Date:	Tuesday 17 December 2019
	,

Location: Carre 3244

**Time:** 10.45 – 12.30

## Present:

**Staff:** Sabine Padberg, Marloes van Grinsven, Bert Molenkamp, Sharon Vonk, Erik Tews, Arend Rensink (Programme Director), Rom Langerak (10.48)

**Students:** Danique Lummen (Educational affairs), Sander Bakkum, Robert Banu

Secretary: Robin Waterval

#### Absent:

Anna Sperotto, Angela van Sprang, Niek Khasuntsev

## 1. Opening and Determining agenda

a. Molenkamp opens the meeting at 10.45

## 2. Announcement PD

- a. Announcement
  - i. Audit
    - 1. The audit was last week and the programme received a pass. We may continue the programmes for the upcoming 6 years.
    - 2. We received a few recommendations/comments:
      - a. Al is underrepresented as a topic in the bachelor.
      - b. Instate an Advisory board for the bachelor.
      - c. Some students take longer than desirable finishing the programme.
      - d. Offering courses more than once per year.
      - e. Rom Enters the meeting at 10.48
      - f. More care should be taken into training the Teaching Assistants.
      - g. Alumni are undervalued for use within the programme.
      - h. Percentage of cum laude degrees are too high.
  - ii. Hiring of teachers

- 1. We are at the end of a long period of time in which 7 teachers could be hired. So far 4 new teachers have been hired and there are still 3 more candidates.
- 2. They will be able to start from February. These lecturers will work on modules within the Bachelor Programme. The teacher shortage is most noticeable there.

## iii. Flowers for students

- There was a nomination for Rick de Vries and Justin Praas by Doina wich were handed out. There were 3 more given out to: Sophie ..., ..., and Yevhen Khavrona.
- Langerak did not do post processing. Rensink did some and send it to the University news as well as put it on the student and staff portal.
- 3. Van Grinsven will take care of the post processing.
- 3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence

## a. Lunch TOM 2.0

 Tews and Lummen attended the lunch. It was an event mostly tailored to students. They mostly wanted to receive feedback from the students on how they wanted to study.

#### 4. Minutes of the 139th PC-IT meeting d.d. November 12th 2019

- a. Comments:
  - i. Page 5: Banu mentions that Van Sprang would like to join the TER workgroup.
- b. Action points:
  - i. Finished action points have been removed and comments have been put here.
  - 404: The coordinators thought it would be okay if it was organised by an external party like the PC or the OOC. Everyone was open to the panel meetings.
    - 1. There is a new Bachelor coordinator for BIT, Jan van Helvert. He will be the contact person for the OOC.
    - 2. @Padberg: Invite Jan van Helvert for the PC meeting of February.
    - @Rensink: Speak with Jan van Helvert about the panel meetings, OOC and PC.
  - iii. 448: Done: Van Grinsven printed the overview.
    - 1. @Van Grinsven: Send the list of electives to Padberg.
      - 2. @Padberg: Put the list of electives with a maximum number of students on the agenda for next time.
  - iv. 458: Doina did not send it in yet. Will be put up for the agenda next time.
    - 1. @Lummen: Make an appointment with Bakkum, Banu and Langerak to discuss the houses system.
  - v. 460: Done, was included as an email. Andreas has included very good arguments why it should be taught in Q1.
    - 1. @Langerak: Forward the email of Andreas Peters to Padberg and inform Padberg what should be done with the email.

#### Commented [1]: Inaudible

- vi. 461: Done.
  - 1. @Rensink: Make an announcement that the language code of conduct can also be found on canvas.
- vii. 465: Was not done. Will be done in the next round of QA interviews.
- viii. 466: Was not done.
- 5. Fact sheet NSE
  - a. General
    - i. The Programme has improved on many points. Some points have regressed a minor amount.
    - b. Bachelor
      - i. Group sizes decreased.
      - ii. Internationalisation seemed to improve a lot. In respect to the other Technical Universities we can still improve.
      - iii. Rensink has an evaluation planned with Inter-Actief in January.
    - c. Master
      - i. All aspects have improved.
      - ii. Internationalisation is still below the national average.
- 6. Curriculum Tool
  - a. The Curriculum tool is a great way to improve quality assurance. It gives a good overview of what the programme wants/promises to do and how we do it. These points are also in the TER, but are rarely read.
  - b. The PILOs should be evaluated at least once per year by the PC, preferably before the TER of next year, so that necessary changes can be made. It is usually developed in March/April.
  - c. @Padberg: Put "PC Chairman and PD share their results about their meeting about how to evaluate the PILOs"on the agenda at the March meeting.
  - d. It would be great if teachers realized what their modules mean within the programme. So that they are aware what PILOs within their module.
  - e. Rensink gives a short introduction to the curriculum tool.
  - f. Rensink wants to know for the bachelor as well as the masters whether the PILOs are still in line with the current version of the programmes.
  - g. The PC will propose a procedure to evaluate the PILOs.
  - h. The tool contains a heatmap with all the learning goals which shows which module contributes to which PILO. Since the module coordinators are in charge of the learning goals on OSIRIS, it would be great if they could be in charge of updating the learning goals in the curriculum tool.
  - i. The PC supports the use of this curriculum tool to improve the quality assurance.
  - j. All (Semi-) Mandatory Master courses are in the curriculum tool.

## 7. Double degree master programme

- a. AM/AP came up with a document regarding double master programmes. They suggest this would be used by all double master programmes. The main issue is that double masters for Computer Science is that they take up 180 EC instead of the 120 EC that is proposed.
- b. Right now this is not possible for the Computer Science Master. Either it should be more flexible or it may not be adopted by the PC.

# c. @Rensink: Reply to Jan Willem Polderman about the double degree master programme document.

## 8. Minor: Study Tour

- a. The weeks have been divided in three, so each period of weeks is now 5 ECs, to better represent the workload that goes into the minor.
- b. There is a difference between deepening and broadening minors. Within our curriculum, you need at least 15 EC on a paradigm shift, but you can do one more elective.
- c. The question arises whether one could do the Study Tour instead of a paradigm shift elective. The going abroad minor is enough of a paradigm shift, but also consists of 30 EC.
- d. The PC thinks the Study tour includes enough of a paradigm shift to be considered as one.
- e. Since the internship teaches students many things they do not know yet, this would also be considered as a paradigm shift.

## 9. Reflection

## a. Smart Spaces

- There was not much to add.
- b. There are still quite a few missing from the Master, but Rensink is working on that

## 10. Quality Assurance

- a. Idea was to pick a few courses each module to talk with the responsible teachers of these courses and exchange some information.
- b. The discussions with the teachers seemed very pleasant and resulted in a lightweight discussion about the modules.
- c. The results of Quartile 1 are already available.
- d. @Padberg: Include "choose courses for the next QA meetings" on the agenda.
- e. The reports have also been sent to the teachers, so that factual errors can be removed from the reports.

#### 11. Admission bachelor students to master courses

- a. Bachelor students of different studies also apply for Master courses.
- b. The reason why this is possible is because most master courses do not have set requirements for applying, even though it is assumed that an applicant has a finished bachelor within Computer Science (or something equivalent).
- c. The PC agrees that discouraging bachelor students who do not have the required knowledge from master courses is a good idea. This will be done by adding the necessary requirements to the assumed previous knowledge on the OSIRIS page.

## 12. A.O.B. and Proposal items next meeting, Questions and Conclusion.

- a. Rensink and Langerak wish everyone happy holidays.
- b. Langerak closes the meeting at 12.32.

## **Updated Action Point list**

Nr.	Given in	Description	Responsible	Deadline
458		Put "Reflecting on Module 1 & Houses system" on the agenda for next meeting	Padberg	December 2019
465		Discuss the issue concerning politically correctness in their evaluations with the teachers. Updated: Was forgotten to do for the initial round. Will be done for the next round.	Quality Control teams	01/12/2019 Updated: April 2020
466		Put "Quality control for courses not under our jurisdiction" on the agenda for next meeting.	Padberg	December 2019
470		Invite Jan van Helvert to the PC meeting of February.	Padberg	January 2020
471		Speak with Jan van Helvert about the panel meetings, OOC and PC.	Rensink	January 2020
472	December 2019	Send the list of electives to Padberg.	Van Grinsven	January 2020
473		Put the list of electives with a maximum number of students on the agenda for next time.	Padberg	January 2020
474		Make an appointment with Bakkum, Banu and Langerak to discuss the houses system.	Lummen	January 2020
475		Forward the reaction of Andreas Peters to Padberg and inform Padberg what should be done with the email.	Langerak	January 2020
476		Make an announcement that the language code of conduct can also be found on canvas.	Rensink	January 2020
477		Put "PC Chairman and PD share their results about their meeting about how to evaluate the PILOs"on the agenda at the March meeting.	Padberg	March 2020
478		Reply to Jan Willem Polderman about the double degree master programme document.	Rensink	January 2020
479		Include "choose courses for the next QA meetings" on the agenda.	Padberg	January 2020

5