

Minutes PC CS Meeting 150

Date:

Tuesday 3 November 2020

Location:

Home/ Microsoft Teams conference room

Time:

10.45 – 12.30

Present:

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

Students: Niek Khasuntsev, Willem Schooltink (Educational affairs), Sander Bakkum, Marten Voorberg, Jayanshi Tripathi

Secretary: Robin Waterval

Absent:

Elena Mocanu

1. Opening and Determining agenda

- a. Langerak opened the meeting at 10.47

2. Announcements by Programme Director

- a. The university made the call to prepare to fully return to online teaching (and testing), so that the programme is prepared when necessary. Even though online testing is very undesirable, delaying tests until physical tests are allowed again is even more so.
 - i. If there are any questions surrounding online testing, Rensink would like to refer them to the student members of the PC. If necessary, Rensink would also like to organise a Q&A session where students can actively ask questions.
 - ii. If a testing scheme will not work out online, then changes should be made as soon as possible with the approval of the examination board. So that students have enough time to adjust to it.
 - iii. When physical testing is not allowed anymore we will switch to online testing as soon as possible. As soon as it is considered safe and the university allows it, we will switch back to physical testing.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence

- a. *There was no relevant incoming/outgoing correspondence*

Minutes PC CS Meeting 150

4. Minutes of the 149th PC-CS meeting d.d. October 6th 2020

- a. Comments:
 - i. *There were no comments on the previous minutes.*
- b. Action points:
 - i. *Finished action points have been removed and comments have been put here.*
 - ii. 466: Waiting.
 - iii. 477: Will be discussed at point 5.
 - iv. 494: Will be discussed at point 10.
 - v. 495: Waiting.
 - vi. 503: The document was sent just before the meeting.
 - 1. In short: If a student has passed the core based on the rules of last year, they will also have passed the new core.
 - 2. The grades will be updated to half point grades, so some students will receive a slightly higher grade and others a slightly lower grade.
 - 3. Students that did not complete the entire module (7 students in total) have already been updated on the change.
 - vii. 505: New Ethics teachers are now known. Vonk will plan a meeting shortly.
 - viii. 508: Will be discussed at point 5.
 - ix. 509: See explanation of AP 503.
 - x. 510: Will be discussed at point 7.
 - xi. 511: Will be discussed at point 8.
- c. *The minutes have been approved*

5. PILOs: How to evaluate

- a. PILO (Program Intended Learning Outcomes) should be stable. We cannot change them at random, because that would affect what our study should teach students.
- b. Rensink and Langerak discussed how to evaluate them, and suggest evaluating them every 2 years before an audit.
- c. For the bachelor it is important to involve the chairs in the discussion. One result of the previous audit was to involve feedback from the workfield on the programme.
- d. After that has happened, the results will be discussed within the PC.
- e. **@Waterval: Make a long term action point list and include to evaluate the PILOs before a (midterm) audit.**

6. CEEP (Committee for Education Evaluation Panels)

- a. The CEEP has asked the PC whether we want to receive the reports of the panels.
- b. These reports would be beneficial for the PC to receive, so that the PC has a better insight in the modules, however it is not necessary to discuss these reports at every meeting.
 - i. When the PC does receive reports, this should be clearly communicated to the students when they are invited or attending the panel meetings.
- c. **@Langerak: Contact the CEEP and discuss how the PC can receive the panel reports.**

7. Composition Programme Committee

Minutes PC CS Meeting 150

- a. Since the CAES group is not represented in the curriculum group, Molenkamp was asked to remain as a member of the curriculum group, even though he left the PC.
 - i. He will only be contacted if it relates to his field.

8. Annual Report PC-CS

- a. Last year there was a comment that some reflection would be proper in an annual report. Since the PC has not yet had a training course, the reflection will be included in a future report.
- b. Other than some textual comments, the document might benefit from different levels of headers.
- c. **@Langerak: Update the report and forward it to Padberg.**

9. QAI

- a. Bakkum & Langerak discussed the research project
 - i. As the bachelor is getting bigger there is some concern for finding enough assignments.
 - ii. There are also some issues with the 10-week format, as it is a short amount of time for the research project. The teacher would prefer to return to a semester course instead.
 - iii. The teacher also suggested it would have been nice to have some sort of document with information on who to contact in certain situations.
- b. Khasuntsev and Mocanu have not been able to schedule a meeting with Marco Bekooij yet.
 - i. Van Grinsven has received the reports, and has a different contact address for the teacher as well.
 - ii. **@Van Grinsven: Forward the reports and the contact address to Khasuntsev**
- c. Tripathi was also unable to schedule a meeting with Geert Heijink.
 - i. Padberg mentions he was out of office until recently.
- d. Voorberg and Sperotto also had a meeting with the teacher of Data & Information.
 - i. The teacher has not yet approved or sent comments on the report.
 - ii. The report will be submitted to be discussed for the next meeting.

10. PC members - Training Courses participation Councils

- a. Langerak was forwarded twice to a different party and now received some info from an external office (TAQT) in Amsterdam.
- b. There is an Education quality officer (Cynthia Souren) in our faculty. Her opinion can be of value in this discussion as well.
 - i. If she has a different idea then that idea could be explored further.
 - ii. Otherwise Langerak can look further into TAQT, as it might also be beneficial to have an outsider look into the structure for once.
 - iii. For reference: Khasuntsev had a training with the BIT programme committee that lasted the better part of the afternoon learning about the rules surrounding PCs, but also on how to cooperate.
 - iv. **@Rensink: Discuss the course options with Cynthia Souren and inform Langerak of the result.**
- c. The 12 people that will attend the training would be at least:

Minutes PC CS Meeting 150

- i. The 4 student members
- ii. The 4 staff members
- iii. Rensink, Vonk, Van Helvert (Van Grinsven already had multiple recently so she will not join)
- iv. Padberg

11. A.O.B. Questions and Proposal items next meeting

- a. Langerak had a meeting with other PC chairmen and the educational dean of the faculty about WSV (Wet Studie Voorschot), where a list of priorities was made.
 - i. The NVAO (Nederlands-Vlaams AccreditatieOrganisatie) then evaluated the plans and thought our plans were very ambitious. They wanted the ideas to be more clustered together.
 - ii. The PC should receive a document with the details soon. Small adjustments can still be made to the plan.
- b. Rensink wants to give some words of praise to the PC on their ambition and recent works.
 - i. In other news, Rensink will announce the winning design of the facemask competition tomorrow where every teacher and student can claim one.
- c. Voorberg suggests discussing the quality of teaching assistants at the next meeting. There are a lot of teaching assistants in the modules (e.g. 80 in module 2) and the quality of our education could be improved a lot by evaluating this. This was also mentioned at the previous audit.
 - i. **@Rensink: Provide Langerak of contact details of Eline Meijerink.**
 - ii. **@Langerak: Invite Cynthia Souring and Eline Meijerink to the next meeting to discuss teaching assistants.**

12. Conclusion.

- a. Langerak closes the meeting at 12.06

Minutes PC CS Meeting 150

Updated action point list

Nr.	Given in		Description	Responsible	Deadline
	Month	Meeting #			
466	November 2019	138	Put "Quality control for courses not under our jurisdiction" on the agenda for next meeting.	Padberg	December 2020
495	April 2020	144	Put the Cum Laude calculation rules for the Master on the Agenda in January 2021	Padberg	January 2021
512	November 2020	150	Make a long term action point list and include to evaluate the PILOs before a (midterm) audit.	Waterval	December 2020
513	November 2020	150	Contact the CEEP and discuss how the PC can receive the panel reports.	Langerak	December 2020
514	November 2020	150	Update the report and forward it to Padberg.	Langerak	December 2020
515	November 2020	150	Forward the reports and the contact address to Khasuntsev	Van Grinsven	December 2020
516	November 2020	150	Discuss the course options with Cynthia Souren and inform Langerak of the result.	Rensink	December 2020
517	November 2020	150	Provide Langerak of contact details of Eline Meijerink.	Rensink	December 2020
518	November 2020	150	Invite Cynthia Souring and Eline Meijerink to the next meeting to discuss teaching assistants.	Langerak	December 2020

Updated long term action point list

Nr.	Given in		Description	Deadline
	Month	Meeting #		
LT1	November 2020	150	Evaluate the PILOs 2 years before the next audit or 1 year before a midterm audit	