

Date January 15th, 2019

Minutes of the 131th meeting of the PC-IT

Present: Bolding, Boschma, Heerlien (chair), Hillerström (minutes secretary), Langerak, Myśliwiec, Padberg, Rensink (program director), Sperotto, Vonk.

Not present: Ammerlaan, Havinga, Molenkamp.

1. Openings and determining agenda

Meeting is opened at 10.42.

Heerlien is chairwomen for this meeting.

No comments on agenda.

2. Announcement PD

The PD mentions that an educational day will be organized in the exam period of the third quartile. This will be further discussed later this meeting (at point 8).

Furthermore, the PD has the pre-enrolment figures for Computer Science at Delft, Eindhoven, Groningen and the UT. At the UT there is an 64% increase, with currently 167 enrolments. Last year, at this point, there were 102 enrolments. The overall increase is 37%. Delft has an increase of 67%, currently 877 enrolments, this is likely to be 1000 at the end. Delft has a numerus fixus of 500, so possibly the students that are not admitted to Delft will come to the UT. Eindhoven has an increase of 21%, which is also above their numerus fixus. Groningen has 100 enrolments this year, which is more than last year. The PD is not sure if Groningen has a numerus fixus. All the mentioned figures are unweighted numbers.

The PD has more positive news, more teaching personnel is hired. There is a prospective of 9 extra assistants and associate professors, of which 2 replace former employees. There will also be some junior teachers, which are recently graduated master- or phd-students. They will only give lectures and do this on a temporary basis. This should take the burden of the existing staff.

Announcement working groups

Working group of quality control has announcements, which will be made at point 6.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence

There is a letter from Havinga to the PD about the change of the IST master into a track of the TCS master. Currently this issue is on the plate of the faculty council. They advised that the university board makes a decision on this topic, followed by a decision of the university council. This all has to be done before the end of February to be able to change it this year.

4. Minutes of the 130th PC-IT meeting d.d. December 11th 2018

On the first page, point 2, not Boschma but Ammerlaan entered the meeting late. At point 342 Boschma's name is spelled incorrectly.

Action-point recap

330: Still needs to be done.

337: Will be discussed later this meeting.

342: Nothing has been done. Meeting will be set.

343: Not done
344: Done
345: Done. Will be discussed later this meeting.
346: Done
347: Done
348: Not done
349: Done
350: Done
351: Done

5. Process Numerus Fixus

The previous time it was discussed that there is some pressure from the ministry to have no numerus fixus, because there is a need for expertise in Computer Science. Therefore, the PD consulted others about the arguments they used for a numerus fixus.

The PD of Creative Technology (Schaafstal) sent a document with their reasons to get a numerus fixus. The PD has not looked at this yet. The PD also asked Delft and Eindhoven. Eindhoven did not respond yet. Delft responded that the university board did everything for their programme and that they themselves therefore have no arguments to share.

The PD mentions that besides the ministry, also the university board and the faculty board must be convinced. First the PC discusses it and subsequently the faculty council, faculty board, university council and university board. After this it goes to the NVAO. The university board is in principle negative about having a numerus fixus.

Earlier on the dean has asked the PD to provide calculations on what the foreseen problem actually is. This still needs to be done.

AP: Boschma and the PD will do these calculations, to find arguments for a numerus fixus.

The PD mentions that the numerus fixus must be announced before March 2019, in order to apply it in 2020. Otherwise the first possible moment to apply a numerus fixus is 2021.

Announcing before March may not be feasible, but the announcement has a dual purpose. It forces the university board to take a stand. In case they do not want to have a numerus fixus, they are implicitly obligated to help to face the increasing amount of students.

More updates on this the next meeting.

6. Course evaluation

The workgroup quality control has looked at the master courses evaluation. There is quite a low response rate at the SEQ's. The highest rate is 52% and only 3 SEQ's have a response rate above 45%. The workgroup would like to receive input of the PC on how to improve the response rates.

First of all, the master course evaluations are new. Therefore, the teachers could promote it better, via Canvas or during lectures. Teacher could provide time during lectures to fill out the evaluation.

The course reflections show that not a lot of teachers promoted the SEQ's. A teacher who did announce the survey at Canvas still had a response rate of only 34%.

The students of the PC point out that the questionnaire for this quartile was sent last week, this is a bit early, since the courses are not finished yet. Students prefer to fill out the questionnaire after the examination, since that can sometimes break a course.

Langerak points out that the teachers prefer that the questionnaire is sent during the quartile, so that teachers can remind the students to fill it out.

Since the questionnaire is sent to the student early on, a reminder at the end of the quartile is favourable.

It is decided that the questionnaire should be sent before the end of the quartile, so that the teachers can remind the student. The questionnaire should also have a closing date, which is the Sunday in week 10 of the quartile. This way the students can fill in the questionnaire after the exam. The students will also receive a reminder email about the questionnaire.

The coordinator quality assurance (Cynthia Souren) sends out the questionnaires.

AP: The workgroup quality control will ask Souren if she can add a closing date and a reminder email to the questionnaire.

A second point for discussion from the workgroup:

There seems to be a correlation between low SEQ scores and not sending in a reflection. There are four courses that did not send a reflection. Boschma thinks this is worrisome.

The PD says that the course Design of Software Architectures did eventually send in a reflection. Two other courses (Cyber Risk Management and Economics of Security) are taught by teachers of Delft. The PD has asked the contact person of Delft if they can also send in a reflection. The contact person has forwarded the request. Since this goes via an extra layer of communication this takes a little longer.

This leaves one course without a reflection, Internet of Things. This is taught by Havinga, but he is absent this meeting and therefore can't give further explanation.

The workgroup sends thank-you-emails to the teachers that gave a reflection. They want to keep doing this, to keep up the high response rates on the SEQ's.

A third point for discussion from the workgroup:

The workgroup thinks that it would be valuable for the teachers to peer-review their own reflection. Now the reflection is a write-only document which is sent to the PD. If the teachers discuss the reflection with colleagues they 1. would put more effort in the reflection and 2. they would have a second opinion and discussion about the reflection.

The PC wonders if this is feasible. The workgroup thinks it is, by adding a field to the reflection from asking them to give feedback to a colleague. The teachers can choose not to fill this in, but the workgroup does believe it will help.

Langerak adds that at places (high schools) where teachers talk amongst themselves about their work, there is usually a higher educational quality culture. Therefore it would be good if teachers discuss their work with each other, since they are responsible for the quality.

This peer-review should be lightweight. The teachers should ask somebody they trust and have confidence in. A culture change should happen, where colleagues talk more with each other about their work.

The PD thinks this is an interesting idea and it should be implemented faculty wide. He adds that the easier the process of peer-reviewing is, the smoother it will run.

Sperotto thinks it is important that teachers understand the idea behind the peer-review and that it proves to improve the educational quality. The reasons have to be really clear to the teachers. Otherwise they will probably be defensive.

The PD suggests to add a tick-box to the reflection from asking whether the teacher discussed the reflection with a colleague. This way it stays lightweight and the teachers can themselves choose a colleague to discuss the reflection with.

AP: The PD will discuss this addition to the reflection with the people responsible.

AP: The workgroup will let Souren know about this idea in their upcoming meeting.

A fourth point for discussion:

The workgroup wants to discuss further whether the course evaluation results should be more widely available for the students that do not follow the course. Sperotto adds that this may lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy, since the courses with bad evaluation results could get less enrolments in the next year. However, for transparency it would be good to publish them.

It could help to publish the course reflection as well, so the students can see the changes and improvements that will be made.

The PD is not in favour of publishing the results to the open questions. Since the reflection also contains responses to the open questions, not all parts of the reflection may be suitable for publication. However, he does believe it is good for students to see what the teacher is going to change.

The PC believes that when the students see that the evaluation is used for the reflection, the response rate to the SEQ may increase. So it would be good if the teachers add an adjusted version of the reflection (without answers to open questions) to Canvas and publish specifically what they will change this year.

This should apply for both the master and bachelor courses.

Boschma mentions that in the documents for this meeting the reflection of model driven engineering is present eight times. It turns out that something went wrong with the combining of all documents. All the SEQ's and reflections are on webdav.

AP: Padberg will add a document on webdav stating where all the important documents are.

Boschma also wonders if the PC will look at all the reflections. The workgroup says they will look at each reflection and if necessary discuss a reflection in the next meeting.

- **Module Computer Systems**

The workgroup has some comments on the course reflection of Computer Systems.

The abbreviation used are unclear, so maybe these can be written out the first time used.

Add the end there is a mix up with the OLC and the educational committee (of InterActief). The teachers probably means the PC (OLC) and not educational committee.

In the SEQ and by students comments were made on the imbalance in grading. For one group the assignment was graded by the teacher and for the other groups this was done by the TA. This is not reflected upon by the teachers.

AP: Bolding will reply to the teacher with the comments mentioned above.

- **Master Courses**

Boschma thinks that the workgroup should take a look at every course reflection and SEQ and if there is something out of the ordinary than the workgroup will put it on the agenda of the PC. The PC and the PD agree with this.

It is a shame that the Internet of Things course did not give a reflection since there were quite extensive answers to the open questions and students gave good feedback.

The PD thinks that there should be a bigger discipline about providing a reflection from the teachers and that the workgroup could play a role in this.

AP: Bolding will send the teachers who did not send in a reflection an email on behalf of the PC and the workgroup that they should take their responsibility and send a reflection.

AP: Bolding will also send the teachers who did send a reflection a thank-you-email.

7. Visitation Process

- **Self-reflection-team**

For the visitation process a critical self-reflection has to be written. This will be written by a 'core team' consisting of Van Grinsven, Vonk, Souren and the PD. The PD would like to have an 'advisory team', consisting of two PC members, who give feedback on the self-reflection.

Molenkamp and Boschma already volunteered and will be part of the 'advisory team'.

The self-reflection must also contain a student chapter. The PD thinks the educational committee of InterActief can play a role in this. The PD already contacted Ammerlaan and put him in contact with Marloes Luttikhuis of CELT. She will inform the student body about what can be put in the student chapter, about what the process is, what it is for and on how they can brainstorm to make this happen.

The PC thinks this is a good idea. The PC students are also part of the educational committee of InterActief. Other students should join the student body in writing this student chapter. InterActief will take the lead in finding students for this and writing the student chapter.

The PD also mentions that currently there is a quick-scan (in Dutch: nul-meeting) performed by an external party. She wants to interview students from the PC. In the upcoming days the students will be invited for an interview. She has already met Langerak as a PC member.

- **Date of visitation**

The 9th and 10th of December 2019.

8. Educational Day

The PD wants to organize an educational day for the teachers. The day will partially be an information meeting, but mostly it will be a day with discussions. The PC thinks it is a good idea. It is also good that it is only for the teachers, since the teachers and students are mixed often in other activities. The PD wants it to be obligatory for teachers and expects 50 participants. The provisional date is 11th of April, 2019.

The PD wants to discuss three aspects with the PC.

- Way of working (plenary session, workshops, discussions)

The PD wants to collect suggestions for the discussion points. The PC suggests to have discussions in smaller groups. One topic for discussion can be the large number of students, what is the bottleneck and what can be done about it. Also concrete questions can be asked to steer the discussion.

Langerak suggests to have a discussion topic where everybody has a strong opinion about, leading to a heated discussion. For example the exercise courses and student attendance. Is this a problem of the teacher or of the student, should the exercise course be obligatory?

The PD thinks a heated topic is a good idea, he suggests language policy and internationalisation.

Langerak believes this topic is not very relevant any more, since teachers accepted the policy on English.

- Programming (location, time slots)

The PD suggests to start at 10.00 and end at 17.00. Sperotto mentions that teachers will try not come and therefore, the PD must make very clear what he wants to achieve with this educational day. She suggests adding a key-note, to make teachers exited to be there.

Langerak suggests to name it “yet-another-obligatory-educational-activity”. The PC and the PD think this is a good idea.

- Support form the Programme Committee

The PD wants to make this educational day part of the annual cycle, as a replacement for the UT wide educational day. The PC thinks this is a good initiative, if the upcoming educational day is a success. The PD will report on the day, in the meeting after the educational day.

AP: Padberg will put the evaluation of the educational day on the agenda of the meeting following the educational day.

9. Rules PC

- **By-laws**

The by-laws are from January 2012 and in Dutch. In case the PC wants to keep the by-laws they should be translated. Therefore, a discussion is necessary about the importance of these by-laws.

It is not clear whether it is obligatory to have by-laws.

Boschma mentions that many things stated in the by-laws are also stated in the law.

Padberg points out that Artikel 6 can be of importance, since it states what preparations the PC should take before a meeting. This is currently not really done. These rules can form a good guidance.

There are rules about the PC on faculty level as well.

AP: The PD will ask the faculty board to publish the new faculty rules on their website.

The PC thinks it is good to at least have a document on webdav where it states how the PC will work.

AP: Van Grinsven will send the faculty rules to Padberg.

AP: Padberg will put the faculty rules on webdav.

It is also necessary to look at what is stated in the law (the Dutch WHW law) about the PC. Padberg has already looked into this with somebody from the CELT. The website <https://opleidingscommissies.nl/> also has much information.

Langerak mentions there used to be a working group in the PC on the operational matters. It would be good to have this committee again to have this discussion.

AP: Boschma and Langerak volunteer to look at all the laws and rules about the PC and make a proposal on what should be discussed in the PC.

AP: Padberg will try to combine everything about the PC in the WHW law (artikel 9 and 10) and the faculty rules and put it on webdav.

- **Adjusted annual plan**

The annual plan has been adjusted according to what has been discussed. There are no further comments on the plan.

AP: Padberg will put the annual plan on webdav.

10. A.O.B. and proposal item next meeting

No A.O.B or proposal items.

11. Questions and Conclusions

This will be the last study year that Heerlien is in the PC (she will write her thesis next year). Ammerlaan and Heerlien want to organize a meeting (in next semester) to get other students interested in joining the PC. Furthermore, Heerlien is the vice-president so a new vice-president must be appointed. Preferably, this is a student and a not a new student member of the PC.

Related to this, Boschma asks when he should inform the PC that he will resign as a member? The PD suggests he lets the PC know well before September, since a membership year runs from September to September. Boschma also plans to graduate next year and he therefore might not be a member again next year.

Bolding mentions that he might take a sabbatical next year and therefore might be absent for a few months. He is fine with staying a member, but then he will be probably be absent for a 3-4 months. This means that Bolding cannot become the new vice-president either.

Myśliwiec adds that he is planning on doing a minor abroad for the first semester next year. He will be here for the second semester next year. The year after that he wants to do a master elsewhere.

AP: The student-members of the PC will discuss this amongst each other, on how to fix this.

The PD mentions that is it good to have a spreadsheet that lists from when till when the PC members are members. The students are appointed from 1st September 2018 till 1st September 2019. Only Myśliwiec is appointed from 1st June 2018 till 1st June 2019. It is also good to have by-laws that correspond to what the PC is doing, so that prospective members can read those before deciding to join.

No further questions.

Heerlien closes the meeting at 12.14.

Action points

#	Meeting	Action	Person	Deadline
330	November 2018	Schedule a meeting with Cynthia Souren and PD	Quality assurance working group	January 2019
342	December 2018	Calculation on the amount of students that the programme would be able to handle (for argument numerus fixus)	PD and Boschma	January 2018
343	December 2018	Add calculation (see 342) to next meeting's agenda	Padberg	January 2019
348	December 2018	Write a letter/email with positive advice for changes within the assessment of Module 7	Chairman	January 2019

352	January 2019	Ask Souren if she can add a deadline to the course evaluation questionnaire. The deadline should be Sunday in week 10 of the quartile.	PD	February 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
354	January 2019	Discuss with Souren the possibility of a peer-review of the course reflections of the teachers	Workgroup quality control	February 2019
355	January 2019	Put document on webdav stating where the SEQ's of the master courses can be found	Padberg	February 2019
356	January 2019	Inform the teacher of the Computer Systems module with the comments of the PC on the course reflection	Bolding	February 2019
357	January 2019	Take look at every individual course reflection and questionnaire.	Workgroup quality control	February 2019
358	January 2019	Send on behalf of PC an email to teachers that did not send a reflection to ask them to send a reflection	Bolding	February 2019
359	January 2019	Send thank you email to the teachers that did send a reflection	Bolding	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
361	January 2019	Ask director of faculty board to publish the newest faculty regulations on the website.	PD	February 2019
362	January 2019	Put the newest faculty regulations of the faculty board on webdav.	Padberg	February 2019
363	January 2019	Combine relevant laws (artikel 9 and 10, faculty regulations) on the PC regulations and send this to Boschma.	Padberg	February 2019
364	January 2019	Take a look at the bylaws, law and faculty regulations regarding the PC and make a proposal on what should be discussed in the PC.	Boschma & Langerak	February 2019
365	January 2019	Put the adjusted annual plan on webdav.	Padberg	February 2019
366	January 2019	Discuss on new student members and a new vice-chair(wo)man	Student PC members	September 2019

Decisions

6.1 The questionnaire will be send before the end of the quartile. The closing date will be the last sunday in week 10 of the quartile. The student will receive a reminder towards the end of the quartile to fill in the questionnaire.

6.2 A peer-review aspect will be added to the reflection form, in the form of a tic-box. This means that the teachers should discuss their reflection with a colleague, to get extra feedback.

6.3 The workgroup quality control will look at the course reflections and SEQ's. If there is something out of the ordinary then it will be put on the agenda to discuss it.

7.1 Molenkamp and Boschma will be part of the advisory team for the critical self-reflection.