Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science

Date   March 19th, 2019

Minutes of the 132th meeting of the PC-CS

Present: Ammerlaan, Bolding, Boschma, Heerlien (chair), Hillerström (minutes secretary), Langerak, Molenkamp, Myśliwiec, Rensink (program director), Sperotto, Vonk.
Not present: Havinga, Padberg.

1. Openings and determining agenda
Havinga is not present, therefore Heerlien is the chair of the meeting.
Heerlien opens the meeting at 09.00.

Three members announce they have to leave early:
Boschma has to leave at 10.10, Ammerlaan has to leave at 10.15 and Molenkamp has to leave at 10.15.

The agenda is approved.

Heerlien mentions that Havinga is not present this meeting but that he will be leaving the PC. Therefore, a new chair is necessary. According to regulations PC has to chose the chair. Langerak is willing to be the new chair. The PC thinks Langerak would be a good new chair and there are no opponents. Thus, Langerak is the chair of the PC from next meeting on.

Bolding asks if a new member will join the PC to fill Havinga's spot. Officially elections would be held to appoint a new member, but normally the dean appoints a new member. PD has not looked around yet for good candidates but says that in September new staff will join the UT that are good candidates. Therefore, PD asks if it is oke to possibly wait until September with appointing new candidates. The PC has no problem with this. The PD will look around for new candidates and at latest in September a new member will be appointed.

2. Announcement PD

The PD has one announcement regarding the visitation process. The PD thinks the programme intended learning outcomes should be looked at (for both master and bachelor) to see it these are still up to date and fit the programme. Otherwise, either the programme or the learning outcomes should be revised.
This should be done before the visitation and therefore this should be discussed before and at the next meeting.

Molenkamp asks if there is a standard document for all the CS master programmes. The PD responds that there is an ACM IEEE reference framework for CS for the bachelor and that this can be extrapolated during the visitation to the master programme.

Langerak was the PD of CS last time these learning outcomes were checked, so he suggests that he, the PD and a student will look at the learning outcomes this time. Bolding volunteers to do this and will set a meeting with Langerak and the PD.

            Announcement working groups
No announcements.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence

- State of affairs M-IST to specialization M-CS

The PD comments that the university council has approved changing the M-IST into a specialization of M-CS. The M-IST will stop by September 2020. The students currently doing M-IST will be asked to switch to the M-CS, so that there are no more students enrolled in M-IST.

- Language Policy for Teachers and Students

Since not everybody agreed upon the usage of English in the programme, a language policy has been written up. There is one document for students and one for teachers (but they are technically the same).
The documents are send to the teachers and students (via canvas).

Ammerlaan points out to the PD that at a university wide level also a language policy is being written. The PD says that this university wide discussion on the UT council is different from the CS language policy. The UT discussion is on whether or not the main language should be English and not on the implied behaviour in an English programme, as the CS language policy is.

The PC has a discussion on the contents of the policy. Sperotto thinks it is very detailed. The PD argues that these details are important to make the foreigners feel included in the programme, therefore students should speak in English even when everybody is Dutch. Boschma argues that it would make the Dutch students feel more at home if they can speak Dutch at non-study related times (breaks) and that foreign students speak in their native language as well. Langerak argues that non-Dutch speakers will feel unwelcome to walk-in and force a conversation to switch to English. Sperotto comments that it is about the willingness to switch to English and not about whether always English is spoken. If the willingness is their, students will feel welcome to join a conversation.
Heerlien points out this is not the right time for this discussion and ends the discussion.

Boschma asks the PD if the full policy is send to the students, since it is a bit long to read.
The PD says that the arguments for using English are important to read and therefore the full document will be send. However, a short summery can be added to the document.

- Data meetings PC-IT in connection with the TER
- Education Day CS on 11 April 2019
- Keuzegids Master 2019 and article Computer Science

The rest of the incoming and outgoing correspondence is for information.

4. Minutes of the 131th PC-CS meeting d.d. January 15th 2019

The title of the minutes should be changed to PC-CS instead of PC-IT.
There are no further comments.

Action-point recap
330: Done
342: Done, discussion was held about what things need to be addressed when the number of students increases further.
343: This can be discussed at the next meeting under the educational day
348: Ask Padberg next time
352: Done
353: Not done, quality control group and the PD will have meeting with Souren soon to discus this
354: Done
355: Done

2

356: Done
357: Done
358: Done, for quartile 1 all reflections are in and for quartile 2 de Boer still needs (and will) hand it in.
359: Done, also done for quartile 2.
360: This can be discussed at the next meeting.
361: Done, its there but its on IntrAnet and not the internet.
362: Done
363: Done
364: Done
365: Ask Padberg next time
366: Done, with Padberg it should be discussed what the rules are about appointing members for half a year. After this it will be discussed in the PC again.

5. Master TER

Workgroup TER has looked at the master TER. The workgroup had several small comments (see meeting documents), which are discussed here. These remarks of the workgroup have been sent to van Grinsven, who has responded to this.

Comments on the faculty section (section A):
- Art A2.2 – 2 (page 8): The valid period of 2 years for the IELTS and TOEFL are added to not leave any room for discussion.
- Art A2.2 – 3 (page 8): A student that obtained a bachelor's degree in a country not from the list, must have prove their proficiency in English.
- Art A4.7 (page 15): It is indeed not formulated very well. To make it more clear, it is proposed to change 'falsified' to 'scientifically falsified'. This means that a student is taught something that is now understood to be incorrect.

The PC points out that even 'scientifically falsified' does not cover the full intention of this article. Outdated information may be still correct, yet the validity of the results can expire if the tested knowledge is outdated. The intention of the article is clear, but the wording is not fully satisfying. It is agreed that for this year this wording is used and for next year a better solution should be sought.

A positive advice will be given on the faculty section of the TER, with the proposed change of article A4.7.

Comments on the programme specific section (section B):
- Page 5: It is the intention to copy. Even though there is the danger of changing only one of the copied parts, it is better than having to look into multiple documents when reading the TER.
- All typographical remarks will be adjusted
- Page 12: The capstone course is not entirely new, it is a combination of 3 existing courses, which have never been really separate.

The PC should have been informed about this new bundling of courses. The PD will send the Osiris information of the new capstone course to the PC.
- There was no proposal about the research topics for EIT CS and IT, but it is on the agenda of this PC meeting, so this will be discussed at agenda point 7.

The PC agrees that the workgroup can give positive advice on the programme specific section of the TER.

6. Reflection Master and Bachelor

See WebDav in the SEQ folder
- Remaining M-courses Q1
- M-courses Q2
- B-module Q2

The workgroup and the PC have nothing to discuss about specific reflections.

3

The workgroup comments that the reflections work well. The reflections are well-considered, extensive and there are no large deviations between the course evaluation and the reflections.

The PD has a comments to add:
The bachelor course reflection is more extensive than the one for the master courses. Both contain a reflection on the evaluation of the course. The bachelor's reflection also contains the opinion and an analysis of the teacher on the outcome of the evaluation. The PD wants to add the latter also to the master's reflection and asks the PC if they think this is a good idea.
The working group and the PC agrees that this is a good idea.

Sperotto mentions that the number of students filling in the evaluation is still low and that the PC should keep thinking about ways to improve this. The PC agrees and they will keep an eye on it and evaluate in a few quartiles.

7. Research Topics for EIT CS and IT
Advice form the curriculum workgroup on the proposal to split Research Topics

The workgroup has discussed the proposal to split the research topics EIT and wants to give positive advice. The PC has no further comments and agrees. A letter of positive advice will be written by Heerlien.

8. Announcements by PC for mailing
Announcement in mailings from PD to education, What does the PC think of this

The PD emails the teachers every two weeks with some news. The PD suggests to the PC that they could add announcements to this email if they want to. This would also make the PC more visible.

Molenkamp says that the email can contain a link to the website of the PC, where the agenda and the minutes are posted. The PD thinks the barrier to open the link is a little higher.
Langerak thinks that the only information (which is not on the website) that would be necessary to share are the decisions that are being made here. Also an information overload should be avoided.
The PC does not have a clear view of what these announcements can or should contain. However, it is nice to know that there is a possibility to make announcements. Furthermore, the PD will end the mail with a colophon containing the website of the PC.

9. By laws PC
Does the PC need a regulation and what should it contain

Boschma has looked at the by-laws of the PC. His conclusion is that it is useful to have by-laws, but the current by-laws can be rewritten to a shorter version of 1 to 2 pages. The PC has no comments on Boschma's analysis of the by-laws.
Boschma will make a proposal for the new by-laws.

10. Internship as a Minor
What does the PC think of this

The PD wants to discuss the possibility of doing an internship as a minor. During the last visitation it was brought up that there was too little connection to the labour-market in the bachelor. The positive side of this is that the bachelor students are than more likely to continue with the master, instead of finding a job. On the other hand, it might be good to have the option to do an internship. The specific purpose of the minor is to

broaden or deepen once knowledge. An internship is not exactly the same. The learning goals of a bachelor internship must be defined and must fit with the learning goals of a minor.

Molenkamp wonders if it would be possible to take an internship in both the bachelor and the master. The PD says that this option should not be ruled out.

Sperotto thinks that it is not realistic to think that bachelor students will choose not to do the masters, if they get more acquainted with the labour-market. The PD says that it is difficult to know, since there are no figures on this, because now there is no option to do an internship in the bachelor. It is known that now 74% of last year UT bachelor students continued to the masters at the UT.

Langerak has several comments:
- Also for bachelor students that will continue with the master it is good to have a view on the labour-market.
- The comment on the weak connection to the labour-market was based on the old curriculum. As Boschma pointed out the current curriculum does have a bigger connection, with two project modules and several project in the design project being connected to companies.
- Also Inter-Actief is active with connecting students and companies

So Langerak does not think that the connection to the labour-market is weak, but he does see that only few bachelor students have a going-abroad-experience. Figures show that CS is below average.

Vonk says that she does get a lot of requests from students about going abroad. There is support from the study and UT to go abroad, but the initiative lies with the students.

Bolding mentions that it takes a lot of effort from students to arrange such an experience. So more support and promotion is certainly needed. The minor market is not the correct place to promote an internship or going-abroad experience from CS to CS students. The market is aimed at students from different studies to do their minor at CS.

Langerak thinks it is good to gather information on how students experience going-abroad, since it is an adventure (also with finding living space etc.). Now there is no insight in why CS students at the UT go abroad less than students from another university.

Bolding says that students might be more interested if a pre-arranged minor with a partner university is offered. This may lower the bar. Langerak thinks this is a good idea.
Vonk says that students can already ask the exchange officer for contact persons at universities and that there are experience reports available of the students. The reason students do not go abroad is because they want to go the easy way and not the difficult way.

Students have many requests for an internship in the bachelor as well, according to Vonk.

The PC thinks half a year (Minor is 30 EC) at a company is very long. This could be 15 EC. However, the TER should be changed. The rules say that at least 15 EC should have a paradigm shift, so maybe an internship also complies.

The PD mentions that Talent IT (an association of companies) has contacted him with internship offers. In such an internship the students rotates over several companies. It would have to be discussed how this would work for an internship of 15 EC.

Langerak thinks it is a good idea to state that the internship should be about the innovation of the company (or another mission statement), to prevent students from just doing a side job as internship. Vonk points out that this is necessary, since many CS students have a side job.

The next step is for the PD to draw up learning goals for an internship. He would like advice from the PC for this. Myśliwiec will help the PD.

5

Boschma and Ammerlaan leave the meeting at 10.15.
Molenkamp leaves the meeting at 10.18.

Langerak mentions that the PD could asks the advisory board for help, after which the PD points out that there is no advisory board for the bachelor and master and that it is strongly urged to install an advisory board. How to install an advisory board should be put on the table, for another time.

11. Questions and Conclusion

Myśliwiec is absent at the next meeting.
There are no questions.

12. A.O.B. and Proposal item next meeting
The meeting is closed at 10.19.
The next meeting is at the 23th of April.

Action points

#	Meeting	Action	Person	Deadline
348	December 2018	Write a letter/email with positive advice for changes within the assessment of Module 7	Chairman	January 2019
353	January 2019	Discuss with the responsible people in the faculty the possibility of a peer-review of the course reflections of the teachers.	PD	February 2019
360	January 2019	Put the reflection on the educational day on the agenda for the first meeting after the educational day.	Padberg	April 2019
362	January 2019	Put the newest faculty regulations of the faculty board on webdav.	Padberg	February 2019
365	January 2019	Put the adjusted annual plan on webdav.	Padberg	February 2019
367	March 2019	Setup a meeting with Langerak to discuss learning goals	Bolding	April 2019
368	March 2019	Discuss the program intended learning outcomes, for both bachelor and master, to see if they are still up-to-date and fit the programme.	Bolding, Langerak and PD.	April 2019
369	March 2019	Put discussion of program intended learning outcomes on the agenda of the next meeting	Padberg	April 2019
370	March 2019	Forward the Osiris information on the new cyber security Capstone course 2019 to the PC	PD	April 2019
371	March 2019	Write a positive letter of advice on the proposal to split Research Topics for EIT CS and IT	Heerlien	April 2019
372	March 2019	Make a draft for the new by-laws of the PC	Boschma	April 2019
373	March 2019	Write learning goals for the internship as a minor in the bachelor.	Myśliwiec and PD	April 2019

Decisions
1.1 Langerak is the new chair of the PC from next meeting onwards.
1.2 At latest in September a new PC member will be appointed. PD will be looking for good candidates.

6

5.1 The workgroup TER will give a positive advice on the faculty section of the Master TER, with the proposed change of article A4.7

5.2 The workgroup TER will give a positive advice on the programme specific section of the Master TER.

6.1 The PC will keep an eye on the response rate of course evaluations and reflect on it in a few quartiles.

7.1 The PC gives positive advice on the proposal to split the research topics EIT.

8.1 The PD will end the mail with a colophon containing the website of the PC.