Minutes Meeting Programme committee – CS Meeting NR 137

Date: Tuesday 10 September 2019

Location: Carre 3244

Time: 10.45 – 12.30

Present: Sabine Padberg, Anna Sperotto, Iris Heerlien, René Boschma, Ties Bolding, Rom Langerak (chairman), Arend Rensink (program director), Sharon Vonk, Marloes van Grinsven, Erik Tews (new), Robin (minute secretary, new)

Absent: Bert Molenkamp, Danique Lummen

1. Opening and Determining agenda
    a. Rom opens the meeting at 10.44
    b. Agenda change:
        i. Rensink sent the document for TOM 2.0 yesterday, will not be discussed as a document, but will be announced shortly at the end of the meeting.
    c. Announcements:
        i. Erik Tews is here as a new member of the PC.
        ii. Robin will be here as a minute secretary from now on.
        iii. This will be Ties' final meeting, so he brought cake. He wishes all the best and thanks everyone for all the experiences.
2. Announcement PD
    a. Participation day
        i. It is a meeting about having a say in a board and their relation. All Programme committees are invited to this.
        ii. There is no new information than what is in the email. Arend was merely asked to forward the email to the PC.
        iii. Boschma thinks it is odd that the University does not follow their own policy of organising events in Dutch / send invitations in Dutch.
            1. Rensink forwarded the comment to the person sending the invitation.
    b. Critical self-reflection B-TCS and M-CS
        i. The reflection is currently in a draft stage. It has been forwarded to the university board.
        ii. It is complete except that it misses some tables / numbers that have not been put in there or are not correctly formatted.
        iii. Not all received feedback has been processed in this draft.
        iv. Last week there was a meeting with the "Kaner"(?), the body that leads the audit. The NWAO is the body that sets the rules.
        v. Currently we are on schedule to have the document ready by the final deadline.

vi.   The programme committee will not be interviewed by the auditing committee, although Rensink will try to make sure that the committee is represented.

vii.   @Rensink: Forward the dates for the trial and actual audits.

viii.   Audits are planned on the 9th and 10th of November, where Computer Science is only on the 9th.

    1. The final results will be made available after both days have been done.
    2. Proposed times for the interview are:
        a. Bachelor students: 10:45
        b. Bachelor teachers: 13:15
        c. Master students: 14:15
        d. Master teachers: 15:15

ix.   There is a trial audit planned on the 29th of October, which is only for Computer Science.

    1. Times should be roughly the same as the actual audit.
    2. Tews will probably not be there on the 29th because of the deadlines in the module he's teaching.
    3. Sperotto is also not available as this is her free day. She can make it if there is a specific time slot.
        a. Rensink suggests the timeslot of 15:15. Sperotto is available
    4. Rensink suggests moving to the 30th, but this does not solve the issue for Tews or Sperotto.
    5. Ties is available as an alumnus that is not studying a master.
        a. @Rensink: Sign Ties up as bachelor student and alumnus for the (trial) audit.
    6. Boschma and Heerlien are both available.

x.   Rensink wants to know what the best moment is to ask for feedback on the document. It would be nice if the PC could (informally) approve of the document.

    1. The PC agrees that they will make comments on the final draft version so that there are fewer double comments.
    2. @Rensink: Send the final draft of the reflection document at 29th of September at the latest.
    3. Boschma comments that:
        a. His name is incorrectly spelled and should be spelled as René.
        b. Statistics are given about the number of students for the B-CS and M-CS, but there is ambiguity in what the numbers actually mean.

xi.   The programme is asked to think of what the Bachelor will look like in a year. A so called "Houtskoolschets" (roughly translated to "charcoal sketch").

    1. The opinions of the module coordinators have been asked several times already, but the rules keep changing.

<ol start="2">
The document cannot be approved by the program committee, because the next meeting is scheduled for October, while the deadline for this sketch is at the end of September.
The guidelines are not clear at the moment, so the draft version that is available right now might still change a lot.
Modules might be cut up into smaller components so that they are not one atomic block of 15 EC. Where the cut will be is depending on the PC.
<ol type="a">
If students from different studies study the same module, then the module should have the same components for all studies.
The math component will in general be separate component.

The Dutch Document is purely for information, but should have been in English instead.
The PC will await what Rensink did and provide unasked comments on the document.
@Rensink: Send the "charcoal sketch" of the Bachelor programme in for next meeting, so that it can be discussed.

<p>xii. There will be a meeting with all the chairmen of the PCs about the "ITK" (Instellings Toets Kwaliteitszorg/ Institution Test to guarantee Quality) and WSV.</p>

WSV was discussed last meeting. An advice has been given then on how to spend the money.
The meeting is on the 16th of September.
Langerak will let the PC know about what came out of this meeting.

<p>xiii. Announcement working groups</p>

Have not been doing a lot lately
Langerak has been working on the division of Houses a lot.
<ol type="a">
There are currently 7/8 first year students that are enrolled in the module but are not formally enrolled.

<ol start="3">
Incoming/outgoing correspondence
<ol type="a">
/

Minutes of the 136th PC-IT meeting of July 9th 2019
<ol type="a">
Langerak and Padberg were both absent for this meeting.
No comments were given on the minutes.
Action point check
<ol type="i">
392: On the agenda.
393: On the agenda.
402: Done.
403: Done.
404: No update.
405 and 406 are now merged into one AP.
411 will be removed as it is now irrelevant.

        viii.   412: Flower bouquet is ready for the next mailing. Will be kept as an AP, to check whether it has been done.

        ix.   413-415 are all about the same topic. Done.

        x.   416: Done.

        xi.   420: Done.

        xii.   421: Done.

        xiii.   422: Padberg needs the names of the new members in order to do this.

        xiv.   424: Done.

        xv.   425: Done.

        xvi.   426: On agenda.

        xvii.   427: On agenda.

        xviii.   428: Done.

        xix.   429: Done.

        xx.   430: Done.

        xxi.   431: Done - there were none.

5. Internship as minor
   a. Last time there was announced that there was a talent-IT version, which was not in the document.
      i. The document has been updated and sent in.
   b. Boschma wonders how a final grade will come out of this.
      i. Depending on the project description they will have to hand in 3 deliverables. These deliverables will be checked by a supervisor from the University.
   c. Is it wise to split up one project in separate components of up to 5 weeks? It seems short for a complete project.
      i. The companies don't have experience with this. It is also a pilot for them.
      ii. If it is for an actual IT company a project of 10 weeks can be set up. For engineering companies it will probably be split up into components of up to 5 weeks per company.
   d. The internships will be graded in a similar fashion as the Master internships.
   e. Currently these minors will only be given in quartiles 3 and 4 because it is a pilot. If the pilot works out well then it could be done in any quartile.
   f. The deadline to sign up for this minor is October 7th.
      i. Sharon already received 5 emails about this.
6. Reflection Bachelor and Master
   a. Storage SEQ and reflection teachers
      i. Evaluation Bachelor and Master (Link)
         1. While the Bachelor link to the overview does work, the Master link to the overview does not.
      ii. The documents will be on WebHare.
      iii. There are two more documents that are not included.
      iv. A small improvement to the process will be that Padberg will have access to the original folder.

1. Rensink then does not have to first send it to Padberg and Padberg then to the PC.
            v. The reflections will not be discussed. They will only be checked whether it is done in a satisfactory way.
            vi. Concerning the Bachelor:
                1. Data & information
                2. Programming paradigms is missing.
                3. There is also no Reflection on Programming paradigms
            vii. Concerning the Master:
                1. Only 7 out of 11 were there.
                    a. Those that were there were okay.
                2. In software evolution there was the conclusion that the course might not be given next year.
                    a. This was because it was a one-time course.
                3. Rensink has received 3 more since this zip was uploaded, so only one of them is missing.
                4. Since everyone only gave a quick look at the documents so far, Bolding requests to send the complete folder again.
                5. **@Rensink: Send in the Bachelor and Master evaluation documents in again.**
            viii. Rensink is looking into the correlation of teachers asking actively and response rate.
                1. Teachers in general actively ask students to fill in the questionnaire, either through Canvas or in the lectures. This resulted in a few more respondents, but the correlation is not significant.
            ix. Tews wants to know whether there is a good reason why there are no custom questions included anymore.
                1. Rensink responds that that there are only bad reasons, such as that these questionnaires are made at a University level and therefore is too much work to add individual questions.
7. Relation of the PC with the Examination Board
    a. This was once coined as an idea. It was discussed at the PC and the conclusion at the time was that it did not seem like a good idea. Rensink had the strong opinion that the PC should be included more.
    b. Langerak suggests it might be a good idea to invite the examination board to a meeting for roughly 20 minutes to tell what they are doing. The other way around could also happen if the idea sounds useful after the pitch.
    c. The Examination Board meetings are roughly at the same moment so meeting all together might be impractical.
    d. **@Langerak: Contact Pieter Tjerk to see what can be arranged and let Padberg know what meeting the Examination Board will have one of their members join our meeting.**
8. Student PC Members

a. 6 people showed interest in becoming a member of the PC. One person dropped out because of the possibility of elections and a second emailed that they didn't have time anymore to do it. As a result, there are 4 people left.
b. Lunch (Friday 13/09)
   i. Bolding and Heerlien have a meeting with the 4 new members.
      1. Boschma could not attend the meeting.
   ii. The interested new members are:
      1. Sander Bakkum
      2. Angela van Sprang
      3. Robert Banu
      4. Niek Khasuntsev
   iii. Since there is only budget to have 4 students attending at the same time, the new members will officially join when the current student members leave the committee.
   iv. Because of payment reasons the students suggest to change in between quartiles 1 and 2.
      1. Boschma and Heerlien will keep attending the meetings until and including November.
      2. Heerlien hopes that Sander would like to take over the position of vice president, because he has a lot of experience. It will be discussed with them at a later point.
      3. The four new members will also attend all these meetings.
         a. Some can be appointed early when the previous student members leave, others will have to join as spectators.
      4. Bolding and Jakob (?) Will not be attending these meetings.
   v. Boschma proposes to include the new members in the payments, because the articles do not state a hard limit for the amount of students in the PC.
      1. Van Grinsven mentions that the amount of students should be equal to the amount of staff.
      2. Padberg does not know if payment from October is possible, so the discussion is not relevant if payment from October onwards is not possible.
      3. @Padberg: Ask the Education office what is possible concerning the payment of the candidate student members.
      4. @Padberg: Inform Bob that Jakob is not a part of the PC from September onwards and Bolding from October onwards.
   vi. Heerlien says it is important to have a clear concept of who are candidate members and who are official members of the PC.
9. Imbedding EIT from DST
a. DST is one of the Master specialisations. The plan is to have it available in the EIT digital construction per next year.

         i.   This is also a master where students will receive 2 degrees where they spend half their time here and the other half at another institution.

    b. In cybersecurity, where they already have this construction, the program mentor checks whether the program at the other institute matches what should be done according to our TER.

    c. Rensink proposes to invite the Program mentor from DST (Maurice van Keulen/ Christin Seifert) sometime in the upcoming year to ask how they plan to organise this.

         i.   Christin may have taken over from Maurice by then.

    d. A document mapping the learning goals that we expect in the second half to the subjects in the other programme would be sufficient.

         i.   The issue here is that each institute handles their programmes differently, so such a document would be required for each partner institute. The next problem would then be how to keep these documents up to date?

    e. Tews mentions that the PC should take a leading role in the development of the EIT so that the courses given at the partner institutes meet the requirements of the PC.

         i.   Rensink: I'm afraid we have little say in what our partner institutes do and I think Maurice and Christin are on the same page about what the students need to do. So I think it's a good idea for you to talk to them.

    f. @Langerak: Ask Maurice what the state of affairs is regarding the embedding of EIT in DST.

10. Questions and conclusion

    a. Padberg: There is another candidate to be a minute secretary. They would like to attend the next meeting to observe whether they like it. They would become the back-up in case Robin is not available.

    b. Boschma: Currently there are roughly 300 first year students. Modules are being changed to cope with that. None of these changes have been communicated with the PC so far. Should we not be aware of these changes or is this an issue for the examination board?

         i.   Rensink: What kind of things would you as a PC like to know?

         ii.   Boschma: The way the examination has changed might be relevant to the PC. We should make sure the quality of education remains up to par.

         iii. Rensink: We have a quality cycle in place. We have evaluations, reflections, and based on these the module coordinators make changes. When the changes are so large that it warrants a change in the Osiris description, with the learning goals of the module and maybe the organisation, then the PC should be informed of these changes.

         iv. Boschma: The first module had a subject each week where one of the weeks was too hard for the first-year students. Boschma thinks that this week has changed, which is something the PC should be aware of.

<ol type="a" start="22">

       v.   Langerak: Such a similar thing happened last year with Module 7, where the project was sort of removed and substituted. This is something where we should be kept up to date.

      vi.   When to update the PC of these changes is hard to say.

     vii.   **@Rensink: Ask Doina about a summary of things that have changed in Pearls of Computer Science when she has time to write such a document.**

     viii.   The PC would like documents with a summary of things that have changed so they are in the loop and aware of (major) changes to modules. If the changes happen in a panic state (because the changes need to be implemented in a short amount of time) it is fine to let the PC know after the changes have been implemented.

     ix.   Changes to cope with the amount of students are very relevant to the PC.

     x.   The PC can also advice the module coordinators on ways on how to update the module.

c. Bolding wants to thank everyone again. He really liked the openness of the committee. He always felt equal to the staff in this committee.

d. This was Tews' first meeting, so he was not aware of a lot of topics discussed and what to expect and what not. He has now some experience on what will be discussed and can prepare discussions for upcoming meetings better.

     i.   Sperotto: Are you aware of any of the working groups that we have?

     ii.   A working group prepares some documents for the committee so that the documents can be more easily prepared for a meeting.

     iii.   **@Padberg: Put the workgroups on the agenda so that the candidate student members also know more about them.**

11. Any other Business and proposal items next meeting.

    a. No other Business.

    b. Langerak closes the meeting at 12:20.

Updated Action point list:

Nr.	Given in	Description	Responsible	Deadline
404	May 2019	Discuss the implementation of panel meetings per specialization with the specialization coordinators.	Van Grinsven	June 2019
405,406	May 2019	Make a proposal for the implementation of the reflection sampling and peer reflection in evaluations before september	Workgroup quality assurance	September 2019
412	June 2019	Promote the appreciative flower bouquet for students to the staff in the weekly mailing in September.	Rensink	September 2019
422	June 2019	See if it is possible to get an alias email for the PC.	Padberg	September 2019

432	September 2019	Forward the dates for the trial and actual audits.	Rensink	October 2019
433	September 2019	Sign Ties up as bachelor student and alumnus for the (trial) audit.	Rensink	October 2019
434	September 2019	Send the final draft of the reflection document at 29th of September at the latest.	Rensink	October 2019
435	September 2019	Send the "charcoal sketch" of the Bachelor programme in for next meeting, so that it can be discussed.	Rensink	October 2019
436	September 2019	Send in the Bachelor and Master evaluation documents in again.	Rensink	October 2019
437	September 2019	Contact Pieter Tjerk to see what can be arranged and let Padberg know what meeting the Examination Board will have one of their members join our meeting.	Langerak	October 2019
438	September 2019	Ask Maurice what the state of affairs is regarding the imbedding EIT from DST.	Langerak	October 2019
439	September 2019	Put the workgroups on the agenda so that the candidate student members also know more about them.	Padberg	October 2019
440	September 2019	Ask the Education office what is possible concerning the payment of the candidate student members.	Padberg	October 2019
441	September 2019	Inform Bob that Jakob is not a part of the PC from September onwards and Bolding from October onwards.	Padberg	October 2019
442	September 2019	Ask Doina about a summary of things that have changed in Pearls of Computer Science when she has time to write such a document.	Rensink	October 2019