Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science

Date   April 23th, 2019

Minutes of the 133th meeting of the PC-CS

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

1. Openings and determining agenda
From today on the new chair is Langerak. He opens the meeting at 10.45.

Bolding wants to add to the agenda the acquiring of new student PC members. Langerak decides to discuss this at agenda point 4.

2. Announcement PD
The PD has several announcements.

1. Related to the name change of the programme:
An administrative mistake was made (related to new croho number), resulting in all students receiving a message stating that they are enrolled in a study that no longer exists and therefore they will not receive study-financing any more, effective immediately. This problem will be sorted out in time, to not disturb the payments.

2. Screening of the programme, by Lieke Ravestein.
Several PC members were interviewed by Ravestein and the draft report of this has been sent to the people interviewed. A final version will be send before the next meeting and it should be put on the agenda for inspection.

AP Padberg: put the discussion of the final report of Ravestein on the agenda for next meeting.

3. The PC meeting of 18th of June conflicts with an outing of the research group of PD and Langerak. PD requests to shift this meeting.

AP Padberg: send a proposal for a new date for the meeting of 18th of June.

      Announcement working groups
No comments by working groups.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence
- **NVAO decision name change**

For information
- **WSV**

This is about the WSV money. This WSV money is the money that no longer is spend on the students after abolishing the 'basisbeurs', but is now given to the universities. This money must be labelled separately and spend on certain things. In the letter it says that another letter will be send by the faculty-board to the PCs about what exactly is expected from the PCs regarding the WSV.
This letter is not received yet, so the PC should ask for it.

AP Langerak: Contact the secretary of the faculty-board (Stephan Maathuis) about the follow-up letter to the PCs regarding the WSV.

4. Minutes of the 132th PC-IT meeting d.d. March 19th 2019
The minutes are approved.

Bolding says that the acquiring of staff members is addressed in the minutes but that also the acquiring of student members should be discussed.

Bolding will leave for at least a few months in beginning 2020. Myśliwiec will also leave for a few months. Bolding and Boschma discussed that there is little awareness of the PC-CS by the students and it is difficult to find new student members.

Two members of the educational committee of Inter-Actief are already in the PC. It is desirable to not have more overlap between the EC and PC members. Best would be if the PC gets promoted to students programme wide and not only via Inter-Actief. PD suggests that the student members propose a message that will be posted on the master and bachelor canvas pages.

AP student members: compose a message for the canvas pages to promote the PC to students and ask for new student members.

Langerak suggests that the students members think of a way to get more student members.

AP student members: come up with an initiative to get more students interested in the PC-CS.

Furthermore, it is pointed out that the website of the PC is a bit sparse. The PD thinks that the introduction text is not very strong. He suggests to add concrete examples of what the PC has decided.
Langerak asks who is in charge of editing the website. This is not fully clear and therefore webpage editing will be discussed next meeting.

AP Padberg: put discussing the webpage editing on the agenda of next meeting.

Action-point recap
348: Not relevant any more
353: Done
360: Done
362: Done
365: Done
367: Done
368: Done
369: The program mentors of the master are asked to link the courses to the programme intended learning outcomes. The intended learning outcomes are still up-to-date and fit the programme.
370: Done
371: Done
372: Done
373: Done

5. Master courses
There were several proposals for master courses, which have been evaluated by the Curriculum work group.

- **Security Services for IoT**
The change in the course is the partial switch from oral examination to written examination. Andre Kokkeler commented on this that written examination is a little more susceptible to fraud. The work group believes this should not be a problem.

Boschma has a comment: in the proposal the estimation of work is in total 126 hours, which is 14 hours less than 5 EC (= 140 hours) (see Table A). This is odd, since they do offer this as a 5 EC course. Also, the percentages in the table do add up to 100%.

The PC agrees this is strange and that this should be discussed with the teacher.

AP Langerak: Contact the teacher of the course and discuss the estimated #hours being less than 5 EC.

- **ISEP**

Since student numbers were dropping, the proposal is to only offer this course once a year. The working group agreed with this.
Boschma comments that he founds the number of students following this course low, since this course is obligated in the Design specialization of Software Technology. He agrees with the change, but he would want to have an option that when the numbers increase again the course will be offered more often again.

Langerak points out that this is not what is being discussed right now. Only the change to offer it once is discussed and with that the PC agrees.

AP Langerak: send email with positive advice to the teachers of the course.

- **Advanced Algorithms and Complexity**

The working group has seen that there is a similar course in the Math department (Limits to Computing). Last year 2 out of 13 students who followed this course were CS students. The topic taught in both courses are the same, but have a different viewing angle (math vs computer science).

Langerak is positive about the proposed course, since it is aligned towards the needs of the CS student.
He adds that the PC should not be concerned about there being to much courses, since that is something for the management to discuss.

Van Grinsven and the PD point out that formally speaking this course falls under CS and not Mathematics, because it was originality created from a CS research group. It has been discussed to change this to a math course.

Molenkamp opens the discussion on whether students should be allowed to follow both courses. Langerak thinks this should be possible, since the same topic is addressed from two different angles. The PD says that students who follow the CS course may become interested in the math course as well, but that the other way around is less likely. It is concluded that students can follow both courses and that if there is too much overlap, the students will say so.

Boschma remarks that the suggested quartile (q2) may not be the best quartile since there are already several FMT related courses in quartile 2. In quartile 4 there are less FMT related courses.
The PD points out that this course is probably proposed as an advanced course (mantle course). This means it will be part of the 6 courses that students have to choose 4 of. The quartile in which it is offered should be chosen while taking in mind when the other advanced courses are offered.
In case it is an advance course the TER should be updated as well.

The PC decides that positive advice for this course will be given and that it will be asked to reconsider the quartile in which this is offered and whether it is indeed meant to be an advanced course or elective course.

AP Langerak: give positive advice and share concerns related to the chosen quartile and to the course being advanced (mantle) or elective.

- **Change of the software Science courses**

Currently this course is taught twice a year. Members of FMT research group offer specialized material of their own research. Currently 4 topics are taught in 2 editions of this course (each edition has 2 topics). The teachers now feel like they do not have enough time for their topic. The proposed change is to change the topic each year, so that every topic comes around every two years. This way each topic will be 5 EC instead of only 2.5 EC. The course is offered in quartile 3 and 4.

With the new change a student could follow all topics if she follows quartile 3 and 4 twice, i.e. when she enrolled in February.

Padberg mentions that there should be multiple course codes in case a student would follow the course multiple times.

Boschma likes the proposal but has several comments (the bullet points):
- Is scaling it up from 2.5EC to 5EC manageable for the teachers?

The PD, who is a teacher of this course, says that it is manageable since it comes around only once every two years. It is now easier, since teachers do not have to spend time on cutting parts out of the topic.
- There used to be many master courses, it was scaled down. And now we are adding courses again.

The PD responds that faculty council made them look at the offered courses in the programme and it was concluded that there are not many courses that are followed only by a limited number of students. Furthermore, the number of students and teachers keeps increasing, so this should not be a problem.
- Offering bi-annually results in students starting in September missing out on certain topics.

The PD says this is true but that there is a trade-off between getting more topics and spending more time on one topic. Also students have the opportunity to follow capita-selecta on one of these topics.
- Are these topics static or might they be changed again?

The PD responds that the topics are not very static, but at least static for 2 years. If the topics will be changed it will be proposed as a change in the PC again.

Langerak wonders if there is an agreement for students that already have selected their courses. Some students may have followed this course already, but would like to follow the other topics as well. The PD says that this can be dealt with on an individual basis. However, the teachers have not thought about this yet. A transitory arrangement for students who are affected otherwise should be made.

The PC gives positive advice with the advice to add a transitory arrangement.

AP Langerak: send the positive advice to the teachers of the course, with remarks on a transitory arrangement.

6. Bachelor Internship as Minor
Advice
The PD has made a proposal for offering an internship as a minor in the bachelor. This proposal is now discussed in the PC.

Boschma asks for clarification on the required daily supervisor that the students need to find themselves. The PD clarifies that the supervisor oversees the process, but not on a daily basis, and approves the project description in advance and will also be the examiner. There is no fixed supervisor, the students have to find one themselves and the module coordinator can help with this.

The proposed module coordinator is Vonk. Langerak comments that Vonk is not an examiner and the proposal states that the final assessment is done by the module coordinator, which would thus not be possible.

The PD will look into this problem about the module coordinator and the examiner. A solution would be to do it the same as in the master. The supervisor is the examiner, instead of the module coordinator.

AP PD: Clarify who can be the supervisor, examiner and module coordinator for the internship in the bachelor.

Next, Boschma wonders why for the internship as a minor there is a prerequisite of 90 EC, instead of 75 EC for a regular minor. The PD explains this is done, because the students can apply the acquired knowledge during the internship and therefore they must have acquired sufficient knowledge. This is also done because the students are the 'business card' of the university.

Boschma also brings up that last meeting it was discussed that it is not possible to deny master students an internship, when they have done an internship during the bachelor. However, in the proposal it says it *is* possible to deny a student an internship.
Langerak argues that it is not feasible to check for each master student whether they did an internship in the bachelor. Padberg mentions that former HBO students sometimes are denied an internship during their masters. Molenkamp explains that in the Embedded Systems master students that have already done in internship of more than 30 EC are not allowed to do an internship in the master. Otherwise they can.

The PC believes this rule is not practical to implement and that a master should be started with a fresh slate. The PC agrees that this rule on disallowing an internship in the master, when the student did an internship in the bachelor, should be removed.

The PC will give positive advice on this proposal, with the remarks that the rule stated above is removed and that the module coordinator/examiner/supervisor roles are clarified. This advice has now been given officially to the PD during the meeting. Langerak will *not* send an email about this.

7. Invitation session PC per review 8 May
The PC has been asked to participate with a few members in the peer review, preparing for the Institutional Audit. They are initially looking for 1 staff and 1 student member. Langerak has received an email that two staff members already have been found and the question is if a student member is still needed.

Langerak suggests that the name of 1 student member is given and if they still need the student than they can contact the student. Both Bolding and Boschma are volunteering.
Molenkamp adds that he thinks that 1 student and 1 staff member is better than 2 staff members.

AP Langerak: Forward contact details of Boschma and Bolding to the person responsible for the institutional audit and mention that the PC thinks that it is better to have 1 student and 1 staff member, instead of 2 staff members.

8. By Laws PC-CS
Boschma had revised the by-laws and Langerak complements him on this.

There are some remarks on the by-laws.
Padberg mentions that article 4.1 says that each working group receives the documents 2 weeks in advance for preparation. This is actually never done and not very feasible. Also article 4.2 and 4.3 are never done. Langerak is not in favour of 4.2 and 4.3, because it takes away the flexibility and produces overhead and the need for a secretary for each working group.

Van Grinsven points out that WHW is mentioned but not explained in English in the by-laws and that it would be good to translate this.

Boschma points out that currently it states in article 3.3d that a working group drafts the annual circle and planning of the PC-CS. There is however no such working group any more. This means that a new article will be created in which it states that the PC will together draft these documents.

The PC agrees that:
1. article 4.1 is changed to at least 1 week in advanced, instead of 2 weeks
2. article 4.2 is removed
3. article 4.3 is removed
4. title of article 4 is changed to 'preparation <u>working</u> groups meeting PC-CS'
5. in article 5.4 'halve' must be spelled as 'half'
6. 'clerc' should be changed everywhere to 'registrar'
7. in article 1.2 add the English explanation of the WHW. Thus add '(Law on higher education)'
8. in article 10 remove 'and has agreement from the dean of the faculty of EEMCS'
9. in article 10 change 'These regulations are retroactive introduced since ...' to 'These regulations are introduced since 23 April 2019.'
10. article 10 should be named article 7 (numbering is now incorrect)
11. in article 6.1 'Any suggested changes …' is changed to 'Any agreed changes ...'
12. a title must be added to the document
13. article 3.3d is changed into a new article 4 (thus change all following article numbers accordingly) in which it states that the PC-CS will draft an annual report, annual circle and planning of the PC-CS.

AP Boschma: implement the above mentioned changes regarding the by-laws of the PC-CS.

9. Reflection educational day Computer Science
The PD will give an reflection on the educational day of Computer Science which was held at the 11th of April.
There were around 40 attendees. The program contained discussions on how to be able to accommodate more students than there currently are.
One idea that came out of these discussions was to divide the student body from the start into student 'houses'. These are no physical houses, but groups of 75-100 students. This is done to prevent students from drowning in the large numbers of students. There will be spokes person per house; a teacher and a TA. From these houses smaller project groups will be formed, to make sure the students will see similar faces throughout the programme.
A task force 'student houses' will be formed, with the module coordinators of the first modules, to work out the further details. Langerak has volunteered to be the quartermaster (chair) of the task force.

Another issue that was brought up was the number of available lecture rooms. This is put forward to the faculty management to make sure that we get the rooms we need.

In the afternoon some words were spoken about how to implement quality assurance.
Maurice van Keulen gave a presentation on how the Data Science master accommodates their many students. Stefan Hugtenburg of the university of Delft gave a presentation on how they cope with the large number of students. They hired a lot of dedicated teaching staff and a group of teachers manages the courses together.

Several students presented about their experience in student committees. For some teachers this was an eye-opener. Also the use of English, during and outside lectures, was discussed, and it was concluded there is no need for doing more on this subject than already is done.

A questionnaire on repeating this day in the future was sent to everybody there and everybody who could not be there. So far one of the most important responses was that it would be better to held this day after the exam period of quartile 3 instead of quartile 2.

Overall the PD thinks it was a success and he would like to have a larger attendance next time. The PD wants to repeat this day, but there should be a relevant topic for discussion.

10. Quality Assurance
Due to limited time this agenda point is moved to the next meeting. The work group will prepare some agenda points and will make a document from the meeting with Souren.

AP Bolding: Make agenda points for next PC-CS meeting on the quality assurance and make report on the meeting with Souren and send this to Padberg.

AP Padberg: Move agenda point 10 of this meeting to the agenda of next meeting.

11. Questions and Conclusions
Ammerlaan says that the student chapter for the accreditation will probably be presented next meeting.

12. A.O.B. and proposal item next meeting
Meeting closed at 12.34

Action points

374	April 2019	Put the discussion of the final report of the screening by Lieke Ravestein on the agenda for next meeting.	Padberg	May 2019
375	April 2019	Send a proposal for a new date for the meeting of 18th of June.	Padberg	May 2019
376	April 2019	Contact the secretary of the faculty-board (Stephan Maathuis) about the follow-up letter to the PCs regarding the WSV.	Langerak	May 2019
377	April 2019	Put discussing the webpage editing on the agenda of next meeting.	Padberg	May 2019
378	April 2019	Compose a message for the canvas pages to promote the PC to students and ask for new student members.	Student members	May 2019
379	April 2019	Come up with an initiative to get more student members interested in the PC-CS.	Student members	May 2019
380	April 2019	Contact the teacher of the Security Services for the IoT course and discuss the estimated #hours being less than 5 EC.	Langerak	May 2019
381	April 2019	Send email with positive advice to the teachers of the course Industrial Software Engineering Project	Langerak	May 2019
382	April 2019	Send positive advice and advice to add a transitory arrangement to the teachers of the Software	Langerak	May 2019

		Science course		
383	April 2019	Give positive advice to the Advanced Algorithms and Complexity course and share concerns related to the chosen quartile and to the course being advanced(mantle) or elective.	Langerak	May 2019
384	April 2019	Clarify who can be the supervisor, examiner and module coordinator for the internship in the bachelor.	PD	May 2019
385	April 2019	Forward contact details of Boschma and Bolding to the person responsible for the institutional audit and mention that the PC thinks that it is better to have 1 student and 1 staff member, instead of 2 staff members.	Langerak	May 2019
386	April 2019	Implement the 13 changes regarding the by-laws of the PC-CS (see agenda point 8).	Boschma	May 2019
387	April 2019	Move agenda point 10 (quality assurance) of this meeting to the agenda of next meeting.	Padberg	May 2019
388	April 2019	Make agenda points for next PC-CS meeting on the quality assurance and make report on the meeting with Souren and send this to Padberg	Bolding	May 2019

Decisions
5.1 The PC approves the proposed change of the ISEP course.
5.2 The PC approves the proposed change of the Advanced Algorithms and Complexity course, with the remarks that there are concerns related to the chosen quartile and to the course being advanced (mantle) or elective.
5.3 The PC approves the proposed change of the Software Science course with the remarks that a transitory arrangement should be formulated.
6.1 The PC approves the bachelor internship as minor proposal with the remarks that the rule on disallowing an internship in the master must be removed and the roles of the module coordinator/supervisor/examiner must be clarified.