

## Minutes PC CS Meeting 142

**Date:**

Tuesday 11 February 2020

**Location:**

Carre 3244

**Time:**

10.45 – 12.30

**Present:**

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

**Students:** Niek Khasuntsev, Danique Lummen (Educational Affairs), Angela van Sprang

**Secretary:** Robin Waterval

**Absent:**

Robert Banu, Sander Bakkum, Bert Molenkamp

**1. Opening and Determining agenda**

- a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10:47.

**2. Announcement**

**a. General announcement**

- i. Molenkamp will be absent for a couple of months, because his lectures are scheduled during the meeting.
- ii. Molenkamp will leave the committee from September onwards.

**b. Programme Director**

- i. There is now a canvas page in the making for teachers. This page will include all policies, including regulations concerning graduation projects in the master. This includes the standards for the composition of the evaluation committees.
  1. There is a canvas page for students as well, which will include the same information. Students will gain access to this page as soon as they start a research or final project.
- ii. There is an issue with the app groups within one of the student houses. We need to think of a way to prevent online bullying and inappropriate behaviour. This will be taken up by Lummen and Rensink.

## Minutes PC CS Meeting 142

- iii. The pre-enrollments for the Bachelor by students outside of Europe have increased significantly. From within Europe, the relative percentage of Dutch students is decreasing and international students within Europe are increasing.

### 3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence

- a. All relevant correspondence is on the agenda.

### 4. Minutes of the 141th PC-IT meeting d.d. January 14th 2020

- a. Comments:
  - i. 2nd page: Name written wrong at 5 a iii 1, should be Sperotto.
  - ii. 3rd page: Name written wrong at 6 d, should be Cristian.
- b. Action points:
  - i. *Finished action points have been removed and comments have been put here.*
  - ii. 466: The quality control teams will discuss this amongst each other and prepare something for the next meeting.
  - iii. 477: Will be discussed at the next meeting.
  - iv. 478: Done. The agenda point can be removed.
  - v. 482: Done. They had been informed a few days in advance that the course was cancelled, although it had been removed from rooster.utwente.nl even later.

### 5. Complain Data Science

- a. There were some issues concerning information about evaluation.
- b. **Explanation PD**
  - i. One of the students, who does not study computer science, filed a complaint with the university wide complaint bureau. This resulted in a reply from Maurice, the teacher of the course. One of the assignments was corrected too late, which was announced too late.
  - ii. The complaint concerned the fact that students couldn't break deadlines but teachers seemed to be able to do this at will.
  - iii. The deadline for our master programme was 15 working days, while at physics this was 10. The rule of thumb is that the rules of the faculty that organises the course holds, while technically the examination board decides this.
  - iv. It is unknown why the student went to the university wide bureau without contacting the teacher beforehand.
- c. Conclusion for CS is that communication is key. Inform the students in time when assignments might get graded a little later due to circumstances.

### 6. Update Course Security Services for the IoT

- a. The change of format seems to make the course a lot more scalable. This seems like a proper solution and the PC approves of it.
- b. There is still a scoring formula missing from the document, but the teacher will be able to update this.

### 7. Master courses maximum number of participants

## Minutes PC CS Meeting 142

- a. *The document was here last week already, but Van Grinsven wasn't here to help with the discussion.*
  - b. **Explanation Marloes**
    - i. Some teachers put the cap in the osiris description, some put it on the canvas page, but have no official cap in osiris when registering.
    - ii. Especially with new courses the cap is normal, because it is still a trial whether it works. Then after the course has been given the feasibility can be checked and the cap adjusted.
  - c. The question remains whether caps are a problem.
    - i. The problem in a way, is how the cap is enforced. Some quartiles don't have a lot of courses, so having a cap on a course in those quartiles will result people not being able to take a subject in that quartile.
    - ii. Exchange students also have an issue because they usually aren't able to enroll far in advance.
  - d. Students that have a course that is mandatory or choosing it as an advanced elective for their degree, should receive priority over other students.
    - i. Other than that the principle of first come first served seems fine.
  - e. Furthermore, introducing more subjects into a quartile makes caps less straining.
  - f. When looking at the TER it should be taken into account, whether caps induce problems in studiability.
  - g. It is important to make the communication about how to register more clear. There should not be different ways of enrolling into a course (e.g. on Osiris/ mailing the teacher/ sign up on Canvas).
  - h. **@TER team: Make sure the caps for master courses are checked whether they induce problems in studiability when the new TER is available.**
- 8. Cum Laude-regulations in the new TER - Advice for the PD**
- a. From next year onwards grades will be given on a .5 scale, although 5.5 will not be able to be submitted, thus preventing a 5.46 to be rounded up to 5.5, which seems like a sufficient grade, even though it is not.
  - b. The question arises whether the rules for cum Laude be the same. A 9 will be harder to receive if an 8.5 can also be given. A similar situation occurs for a 6.5 and a 6 (for only being allowed one 6).
  - c. There is also a difference between the weighted and unweighted average that the Bachelor and Masters use respectively for determining whether someone finished Cum Laude.
  - d. Also the requirement for the bachelor research project is currently an 8, where we also have a lot of Cum Laude students, therefore we could raise the bar here.
  - e. The bachelor requirement could be changed to only involve the research part of the research project, therefore not including the reflection. The bar can then be raised to 8.5.
  - f. The rule should in the end be that we end up between 10 and 15% Cum Laude students.
  - g. **@Rensink: Look into how changing the rules affect the amount of Cum Laude Bachelor students, based on the results of the previous few years.**

## Minutes PC CS Meeting 142

- h. **@Vonk: Get the grade distribution for the research final project of last year by calculating the final grades when given the half point grades being available next year.**
  - i. Currently there is a difference between what is on Osiris and what is being used to determine Cum laude within the Master. Rensink gives the preference that master should change to a weighted average to be in line with the bachelors.
  - j. With Tom 2.0 coming up, the final grades will be representing different study units, therefore it makes sense to use a weighted average instead of an unweighted average.
  - k. The required grade for the final project will remain a 9.0.
- 9. Double degree master programme**
- a. *As discussed during the action points, this point is removed from the agenda.*
- 10. Reflection**
- a. Most courses except for the ones from Delft were there.
  - b. The reflection for the natural language processing course was missing from the folder. It was submitted however.
  - c. **@Rensink: Move the reflection for the natural language processing course into the correct folder.**
- 11. Course for Programme Committee**
- a. There are a lot of new members in the PC. Therefore it might be a good idea to consider to take a course and who will take that course.
    - i. The actual student and staff members of the pc will attend (if their calendars permit).
    - ii. Van Grinsven is not interested
    - iii. Vonk would like to join.
    - iv. Rensink thinks he should not be involved in this.
  - b. The PC thinks that there are both reasons for Rensink to join or not to join. By joining, both parties are aware of what information everyone received.
  - c. **@Langerak: Send CELT an email to consider a date. Also ask them whether it would be a good idea that the educational management joins (either full time or part time).**
  - d. **@Padberg: Put celebrating the 144th meeting on the agenda.**
- 12. QAI**
- a. **Module/courses Q1**
    - i. Will be moved to the next meeting, because not all the reports were in yet.
    - ii. Tews and Khasuntsev have a meeting this afternoon
    - iii. Molenkamp and Bakkem also still need to hand in their report.
    - iv. The reports will be put in the archive for Quality control.
    - v. **@Padberg: Keep the QAI on the agenda.**
- 13. A.O.B. and Proposal items next meeting**
- a. Rensink is going to send the new links for the course overviews. They will be visible to anyone at the university of twente. The staff can look them up if they log

## Minutes PC CS Meeting 142

in with their staff google account. The students can request access, to which Rensink will provide them access.

- b. Rensink thinks the structure of the meeting documents is a bit off.
  - i. The current way is how it happened for the past few years.
- c. **@Padberg: Put up the list of courses of Q2 in the folder so that new courses can be picked to evaluate at the next meeting.**

### 14. Questions and Conclusion.

- a. Langerak closes the meeting at 12.23

### 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
483	February 2020	Make sure the caps for master courses are checked whether they induce problems in studiability when the new TER is available.	TER team	April 2020
484	February 2020	Look into how changing the rules affect the amount of Cum Laude Bachelor students, based on the results of the previous few years.	Rensink	March 2020
485	February 2020	Get the grade distribution for the research final project of last year by calculating the final grades when given the half point grades being available next year.	Vonk	March 2020
486	February 2020	Send CELT an email to consider a date. Also ask them whether it would be a good idea that the educational management joins (either full time or part time).	Langerak	March 2020
487	February 2020	Put celebrating the 144th meeting on the agenda.	Padberg	March 2020
488	February 2020	Keep the QAI on the agenda.	Padberg	March 2020
489	February 2020	Put up the list of courses of Q2 in the folder so that new courses can be picked to evaluate at the next meeting.	Padberg	March 2020