Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science

Date   May 21th, 2019

Minutes of the 134th meeting of the PC-CS

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

1. Openings and determining agenda
The meeting is opened by the chair at 10.46.
There are no comments on the agenda. The agenda is approved.

2. Announcement PD
The PD has 4 announcements.

1. New data from the 13th of May on the number of bachelor students for 2019-2020 shows that it is still reasonable to get 300 students.
There is no concrete information on the number of master students. The PD thinks that over the entire year 100 master students is reasonable, which is 20 students more than in this year. This increase is based on the international students that will graduate this year from the bachelor and might continue to the master.

Padberg comments that from the forms handed in so far by the students graduating, not many international students plan on continuing to the masters.

2. There has been a round of evaluations of the courses in quartile 3. These evaluations were sent back to the teachers for reflection. Since they were sent late to the teachers of the master courses, there are not many responses yet. These evaluations should be discussed in the meeting of June.

AP Padberg: put the reflections of the bachelor and master courses on the agenda for the next meeting.

3. As mentioned earlier a TOM2.0 is planned and will probably be implemented in 2020-2021. The structure of TOM2.0 is still an ongoing discussion, but the PD has faith that the current structure can be easily integrated in the TOM2.0 structure.

4. The PD has heard that the faculty council will ask the PC to come up with more ideas on what to do with the money from the Wet StudieVoorschot.

   Announcement working groups
No announcements by working groups.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence
There is no incoming/outgoing correspondence.

Ammerlaan makes an announcement:
The new officer of educational affairs from InterActief, Ms. Lummen, will be joining the PC meetings from now on. She will take over Ammerlaan's position in September 2019 and until then will be present to orient.

4. Minutes of the 133th PC-IT meeting d.d. April 23th 2019
On page 7: 'attending' should be replaced with 'presented'.
There are no further comments.

Action-point recap

374: Not done. The PD did not sent the document to Padberg yet.
However, the document is for information to the PC, therefore this AP is irrelevant.

AP PD: Send final report of the screening by Lieke Ravestein to Padberg.

375: Done.
376: Done. Langerak did not receive a reply from Stephan van Gils yet. However, the PD mentioned in his announcements that this would happen soon.

377: Done.
378: Done.
Myśliwiec read the message to the PC. The PC agrees the message is clear, but that it lacks information on the monetary compensation which PC student members get.
Myśliwiec will add this to the message and subsequently send it to Vonk or van Grinsven, who will post it on Canvas. The message will also be posted on the website of InterActief and in their weekly email.

AP Myśliwiec: Send the adjusted message to Vonk & van Grinsven and Ammerlaan.
AP Vonk/van Grinsven: Post the message on Canvas.

379: Done. An interest lunch will be organized in Q1 of 2019/2020, in collaboration with the educational committee of InterActief. There will be a small presentation on what the PC does, after which there is the possibility to chat with the student members and if possible the PD. This interest lunch will be announced as an activity on the website of InterActief.
Langerak adds that he is willing to be present as the chair of the PC and possibly give a presentation.
This topic will be further discussed in September.

AP Padberg: Put the interest lunch to acquire new PC student members on the agenda of the meeting in September.

380: Done. The estimated hours was not the main issue in Langeraks perspective. Langerak did contact the teacher about the issues raised during the PC meeting. He did not receive a reply yet.

381: Done.
382: Done.
383: Done. The quartile proposed by the PC was not feasible, therefore the course will be give in the originally proposed quartile.

384: Not done. The PD comments that there is an alternative proposal submitted for the traineeship as a minor. There is a platform of local IT related companies, called TalentIT, which offers students the opportunity to learn about local employment possibilities. They are very willing to accommodate traineeships for students. When using TalentIT students do not have to make their own proposal for a traineeship any more.
The plan is to roll out a pilot with 15 students for next year. This pilot is already mentioned in the TER. A possibility is that about half of these students will find a traineeship themselves and the rest will be accommodated via TalentIT.
The discussion on the supervisor, examiner and module coordinator is still active. The PD will look into the various issues related to the traineeship in the bachelor.

385: Done. Bolding went to this meeting and found it quite interesting. The differences between the different PCs stood out. Bolding feels that the PC-CS is lagging initiative in taking an extra step besides the regular meetings. An example is having regular meetings with the examination committee.
Another idea is to have annual meetings with the other PCs to share ideas and get inspiration. Bolding is willing to take the initiative to set this up.
The PC members could also take courses to increase their professionalism regarding the PC.
Langerak decides to discuss this in the next PC meeting. Bolding, Langerak and Molenkamp will prepare this agenda point.

AP Padberg: Put the professionalism of the PC on the agenda of the meeting in June.
AP Bolding, Langerak, Molenkamp: Prepare the discussion on the professionalism of the PC at the meeting in June.

386: Done.
387: Done.
388: Done.

5. Bachelor TER
Last week the workgroup TER received both the University part (Romp) and the faculty part. The workgroup had minor comments.

- **University part (Romp)**

Comment on art 4.2 (page 15). Who appoints the module coordinator in case the module coordinator and the module examiner are not the same person?
The PD answers that this is stated in art 1.2, the programme board (opleidingsbestuur).

Regarding the public oral exam described in art 4.5.1 (page 16): the workgroup wonders what a reason would be to refuse the attendance of another person at the exam.
The PC responds that the Dutch law states that an oral exam should be public. However, it is not desirable that students that will have the same exam, later on in the same exam period, have the opportunity to hear the questions and discussion more often than the other students. Since the definition of public is not stated in the TER, article 4.5.1 is formulated as is.

The workgroup asks clarification on the task of the PC regarding the TER, as mentioned in article 8.5 (page 26). Vonk answers that the PC has to check if the TER is executed well and if the rules are applied. The PD says that this implies that the TER is discussed in annually in the PC and that this is stated in an annual report.
For further guidelines and trainings Frank van den Berg can be contacted.

- **Faculty part**

Some minor adjustments are the omission of the assessment tables for each module, which will be put on Canvas instead. The PILOs (programme intended learning outcomes) have been reformulated, the content remains the same.

On page 2 in the University part (Romp) it is stated that it may be desirable to extend the validity period of the module parts to make sure the transitional arrangement is clear and transparent, which can be decided by the program. The workgroup wonders if the module coordinators are in the position to make this decision.

The PD mentions that a presentation was given by Herbert Wormeester from the university council on TOM2.0, from which it became clear that TOM2.0 will *not* be implemented in September 2019. They advice to inform students about components of the current modules which will be subparts of the modules in TOM2.0, so the students can plan ahead.

Molenkamp wonders if this will be communicated to the students, to make the transition smooth.
The PD says that a clear picture of TOM2.0 will be presented to the students. However, currently the structure of TOM2.0 is an ongoing discussion and it is difficult to say things for sure in the near future.

The PD does not want to tell students they can skip certain parts of a module in 2019/2020 and redo those parts in TOM2.0 in 2020/2021, as advised by Herbert Wormeester. Ofcourse, there will be a transitional arrangement, which will be communicated to the students on time.

Padberg has a comment regarding the table in art 1.3.1 (page 4) of the Faculty part; many students register for a minor, although they mean to register for module 8. In the table for module 8 is says 'minor/elective module'. Vonk agrees that the table might be confusion and that it can maybe be rephrased.

The PC gives positive advice on the faculty part of the TER.

AP Padberg: Write a letter with positive advice on the faculty part of the TER.

6. Reflection Master and bachelor
See on webdav in the SEQ folder

The PD mentions that there is a duplication of information on the evaluations of all the reflections of the bachelor and master. Some of these are added to the SEQ folder on webdav, but all of these are in a folder maintained by Cynthia Souren. It is better if the PC gets access to this folder, to make sure the PC is always up-to-date on the evaluations.

AP PD: Discuss with Cynthia Souren if the PC can have access to this folder with the evaluations.

Since the folder on webdav is not up-to-date and not all reflections are done yet, the agenda point will be moved to the next meeting.

AP Padberg: Move agenda point 6 of this meeting (May) to the meeting of June.

7. Accreditation
Critical self-reflection
The PD wants the PC to participate in the writing of the critical self reflection and asks if there are two members who want to do this, preferable a student and a staff member. The writers need to write sections and give feedback on the sections written by the others. The table of contents is already made. The writing process has to start in May.

Sperotto may be willing to actively write and will discuss with the PD what this exactly yields. Bolding will ask Heerlien and Boschma if they are interested in actively writing the critical self-reflection.

AP Bolding: Ask Heerlien and Boschma if they want to participate in writing the critical self-reflection.

The pre-last version that has to be send to the university board must be ready in September. This means that during the summer holiday feedback on the content of the critical self-reflection must be given. Both Langerak and Molenkamp are volunteering to provide feedback.

Mock/rehearsal visitation
The rehearsal of the visitation is the 29th of October, while the real visitation is the 9th and 10th of December. The rehearsal visitation will be held by 2 people experienced with visitations, who will ask the PC questions about the content of the critical self-reflection and about the important things which are missing in the self-reflection. During this rehearsal the PC will learn what can be asked during the real visitation and the critical points will become clear.

Molenkamp mentions that during the visitation of EmSys 2 years ago there was no specific meeting with the PC. He wonders if that will be different this year. He will send the programme of this EmSys visitation to the PD for information.

AP Molenkamp: Send the programme of the visitation of EmSys to the PD.

Ammerlaan asks if there was any feedback on the student chapters input. The PD answers that due to a lack of time this has not been looked at yet.

8. By Laws PC-CS
Approval new by-laws
The by-laws are approved with the notation that some minor spelling and sentence construction errors will be corrected.

AP Bolding: Communicate the errors in the by-laws to Boschma.
AP Boschma: Correct the errors in the by-laws and send them to Padberg.
AP Padberg: Upload the updated by-laws to the website of the PC.

9. Quality assurance
Progress
The workgroup had a meeting with Cynthia Souren, in which the ideas of the PC-CS were discussed. One of these ideas is the reflection on the course evaluations by the teachers. There were a few points coming from this meeting, to be discussed in the PC.

MSc panel meeting
A panel meeting for master students, in which the overall state of the programme is discussed, was opted.
A few years ago the evaluation switched from programme level to course level and now an evaluation on the coherence and complements of the programme is lacking.
Van Grinsven thinks it is a good idea to introduce these panel meetings once a year. This has already been tried a year ago, but only 2 of the 6 students that signed up eventually showed up.

A discussion on the programme may be too general in case the students from all 4 specializations will be invited to the same meeting. It is better to have these panel meetings on specialization level.
These panel meetings are already held in the Cyber Security specialization.

Langerak believes it would be best to discuss the possibilities of specialization wide panel meetings with the specialization coordinators. Also to get information from the Cyber Security specialization on how they organize these meetings. Van Grinsven will take this up with the coordinators.

AP van Grinsven: Discuss the implementation of panel meetings per specialization with the specialization coordinators.

The PD announces that there will also be an exit questionnaire in the future for all the students that have graduated.

2. Reflection sampling
The workgroup had the idea to examine the implementation of the reflections and evaluations, for about 10 courses each time, every two years. It will be a good way to see if and how the courses have changed according to the evaluations. Every two years might be a little to less frequent.

The PC thinks it is a good idea to do this and to first start with one time and then to see how often it should be repeated. The first time should be held after Q2 (January 2020), so that the teachers have done an evaluation twice and have had time to make adjustments.

Molenkamp says that an alternative can be to ask the teachers before the new quartile starts, if they have implemented the things they have mentioned in the reflections. The PD mentions that this will indeed be implemented, but that it is good to additionally have the reflections sampling by the PC.

The details of the reflection sampling still need to be worked out and the workgroup will focus on this. There was also the idea to add peer reflections in the evaluations, but no concrete implementation has been decided upon yet. This workgroup will look into this as well.

AP Workgroup quality assurance: Make proposal for the implementation of the reflection sampling before September.

AP Workgroup quality assurance: Make proposal for the implementation of the peer reflection in evaluations.

10. Website PC-CS
The responsibility for maintaining the website is discussed.
Van Grinsven points out that in the past the registrar was charged by the PC to make changes to the website. Currently, Padberg does put documents on the website and updates the information on the members. The other content is not clearly handled by anybody.

Langerak suggests to make 1 PC member responsible for keeping the website up-to-date, this will be the webmaster. The webmaster can make changes without needing to notify the PC.
Molenkamp volunteers to be the webmaster and van Grinsven will make sure Molenkamp gets access to the website.
All PC members will look at the website and send their comments to Molenkamp, who will consequently up-date the website.

AP van Grinsven: Give Molenkamp access to the website of the PC.
AP Everybody: Look at the website and send any comments to Molenkamp.
AP Molenkamp: Up-date the website of the PC.

11. Questions and Conclusions
New date for June meeting
A new date is set for the meeting in June, at Wednesday 12th of June from 09.00 to 10.45 at **Ravelijn 3411!**

12. A.O.B. and proposal item next meeting
Langerak mentions that he got a nice appreciative flower bouquet from the students and he want to remind the staff members that they should also hand out flowers to students.
The PD says he will add this to his weekly mailing.

AP PD: Promote the appreciative flower bouquet for students to the staff in the weekly mailing.

The meeting is closed at 12.20

Action points

384	April 2019	Various issues concerning internship in the minor in the Bachelor	PD	May 2019
389	May 2019	Put the reflections of the bachelor and master courses on the agenda for the next meeting.	Padberg	June 2019
390	May 2019	Send final report of the screening by Lieke Ravestein to Padberg.	PD	June 2019
391	May 2019	Send the adjusted message to Vonk & van Grinsven and Ammerlaan.	Myśliwiec	June 2019
392	May 2019	Post the message from AP391 on Canvas.	Vonk/van	June 2019

			Grinsven	
393	May 2019	Put the interest lunch to acquire new PC student members on the agenda of the meeting in September.	Padberg	September 2019
394	May 2019	Put the professionalism of the PC on the agenda of the meeting in June.	Padberg	June 2019
395	May 2019	Prepare the discussion on the professionalism of the PC at the meeting in June.	Bolding, Langerak, Molenkamp	June 2019
396	May 2019	Write a letter with positive advice on the faculty part of the TER.	Padberg	June 2019
397	May 2019	Discuss with Cynthia Souren if the PC can have access to this folder with the evaluations.	PD	June 2019
398	May 2019	Move agenda point 6 of this meeting (May) to the meeting of June.	Padberg	June 2019
399	May 2019	Ask Heerlien and Boschma if they want to participate in writing the critical self-reflection.	Bolding	June 2019
400	May 2019	Send the programme of the visitation of EmSys to the PD.	Molenkamp	June 2019
401	May 2019	Communicate the errors in the by-laws to Boschma.	Bolding	June 2019
402	May 2019	Correct the errors in the by-laws and send them to Padberg.	Boschma	June 2019
403	May 2019	Upload the updated by-laws to the website of the PC.	Padberg	June 2019
404	May 2019	Discuss the implementation of panel meetings per specialization with the specialization coordinators.	Van Grinsven	June 2019
405	May 2019	Make proposal for the implementation of the reflection sampling before September.	Workgroup Quality Assurance	September 2019
406	May 2019	Make proposal for the implementation of the peer reflection in evaluations.	Workgroup Quality Assurance	September 2019
407	May 2019	Give Molenkamp access to the website of the PC.	Van Grinsven	June 2019
408	May 2019	Look at the website and send any comments to Molenkamp.	Everybody	June 2019
409	May 2019	Update the website	Molenkamp	June 2019
410	May 2019	Promote the appreciative flower bouquet for students to the staff in the weekly mailing.	PD	June 2019

Decisions
5.1   The PC approves the faculty part of the TER.
8.1   The PC approves the by-laws with the notation that minor spelling errors are to be corrected.
10.1   Molenkamp is the webmaster and will keep the website of the PC up-to-date