Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science

Date   March 13th, 2017

Minutes of the 123rd meeting of the OLC-IT

Present:, Bolding, Boschma, Hartvelt (minutes secretary), Havinga, Heerlien, Heijenk (Programme Director), Heijnen (10:49), Huisman, Kempen, Kortstra, Padberg-Heskamp

Van Grinsven is ill, Molenkamp has cancelled and Sperotto is not present due to her pregnancy leave

1. Opening and determining agenda

The meeting is opened at 12:45.

Heerlien mentions we might need to discuss the National Student Enquiry. PD will make an announcement about this.

2. Announcement PD

There was a response rate of around 30-35% for the National Student Enquiry. While this is under the UT average, it is a pretty good score. That's the only thing PD can tell as for now.

In the 'Keuzegids', the computer science bachelor scored as a top education. The score for the master has stopped its downtrend, but with 56 points we're in spot 9 out of 10, which is not good. The scores of spots 5 to 9 are pretty close. Our score is 'reasonable', as are the other 4 above us. The score is determined through visitation, in which we scored sufficient. The most important factor are the NSE scores of the past year, but even though we scored a bit better, we've not improved enough compared to other universities. We have to wait until the next NSE scores until we can make a plan of action to improve the programme.

PD is working on the founding of a 'Talent IT' programme to help businesses in Twente to find employees from the UT. Most students move to the West to work after their studies. This programme will focus on offering internships and side jobs for students of the UT. The Saxion students in the last 2,5 years of their programme will also participate in this. This programme will help students by paying a part of their tuition fee as compensation.

A month ago, the Master Week took place to offer prospects of masters to current bachelor students. There were no specific reactions from students, just about the planning, which was suboptimal. To circumvent this, video was taken of the presentations by the video committee of Inter-*Actief.* This video will be distributed to the people who missed the activities.

3. Incoming/Outgoing Correspondence

A week is not enough to form an opinion and changes about the OER. Just giving the programme committee a week is not taking the PC seriously, and this should be communicated back. There will be a PC meeting in the week before the week in which the OER should be discussed. In reality, the concept version of the OER has never been on time, making this even more difficult. In the current planning, the programme committee has much less time than the faculty committee, which is unfair. Huisman mentions the PC should have as much time as the FC, who have three weeks. The PC meeting of the 10th of April will be changed to the 26th of April, and used to discuss the Master OER. The members of the OER working group of the programme committee will block the 10th of April in their calendar to make changes to the OER. The meeting on the 8th of May will then be cancelled.

The May vacation will be two weeks, which complicates the planning of programme committee meetings to discuss the bachelor OER. The programme committee meeting would take place on the 5th of June, giving the OER working group a week to discuss it. Additionally, the OER working group will meet on the 29th of May.

4. Minutes & Actions of the 122nd meeting

The question is asked whether the updated version of the minutes of the 121st meeting is already finished, as none of the committee members have seen it yet. They have not been made yet. This, along with several improvements to the minutes of the 122nd meeting will be communicated by the secretary to the secretary of those minutes.

There is a discussion about the part of the minutes in which the possible overlap between the reflection courses and ethics courses in the bachelor and master is discussed. Boschma wonders whether any actions have been made as a result of the discussion during the last meeting. Heijnen will organise a meeting together with van Grinsven to evaluate the overlap between these reflection and ethics courses between the Bachelor and the Master.

265   Ongoing action. The results are not definitive yet, as the exam committee is still working on them.
283   Ongoing
292   Ongoing, as discussed above.
293   Completed
294   Completed. This action was about the course Basic Machine Learning. The question was whether there was enough capacity. Poel will adjust the capacity through student assistants if necessary.
295   Completed. Meratnia will make a module guide to properly inform students about deadlines.

5. Courses

The Study Tour course has been discussed before. Stienstra, Pires and the Study Tour Committee of Inter-*Actief* have been consulted since. The courses are identical between the bachelor and the master. It has been accepted as an official UT minor for CS and BIT students. In order to this, the two variants for participants and organisers have been merged. The course has been made independent of the destination of the study tour, to ensure the course can be re-used in next iterations of the study tour. In order to make this as open and reusable as possible, maybe some restrictions such as the use of the STARR reflection model should not be made explicit. As for the grading, the PD has the final responsibility, but the grading will be done by the teachers of the course. The course is accepted by the programme committee.

The Software Evolution course is a one-time course. Boschma asks why the lectures aren't videotaped to provide the possibility for a repeat instance of the course. PD will discuss this with Rensink, who will discuss it with the responsible person at the TU Eindhoven. Even if repeatability is not achieved, it is still a good idea to organise the course for this year only. There is a discussion about whether Rensink could organise the course in the future at the UT. However, he would not be the suitable person to organise this in the future.

6. Swap of Dutch and English name of the bachelor programme

In 2019, if no changes are made, all international students who graduate will officially have "Technische Informatica" on their diploma. To prevent this, a request to DUO could be submitted to change the current second name 'Computer Science & Engineering' to the official first name of the programme. Everyone agrees this is a good idea. The PD mentions he will try to complete this before February and the start to the process will be made as soon as possible. The chairman will communicate an official recommendation about this to the PD.

There is a discussion about whether the name 'Technical Computer Science' which has recently been used in official communication should still be used, or also be changed to 'Computer Science & Engineering'. The decision was made to use 'Technical Computer Science' in official communication as it appeals more to German students than 'Computer Science & Engineering'. The programme committee agrees there should be uniformity as the current divide between two names is confusing. The official name of the programme in Delft and Eindhoven is 'Computer Science & Engineering'. The decision is made to change the official name in communication to 'Computer Science & Engineering' starting at the moment of the aforementioned English name swap.

7. Quality Agreement

The UT has received extra money from the government in order to increase the quality of the education, at the expense of the student grants. There is an open question to the programme committee about how to achieve this increase in quality. A few themes concerning quality agreements are given in the letter that was sent to the programme committee. Heerlien mentions the results of the NSE could be used as pointers as to in which areas improvements should be made. Bolding mentions there should be better monitoring on quality. The example of module 6 is given. However, the PD mentions that changes are being made according to the feedback, although they have not panned out as improvements yet. For these quality improvements, there is a budget of roughly €200 per student.

The PD mentions Inter-*Actief* could organise an activity or poll to gather ideas for improvements and investments. Kempen and the other present students agree this could be a good idea. Kempen is going to discuss this at Inter-*Actief*'s next board meeting. While there is no official deadline, the PD mentions this should be done as soon as possible, if possible within 2 weeks.
PD mentions the activities by Inter-*Actief* are always more effective than the ones organised officially by the programme. Kempen mentions Inter-*Actief* could also help with meetings as a result of the results of the NSE.

8. Update Master Courses

PD mentions the idea of a university is that the research continually improves the education. However, there are no formal measures in place to achieve this. Huisman mentions not all of the suggestions about technologies made by students are necessary, as the education should be more about the ideas and fundamentals of the tools, not about the tools itself. Furthermore, most professors are too busy to make drastic changes to courses. The PD mentions there is a real urgency to update and improve courses though, and the least that we can do is adding a question about how up to date the content of a course is to the yearly evaluations of master courses.

Boschma asks whether the programme committee can see the results of the evaluations. This is not possible yet. The PD assures the programme committee that, in the future, when all courses are evaluated, the results of the evaluations will be shared with the programme committee.

Kempen wants to discuss the evaluation of the Basic Machine Learning course as there were a lot of complaints by students about the course. PD will request the results of the evaluation done by the teacher of the course.

9. Deadline for Papers

Heerlien mentions there should be standard time for deadlines, as students got into trouble because of missing deadlines in the morning that they expected to be in the evening. Kempen mentions that due to internationalisation, people have made mistakes with 12 A.M. and 12 P.M. The programme committee agrees that forcing teachers to use a standard deadline format would be too much. As long as the communication about the deadline is clear and the actual time does not change abruptly, the current situation is fine.

10. Level English Students

There are official guidelines to the level of English for Bachelor and Master students to be admitted to their studies through the IELTS test. A few examples about students with subpar students are discussed. Some students get trained to pass their acceptance exams but do not have sufficient skill in English. However, the UT is forced to accept them as they passed their exam. There is also a cultural problem in which some people do not feel comfortable with throwing their project partner under the bus if communication is difficult. However, the programme committee agrees that, save a few outliers, the overall level of English in students is more than acceptable.

The current minimum score for the IELTS test in order to be accepted into a bachelor programme at the UT is a 6.0. This is an average over four parts. An option could be to require minimum scores for each individual part. The students who barely scrape by the minimum grade usually score well on the passive parts and compensate their failing grades for the active parts. However, we can not change the entry restrictions for just our programme, this has to be discussed across the UT. Heerlien will relay the outcome of this discussion to the faculty committee.

Another discussion ensues about plagiarism, as the guidelines differ per culture and per country. In the past, a lecture about the rules regarding plagiarism on the UT was given. A similar lecture will be organised in the first year of the bachelor programme. This lecture should focus on the practical points of plagiarism, such as copying code, rather than academic plagiarism, as that is not yet relevant in this part of the bachelor.

A further discussion about tutoring starts as a result of the discussion about groups of students who are at higher risk of failing parts of their programme. There are options to use students as tutors or just tutor the risk groups. Using students as tutors would remove the parental role effect that teachers as tutors have, however.

11. A.O.B. and Proposal Item Next Meeting

Kempen proposes a discussion of the number of presubscriptions for the bachelor programme, as they are rather high and are already over a thousand in Delft. Padberg mentions she will add it to the agenda of the next PC meeting.

12. Questions and Conclusion

Kempen mentions she cannot access WebDav. Padberg will help her access it.

Kortstra mentions the next programme committee meeting will be his last, as he will soon start on his graduation. Boschma will try to promote the programme committee during module 4 to find another bachelor student for the programme committee, to replace Kortstra.

Bolding asks when the programme committee can expect the evaluations of module 2. The PD mentions they will be available during the next meeting.

Actions

#	Meeting	Action	Person	Deadline
265	March 2017	Check whether there is a correlation between the grades for Q2 and the algorithms pearl in Q1	Huisman & Heijnen	March 2018
283	June 2017	Formulate confidentiality of master projects in OER	PD	May 2018
292	December 2017	Look at the content of Logic and Computing & Artificial Intelligence part of Reflection I and II	PD	January 2018
296	March 2018	Organise a meeting with van Grinsven to evaluate the overlap of the reflection and ethics courses	Heijnen	April 2018
297	March 2018	Discuss the repeatability of the Software Evolution course with Rensink	PD	April 2018
298	March 2018	Communicate an official recommendation about the name of the bachelor programme to the PD	Chairman	April 2018
299	March 2018	Discuss an activity to gather ideas how to spend the improvement budget at Inter-*Actief*'s next board meeting	Kempen	27th of March, 2018
300	March 2018	Request the results of the evaluation done by the teacher of the Basic Machine Learning course	PD	April 2018
301	March 2018	Relay the outcome of the discussion about the level of English among students to the faculty committee	Heerlien	April 2018