

Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science

Date: July 3rd, 2018

Minutes of the 126th meeting of the PC-IT

Present:

To be added in a later version.

1. Opening and determining agenda

The meeting was opened at 10:48. Huisman has indicated absence. Reidsma will arrive later and only partially attend the meeting.

2. Announcement PD

National Student Survey

There is an announcement on the National Student Survey (NSS).

We have a slight decrease in score; average of all universities has decreased more than our score. In some cases our scores even increase while those of other universities has decreased. There is a short discussion about whether the scores are for Computer Science or Technical Computer Science. In the end, Bolding comments that the scores are probably for 'Technische Informatica' (Technical Computer Science). In September the PC-IT can see how it turns out with respect to the global average, by then the PC-IT can see if there are things that need improvements.

Boschma mentions he sees a drop in group size and internationalisation. PD can understand where the group size score is coming from, but he finds it hard to interpret the internationalisation score.

PD mentions that the Masters programmes had lower scores over the previous years but have now increased somewhat. The scores are still slightly below average, and some points really stand out such as providing information, which will be one of the things that can be discussed in September. For Internet, Science & Technology the sample size was too small to have any statistical relevance.

First-year students

Concerning first-year students there are no new insights, 200 students are still expected with $\frac{1}{3}$ coming from abroad.

Last meeting of PD Computer Science

This is the last meeting of PD as chair of the programme, in September Rensink will take over. (At the time of the meeting this had not been announced yet, ed.) PD thanks all members for their cooperation. Some members comment on their experiences with the PD over the last few years.

11:04 Reidsma joins the meeting

Announcement working groups

There are no announcements from the working groups.

3. Module 6 Intelligent Interaction Design

Last time the evaluation results of module 6 were on the agenda, but the committee thought it would be better to discuss this when Reidsma was present. PD asks Reidsma to go through the evaluation and his plans for next year.

Last year the module was split for TCS/BIT and CreaTe into separate modules. The reason for this was that CreaTe had a lot more background knowledge concerning HMI and TCS/BIT had more background knowledge concerning AI. The gap seemed to get bigger every year, which is why the module was split and adjusted to the programmes. The main structure of the module did not change. Many evaluation sessions have been held throughout and after the module.

The positive outcome: it seems the right topics are put together in this module at this point.

The main critique: the communication and organization with respect to the HCI part was not really under control all too well. Reasons for this may be the new teaching methods/material and a new teacher who is still getting used to these students and this particular topic in this setting. There are some more specific comments but the HCI part seems to be the main thing to work on for next year.

For next year some of these problems will resolve themselves because the teaching staff can build upon the materials from the previous year. This means that organization and communication should be a lot smoother. Reidsma mentions that, apart from the previous points, the Christmas holidays had quite an impact on the students. One of the things Reidsma is thinking of is planning a 'shelving' lecture before the holidays and planning a 'restart' lecture after the holidays in order to transfer knowledge accordingly over these two weeks of vacation.

An extra lecture on classifiers would - especially for BIT - be more relevant in the longer term, so we will try to include that next year. For AI there was also a question about the relation between the AI and HCI part of the module, i.e. 'How can we use the AI knowledge in the HCI course?'. Reidsma thinks this does not work so well, because if you want to make the AI techniques relevant for an HCI project you basically need the Master level version of that course and he thinks that if you want to teach that in year 2 of the Bachelor you will have other problems. What can be done is showing specific examples of how AI can become relevant to HCI.

For this, two lectures would be added. Kortstra mentions that adding specific lectures for this might not work and one could better add it to existing lectures. Reidsma says that will be hard since the other lectures are focussed on basic techniques. Havinga comments that

there might not be room for extra lectures, PD replies by saying that the evaluation clearly shows students did not put a lot of time into this module, however, they also indicate they did not learn that much, which suggests there would be room for additional material. Reidsma finds it very hard to decide on interventions in his teaching on the basis of the questions in the evaluation documents.

Reidsma thinks that students overestimate their competences concerning talking to users, many people think it is very straightforward and do not put a lot of effort in. This is possible but it does not make for qualitative good results. Reidsma says year by year they have plans to be more demanding towards students. Heerlien suggests giving the students more choice concerning their choice of method. Reidsma says this is already a possibility, and he thinks that people who are not already interested in this particular topic will not suddenly become interested because they can choose their method.

Reidsma adds that many solutions work in retrospect but not beforehand, because beforehand a lot seems superficial. Reflection works way better than investing more in knowledge beforehand. The scores do, however, not indicate that students think they have learned a lot from reflection. Reidsma thinks this effect is in fact there. Several other members ask if it is possible to make students realise they have in fact learned from their reflection. Reidsma replies this seems to happen only later in students' university career. Reidsma concludes that students have shown him they learned a lot, but they do not fill it in in the evaluation.

Bolding thinks the students may think they have learned something, but they may not see the value in it. For example, 'I learned how to communicate with people' may not be something students find relevant new knowledge. Kempen indicates that she thinks it is concerning that if students have learned something but they do not feel that way. What may come into play is that they start with certain expectations, derived from other students or prejudice, which may make for some resistance. Perhaps it would a good idea if a student from, for example, the Master programme HMI could explain how the knowledge is relevant to the field, according to Kempen.

The level of appreciation of the students is very low, which concerns PD. At some point the scores should go towards more average numbers. Reidsma comments that low scores demotivate teachers and the teaching staff is not teaching in order for students to 'have a good time', so he is happy with some resistance from the students as long as it does not become destructive resistance. It flips over into destructive resistance regularly which worries Reidsma more than low student appreciation for the module. Many students, according to him, do not feel this module is relevant to them because 'they will be a computer scientist, and they do not work with users'. PD says it is their role as teacher to teach students that is wrong.

Boschma comments that the main problem remains the organizational part of the HCI course, not whether students feel they have actually learned something or not. Boschma does not see problems with the learning goals, when he finished the course he did not think he would ever use it but later on it turned out he would. Reidsma replies that these

organizational and communication problems that they have experienced again are very problematic, since these things are much more damaging to already resistant students. If the course would be smoother, resistant students would flow through more easily, he thinks.

The PC-IT wonders whether the taken measures to improve organization are scalable enough for the years to come. Reidsma says he is not worried about the scaling yet. Havinga emphasizes that - with the experienced organizational problems - a lot of thought should be put into making absolutely sure that scalability is achieved.

Boschma mentions that one of the problems was that the coordinator was not visible enough. He asks if it is even possible for the coordinator to teach in the same module he/she coordinates. He adds that while Reidsma is in this coordinator of the TCS/BIT module he does not teach in it and is thus quite invisible. Reidsma says this is a good question. In the report it is stated that it 'might' be good to add an extra teacher, Boschma says this is not very concrete. Reidsma states there is no random supply of teachers laying around, thus making it hard to 'just' add an extra teacher.

Bolding asks if the good citizenship grade will be continued next year. Boschma adds that the reason this question is asked is that it appeared some students passed their courses because of that grade. Bolding also asks what the value of this grade is and if it isn't a better idea to change this to a bonus instead of a mark so the passing of the course/module is not dependant on 'being a good citizen'. Reidsma agrees that a bonus as described by Bolding is a strong suggestion that would improve the good citizenship. If the staff continues the good citizenship they want to try this method. The grading scheme should then be adapted, Havinga mentions, and the PC-IT should be informed of these changes. PD adds that the grading scheme should be published two weeks before the start of the module.

Boschma has a last comment on the extra resit. Reidsma explains that previously one extra resit was granted to students who needed only one repair to pass the module. This resit could be for Statistical Techniques, for which a resit was already organized, or for the AI course. Reidsma mentions he did grant people an extra resit, but forgot to officially inform the PD and exam committee of this. The repair was taken into account in the manual but it was not in the grading scheme.

Heerlien wonders why the second resit is even there, since the module apparently is 'quite easy'. PD says that, would it be proposed again, the PD would probably deny the extra resit. In addition, if the exam committee does not approve it, it is not possible anyway. Reidsma replies he had the intention to include this extra resit, but now has doubts since he thinks it will be shot down. He argues that the extra resit saves 10-15% of the students from coming back, and it is the choice of the PC-IT, PD and exam committee to either approve or deny this extra resit.

Kempen cannot find it in the documents but says there have been complaints about guest lectures which were seen as highly promotional by students. Reidsma thinks that someone who is already averse to the topic will easily shoot down guest lectures as promotions. Reidsma says he would - if they came in - disregard complaints concerning promotion in

guest lectures since he thinks it is nonsense. Kempen adds that the study association organizes lunch lectures weekly and maybe students compare the guest lectures to those. She also adds once again that a lecture from a student within the department could be more beneficial to the course. Reidsma replies by saying that he thinks that students who are not interested in this topic do not exhibit a lot of respect for older students, so he thinks this will not work out.

Comments from Huisman

The comments from Huisman will be forwarded to Reidsma.

12:00 Reidsma leaves the meeting

4. Incoming/Outgoing correspondence

A new meeting schedule was proposed over email.

Boschma will not be present at point 8. Molenkamp will not be present on September 11th. The overall scheme is great. Padberg will create invitations for the new schedule.

5. Minutes & Actions of the 125th PC-IT meeting d.d. June 5th, 2018

Boschma asks whether it is or is not the case whether the Dutch version of the TER is leading. Van Grinsven says it is allowed to have a completely English document as long as the target audience is fully English, at least that was the case for the Masters programme. She is not completely sure about the Bachelor programme.

Boschma also asks why at some point Dutch abbreviations (for example, 'V' for 'voldoende') are used. PD comments that he should have been going after that for his action point but has until now not done so.

PD comments that under point 2 some percentages are mentioned, but they are not percentages, they are actual numbers.

Boschma mentions some first names are used throughout the document.

The minutes state a 'replacement is actively being searched for', but PD thinks they discussed his replacement and the programme committee agreed to the candidate. It should probably be noted that this was the case without naming the candidate.

Kempen mentions that the minutes state she is both present and not present, but she was not present. Sperotto says she is listed as present but was also not present.

PD mentions that at point 5, 3rd paragraph it ends with 'this should be communicated to the module coordinators better' which should actually be an action point for PD which is in fact not done. Boschma thought it was done because he noticed that in some cases the problem was already solved. PD thinks it is still a good idea to take this action point upon him.

Reidsma his name is misspelled on the bottom of page 3.

Actions

292: Done. Meeting has taken place, slides were sent to several teachers to see whether there was overlap and the teachers commented that some things was similar, but there was no concerning overlap.

296: Done. Has been discussed with Macnish and proposal is on the agenda.

307: This action remains on the list.

308: Done. Tews says it's still doable, but he is also thinking about organizing in a different way.

309: This action has been completed.

310: This action has been completed.

311: Done. The lecturers agree with the view of the the PC-IT that there is indeed too much overlap. This has been communicated to Hartel, but there has not been a response yet.

312: Boschma explains the complaints were: not well-structured, outdated materials, book was not suitable study material, no survey sent to students, problems with tools, documentation, the list goes on. Boschma does not think it will improve if nothing extra is done and would like to see an improvement plan. The PC-IT agrees Boschma may give his input as representative of the committee. The PC-IT can still demand an evaluation or can demand an improvement plan. This action remains on the list.

313: Due to Huisman's absence this action remains on the list.

6. Computer Ethics

There are two important points: the way of assessment and increasing the level. In order to make sure the latter does not affect students from different Bachelor programmes extra videos will be made to make sure they can be on the right level as well. PD states these are technically two proposals in one.

Boschma says a 24-hour exam is not the way to go and would like to change it to, for example, 9:00 in the morning till 18:00 in the evening. He thinks people will try to spend 20 hours on it, which does not seem healthy. Molenkamp says the proposal would thus be 8 hours. Huisman has touched upon a different point in her comments which states that students should prepare before the 24 hours start which requires a lot of discipline. PD says Master students should be responsible enough to do that.

PD concludes the overall opinion is to limit the assignment to 8 hours and agree with the rest of the proposed changes (the increase in level and the corresponding videos, ed.).

7. Module 5 maths

The proposal is to split the big resit into two partial resits. The partial exams (not the resits, ed.) are scheduled on the same day. Heerlien thinks it makes more sense to have the first partial exams on seperate days. Mysliwiec suggests the first resit could take place before the

initial second partial exam, to make sure that students have an incentive to know all parts of the first partial exam as pre-knowledge for the second partial exam. Molenkamp states the reason the current planning is done the way it is is probably due to the project and can therefore hardly be changed.

Ask the Mathematics teacher of Computer Systems whether there is a scheduling mistake concerning the first two partial exams being on the same date. (actionpoint PD)

8. Proposal items next meeting

The next meeting will take place on September 11th.

Heerlien got a question from the faculty council stating that the programme committees discussed the IELTS score and that EE updated their standard to a 6.5 while the other committees left it at a 6.0. Heerlien cannot remember that the PC-IT has discussed it. The consensus is that the PC-IT has not had an active discussion concerning the increase of the IELTS minimum for students. PD suggests that we should have the discussion on this topic based on facts, not just opinions.

It is asked whether there is an indication that we should change our minimum, PD feels that there is need to do so, but that is based on a feeling, not facts. The rest of the committee agrees.

It is mentioned that the new programme director may not be able to attend the meeting in September. Padberg will ask if the meeting should be moved.

8. A.O.B.

It is brought up that Huisman will quit the PC-IT starting the 1st of September.

Announce the vacancy within the department, and perhaps ask possible candidates.
(actionpoint chairman)

Ammerlaan will get rights to the PC-IT files, Kempen requests her rights to be removed after September 1st, as she might still need the files to summarize the previous year.

PD brings up that it would be useful for the PC-IT to create a yearly report. The committee agrees. (No action point given, ed.)

9. Questions and conclusion

There are no questions. The meeting is closed at 12:42.

Appendix A. Action List.

#	Action	Who?	Deadline	Status
307	Start a discussion about a shift from Dutch (Voldoende, Niet voldoende) to international terms on diplomas	PD	July 2018	In progress
312	Discuss the students' complaints with the teacher of the Service Oriented Architecture course	Boschma	September 2018	In progress
313	Remind the teachers and module coordinators of the possibility to send students appreciatory flower bouquets.	Huisman	September 2018	In progress
314	Ask the Mathematics teacher of Computer Systems whether there is a scheduling mistake concerning the first two partial exams being on the same date.	PD	September 2018	New
315	Announce the vacancy within the department, and perhaps ask possible candidates.	Havinga	September 2018	New