the changed made by EE are only on paper and not in practice. This is because UT wide nothing has changed (the pass mark for the IELTS is 6.0), including at the admission office and therefore the admission office will accept EE students with a score of 6.0.

Van Grinsven also says that the TCP language centre advised against the change of the IELTS score. However, TCP did mention that at the end of the bachelor students do have difficulties writing their thesis. Therefore, it may be good to pay more attention to academic English during the program. There is an academic skills module in which this is possible.

2

– Bolding enters meeting at 11.13 –

The PD says he has not gotten any signal that the English level of the students is too low. Langerak agrees and says that the PC-IT should only have this discussion in case there is a problem with the English level.

Since this is a matter that should be changed UT wide and since there are no signs of any problems with the level of English of the IT students, the discussion on raising the IELTS score is ended.
The PC concludes that there is no need to look any further into changing the IELTS score, since there is no sign of any problems.

Because the faculty counsel wanted the PCs to discuss this, Heerlien will ask the faculty counsel if they expect the PC-IT to give an advice on this matter.

6. Change name Computer Science Croho
The PD found out that it is possible to change the official name of the bachelor Computer Science & Engineering to Technical Computer Science without bureaucratic nonsense.

First of all, what already has been done is changing the Dutch name on the diplomas to the English name, Computer Science & Engineering. This name is the name that is used in the Croho. Internally and for advertisement another name is used, namely Technical Computer Science.

Now the PD proposes to change the name in the Croho from Computer Science & Engineering to Technical Computer Science. In order to change the name, the FC needs positive advice of the PC-IT in writings this week. In case PC-IT is against changing the Croho name, than only the name on the diplomas will be changed.

Langerak firmly supports changing the name to Technical Computer Science. He dislikes the 'engineering' part of the current name, since often 'engineering' indicates that the study is on HBO level. Especially foreign students may get the wrong idea of the study and therefore not apply.

Bolding expresses his concerns with changing the name. TU Delft en TU Eindhoven both use Computer Science & Engineering. He wonders if it is a problem that the UT would have a different name.

The PD is firmly convinced this is not a problem since currently there are seven different programmes together in the accreditation process which each use different names.
Furthermore, the PD believes that the new suggested name clearly covers what the program is. The engineering part of the current name is not really present in the program. The term 'technical' suits the program better.
Langerak agrees that with the term 'technical' we show that the program is core computer science.

It is concluded that the PC-IT gives positive advice on changing the name. The name Technical Computer Science describes better what the program is than Computer Science & Engineering.

Heerlien will ask Havinga to put this positive advice in writing and send it to the PD before the 14th of October.

7. Quality Assurance
The PD likes to start a brainstorm about the quality assurance in both the bachelor and master.

Currently, for the bachelor, there are two ways in which the course and its exam are evaluated. There is a questionnaire, with a response rate of about only 30 percent and there is the OEC (onderwijs evaluatie commissie (education evaluation committee)). The OEC holds meetings in which students can give their

3

opinion on the course. Only a few students show up each time and these students are not representative for the entire year.

The PD believes that nothing is done with the data coming from the questionnaires and the OEC. This should be improved. Furthermore, teachers are not actively asked what they do with the feedback and they may not know what to do with the outcome of the questionnaires.

In the master there is a semester questionnaire, which students fill in twice a year. This questionnaire concerns all the courses a student followed in the past semester and there is little room to discuss individual courses/teachers. Teacher are not aware the semester questionnaire exists.

Langerak says that the philosophy behind the semester evaluations is to get an idea of the program as a whole, since the course evaluations do not give this overview.

The PD believes that the PC should discuss the evaluations.
Currently, the master evaluation process is discussed faculty wide. There is a discussion about revising the questionnaire and having a questionnaire on course level. There is also a quality assurance coordinator from EWI, Cynthia Souren.

Sperotto wonders who is responsible for raising the flag when a course is not good enough and how the teachers are notified about this.
According to Heerlien, currently, a problem is discovered by following courses them selves or by hearing from a fellow student.

Langerak find this unacceptable and says there used to be a subcommittee for quality assurance in the PC. He suggests that we set up a taskforce again.
The PD agrees and states that the PC is partly responsible for quality assurance, as well as the programme management is.

A quality assurance taskforce is formed with Bolding, Sperotto and Langerak as members. Bolding is the chairman.
Heerlien will ask if Boschma also wants to join the taskforce.
The taskforce should come up with a philosophy and procedure. The quality assurance coordinator of EWI should be involved as well.

The PD has some tips/inspiration for the taskforce.
- To get program wide feedback you could have larger meetings with students in which an open discussion is held and students give remarks. This would work well for the master.
- For the bachelor you can appoint students who serve as official representatives which will listen to the comments of fellow students and undertake action when they notice a problem.
- Regarding the OEC, the current model has a disadvantage. The teacher is present during the OEC, which can be intimidating and may cause students to be less explicit.
- To raise the response rate of the questionnaires, it could help to publish their outcomes. It is now completely unclear what happens with the questionnaires. You should leave out the open remarks, to make sure teachers do not get publicly shamed.

The taskforce will look into publishing the results of the questionnaires.
The taskforce is free to organize themselves. The accreditation needs a self-reflection in the summer of 2019. Everything that is done before then of planned is positive.

8. A.O.B. and proposal item next meeting
Myśliwiec points out that the website of the PC-IT is not up to date.

After quick googling it turns out that there are three versions of the PC-IT website. Also the names of the members, the dates of the meetings and the minutes are not up to date. The structure of the minutes needs improving as well.

It is unclear who is responsible for this.

Heerlien will ask Padberg if she know how to change this. The PD suggests to otherwise contact Nienke Nijenhuis – Broersma.

Langerak has a comment/question to the PD about the critical self-reflection that should be ready in the summer of 2019. He asks if it is planned to do a quick scan.

A quick scan is a two-hour session in which you quickly go through the programme to see what points for improvements are. It gives a first impression on what you can do in the critical self-reflection.

The PD likes the idea of a quick scan and plans to plan one.

The PD has an announcement:

The inflow of the first year bachelor is 199 students (last year: 139), of which slightly over 40% is international. The master has currently 53 students, (last year: 51) of which half is international.

There is an increase in master students expected, since the number of bachelor students has increased each year and it is expected that the bachelor students will continue with the master.

Furthermore, last year the master ended with 77 students.

The PD shares another issue, he would like to stop the master Internet Science and Technology (former: Telematics). There were only 2 enrolments this year and in total there are about 6 – 10 students. A few years ago the master was fully rebranded and reshaped, but this did not have any effect.

The PD is thinking about turning the IST master into a specialization of the CS master.

Sperotto mentions that it might be easy to do this, if both masters have quite a lot of overlap. Therefore, it is necessary to find out what the difference in exams are.

The PD will not start the process of termination this year, since the advertisement process has already been started. He just wanted to inform the PC, to receive feedback and not ambush the PC with this plan after it has been approved.

There are no proposal items for the next meeting.

8. Questions and Conclusions

Langerak has a question/suggestion about the evaluation forms for the final assignments in the bachelor. The evaluation forms for the design project and research project are pre-TEM and in Dutch.

There is a visitation coming up and it is very likely that these forms will be looked at, since they are regarding the final part of the study.

Therefore, Langerak suggest that he will look at the forms and make a proposal on what should be changed. During the next PC meeting this will be discussed.

The PD reacts to Hillerström her question on possible improvements for the minutes that it could be a good idea to make a list of decisions made during the PC-IT meeting and add these to the minutes.

The meeting is closed at 12.09.

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
316	September 2018	Reply to Polderman that update of TERs, concerning the scheduling error of AM module Signals and Uncertainty, is approved	Havinga	October 2018
317	September 2018	Make module coordinators aware that deadlines for correcting exams should be communicated to the students	PD	October 2018
319	September 2018	Make facility management of Citadel aware that lecture rooms need improvements (climate wise)	PD	October 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
322	October 2018	Ask Huisman what her tasks were concerning the appreciatory flower bouquets	Langerak	November 2018
323	October 2018	Ask the Faculty Counsel if they expect the PC to give an advice on the IELTS score discussion	Heerlien	November 2018
324	October 2018	Ask Havinga to put advice on the name change of Computer Science in the Croho in writing	Heerlien	October 14th, 2018
325	October 2018	Email the PD the positive advice of the PC on the name change of Computer Science in the Croho	Havinga	October 14th, 2018
326	October 2018	Ask Boschma if he wants to join the taskforce of PC on quality assurance	Heerlien	November 2018
327	October 2018	Ask Padberg if she knows how to change the content on the PC website	Heerlien	November 2018
328	October 2018	Review the evaluation forms for the final project in the bachelor and make a proposal on what can be changed	Langerak	November 2018

Decisions

4.1   Langerak is the president of the curriculum work group.
4.2   Langerak is responsible for organizing the appreciatory flower bouquets.
4.3   The PD will start the process to announce numerus fixus.
5.1   The PC will only discuss changing the IELTS score, when there are signs of problems with the English level of the students. Otherwise, changing the IELTS score is not a subject of the PC-IT.
6.1   The PC gives positive advice on changing the name in the Croho from Computer Science & Engineering to Technical Computer Science.
7.1   A quality assurance taskforce is formed with Bolding, Sperotto and Langerak as members. Bolding is the chairman.
7.2   The quality assurance taskforce will look into publishing the results of the questionnaires.
8.1   In the 129th meeting of the PC Langerak's proposal on changes on the evaluation forms will be discussed.
8.2   From now on the minutes will contain a list of decision made during the meeting.