<p style="text-align:center">Minutes PC CS Meeting 145</p>

Date:
Tuesday 12 May 2020

Location:
Home/ Bluejeans conference room

Time:
10.45 – 12.30

Present:
Staff: Sabine Padberg, Marloes van Grinsven, Arend Rensink, Sharon Vonk, Rom Langerak, Anna Sperotto, Erik Tews, Bert Molenkamp, Jan van Helvert

Students: Sander Bakkum, Angela van Sprang, Willem Schooltink (Candidate Board), Danique Lummen (Educational affairs), *Robert Banu*

Secretary: Robin Waterval

Absent:
Niek Khasuntsev

1. **Opening and Determining agenda**
   a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10.47
   b. Rensink has a different meeting at 12.00, so he would prefer to be finished by then.
2. **Announcements Programme Director**
   a. Students have appreciated the teaching in Q3 a lot.
   b. Online teaching will continue at least until the holidays.
   c. The testing part is not going as well compared to with the current testing scheme.
      i. The Mathline has had a lot of fraud. Module 3 seems to suffer from this as well.
      ii. The tests where it seems fraud has been committed are invalidated. If enough of the people who committed fraud come forth themselves, then those who do not seem to have committed fraud will get to keep their grade.
      iii. It still needs to be evaluated which students have committed fraud.
   d. Evaluation results for Q3 are mostly in.
   e. It is still unclear how teaching will be organised for next academic year. The assumption is that teaching can happen on campus again, but it will need to be

organised differently. We cannot facilitate both having lectures on campus, as well as online for students that cannot attend.

    i.   This might have an impact on prospective students, but this does not show yet in the number of pre-enrolled students. Currently a number of around 300 is expected for Computer Science, similar to this academic year.

    ii.   Currently it is expected that we can do mostly everything again, assuming we can keep 1.5m distance. This means that lecture rooms have severely smaller capacity. One idea to counteract this is to have smaller student houses so that we can still have entire groups in a lecture room.

3. **Incoming/outgoing correspondence**
   a. Langerak forwarded the advice about the master EER to the relevant people
   b. *All other relevant correspondence is on the agenda.*
4. **Minutes of the 144th PC-CS meeting d.d. April 7th 2020**
   a. Comments:
      i. *There were no comments on the minutes*
   b. Action points:
      i. *Finished action points have been removed and comments have been put here.*
      ii. 466: Has not been done.
      iii. 477: Waiting until Rensink has time again.
      iv. 493: Has not been done.
      v. 494: Waiting.
      vi. 495: Waiting.
5. **TOM 2.0 - Module 7**
   a. At an earlier point the PC preferred module 7 to be integrated, meaning that the entire module is one atomic unit. The module is shared with AM and they prefer a coherent module, meaning one can take the parts separately. There was a long discussion back and forth. The final say was given to the module coordinator and they preferred it to be a coherent module.
   b. It will now be split up in four separate parts.
      i. Algorithmic Discrete Mathematics of 5 EC
      ii. Languages and Machines of 3.5 EC
      iii. Algebra of 3.5 EC
      iv. Project of 3 EC
   c. The proposal to make the module coherent is accepted.
6. **Bachelor EER**
   a. **Faculty section**
      i. **@Molenkamp: Send a new version of the EER documents to Langerak.**
      ii. Wherever TER is used currently, EER should be used instead.
      iii. Are modules 5 and 7 still integrated modules? Similar question for Module 10: Web Science.

2

1. Currently all computer science subjects will be "integrated" and Math will be separate, resulting in a coherent module of an atomic, integrated, computer science part and a Math part.
2. The only good integrated parts are operating systems with the project. There are some arguments why computer architecture(CAO) could be integrated with operating systems (OS) as their content is related to each other.
3. There is still a difference with EE, whereas they get to keep their grade of CAO, but if CS students fail OS, they have to redo CAO as well.
4. Tews, the new coordinator of module 5, thinks the module is not integrated at the moment and presenting it as integrated would not make sense. Until the module is more integrated contentwise, the module should stay coherent. However, he does have ideas on how to make the module more integrated.
5. Langerak proposes a vote: We leave integrated modules integrated for now and reevaluate after a year to see if modules still are or have become integrated otherwise re discuss and make them coherent if there haven't been any good attempts or are no good plans on making them integrated.
   a. In favour: 5 (Langerak, Van Sprang, Sperotto, Tews, Molenkamp,
   b. Against: 2 (Banu, Bakkum)
6. Therefore, attempts should be made to make the modules more integrated, if the situation has not improved after a year, the situation should be rediscussed and can still be made coherent.
iv. In Article 3.4 there is a contextual comment about making a third attempt passing a module. Should this be a module or a study unit?
   1. This should remain "a module".
v. There are no individual components described within modules in the current EER. How are these components translated to study units from next year onwards?
   1. These only relate to the math parts in the first year. This was not part of the previous EER, even though it should have been. The partial grade that they had will be changed to a final grade.
   2. **@Vonk: Sent a line to be added to the EER concerning the translation of grades for individual components to separate study units to Langerak for his advice with regards to the EER.**
b. **Double degree TCS and AM**
   i. There is a difference in requirement of quartiles between TCS and TCS-AM for when they can start their final semester.

1. This will be changed that both students need to have 120 credits excluding minors, including all first year study units. So the requirements of TCS-AM apply to TCS as well.

    ii. There is a difference between the Cum Laude for TCS and TCS-AM with regards to the grades they can have.

        1. This is because AM has smaller study units, and therefore more grades. It is harder for these students to compensate for a lower grade.

        2. This should also be taken into account for computer science if more modules are made coherent.

    iii. Since module 7 was changed, it also needs to be updated in the EER.

c. The EER is accepted with the mentioned changes.

d. Rensink leaves the meeting at 12.09

7. **Course participation limits**
   a. The EER workgroup has analysed the situation and only saw a problem for the specialisation of Internet Science and Technology when they have more than 16-18 students per year.
   b. Van Grinsven will monitor the situation.

8. **Confidentiality master Final Project**
   a. There is a proposition at the moment, but EE has a problem with it. It was said that the university should implement this university-wide.
   b. There has been a discussion between the 4TU about shared confidentiality. The university will have a university wide committee handling the confidentiality. The committee is not there yet.
   c. **@Van Grinsven: Send the result of the steering committee with regards to confidentiality for the final master's project proposed change to the PC.**

9. **Evaluation Q2**
   a. Will evaluate 2 bachelor modules and 2 courses of the master.
   b. Bachelor
      i. Web Science is still missing.
      ii. Software systems - Sperotto & Banu
      iii. Intelligent interaction design - Langerak & Van Sprang
   c. Master
      i. …
      ii. Advanced algorithmic & computational complexity - Tews & Khasuntsev
      iii. Data Science (Q1 & Q2)- Molenkamp & Bakkum

> **Met opmerkingen [1]:** 3 courses not there yet.

10. **New PC members**
    a. No update since last meeting.
    b. Banu might also leave from September onwards if he passes his research project.

11. **A.O.B. and Proposal items next meeting**
    a. No other business or item proposals were brought up

12. **Questions and Conclusion.**
    a. Langerak closes the meeting at 12.24

Updated action point list

Nr.	Given in	Description	Responsible	Deadline
466	November 2019	Put "Quality control for courses not under our jurisdiction" on the agenda for next meeting.	Padberg	December 2019
477	December 2019	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
493	March 2020	Look into the option of communicating back the results of the houses survey to the students.	Lummen	April 2020
494	March 2020	Plan a moment to have the PC course, once the situation allows	Everyone	
495	April 2020	Put the Cum Laude calculation rules for the Master on the Agenda in January 2021	Padberg	January 2021
497	May 2020	Send a new version of the EER documents to Langerak.	Molenkamp	May 2020
498	May 2020	Sent a line to be added to the EER concerning the translation of grades for individual components to separate study units to Langerak for his advice with regards to the EER.	Vonk	May 2020
499	May 2020	Send the result of the steering committee with regards to confidentiality for the final master's project proposed change to the PC.	Van Grinsven	May 2020