Minutes PC CS Meeting 141

Date:
Tuesday 14 January 2020

Location:
Carre 3244

Time:
10.45 – 12.30

Present:

Staff: Rom Langerak, Sharon Vonk, Erik Tews, Jan van Helvert, Anna Sperotto

Students: Sander Bakkum, Angela van Sprang, Robert Banu, Niek Khasuntsev

Secretary: Robin Waterval

Absent:

Sabine Padberg, Arend Rensink, Bert Molenkamp, Marloes van Grinsven, Danique Lummen

1. **Opening and Determining agenda**
   a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10.49
2. **Announcement PD**
   a. *Rensink is not here, so no direct announcements from the PD.*
   b. **Announcement**
      i. There will be a meeting soon about the programme development with the PD, the chairman of the PC and Stephan van Gils, portfolio holder of education.
3. **Incoming/outgoing correspondence**
   a. **Meeting scheme FB w.r.t. TER**
      i. A meeting scheme has been sent from the faculty board w.r.t. the TER.
      ii. TOM2.0 does not seem to be taken into account, since they asked for the TER to be finished earlier.
      iii. The guidelines have been approved by the executive board already, although it will be discussed in the university council in February.
      iv. Van Helvert will be dealing with the schedule.
   b. **Mail Andreas Peters Secure Cloud Computing (SCC)**

      i.   Was already discussed at the previous meeting, but the mail was not sent in as incoming document. It was added for clarity.

4. Minutes of the 140th PC-IT meeting d.d. December 17th 2019
    a. Comments:
        i.   Page 3: It was unclear what was meant with 7b. There was a document sent in for some standardised rules for double degree masters. The way these rules were structured were not feasible for Computer Science.
        ii.   Either it should be more flexible or it may not be adopted by the PC.
    b. Action points:
        i.   *Finished action points have been removed and comments have been put here.*
        ii.   458: done. The house system is currently being reflected by Lummen, Banu, Bakkum and Langerak by asking questions to the students and process these answers. Want to have a lunch meeting later and discuss it then. Questions like "Will these houses continue to exist in the second year" arise.

5. Quality Assurance
    a. Courses for next QA meetings
        i.   Last time there were 3 teams that interviewed a teacher. 2 interviewed a master course teacher, 1 did a bachelor course.
        ii.   All reflections for the modules are there by now.
        iii.   Course division:
             1.   Banu and Sperotto will interview Doina Bucur about module 1 "pearls of computer science", because there were quite a lot of problems with the increased student influx. This gives her a good chance to discuss all of them.
             2.   Bakkum and Molenkamp will evaluate the master course "Data science" given by Christin Seifert, who is a relatively new teacher.
             3.   Khasuntsev and Tews will evaluate the master course "System validation" given by Marieke Huisman. The course was rated quite low by the students with a high response rate.
             4.   Van Sprang and Langerak will evaluate module 5 "Computer Systems" given by Erik Tews. Van Sprang took this course
        iv.   Invitations should be sent by the student team member.
        v.   The teams should reflect with the teacher on the evaluation of the course. This gives the teachers a chance to inform the PC of the problems and issues that occurred, to which the PC can take measures or inform the teacher on what measures are already being taken.
    b. Format evaluation
        i.   There is a quantitative information and an evaluation with open questions. Teachers then reflect on these statistics and questions.
        ii.   Currently only the quantitative evaluations are put online at Canvas. How do teachers feel about putting the open questions on Canvas?
             1.   These answers could be taken out of context or be too personal

       iii. **@QATeams: Ask whether the teachers would be fine with putting the reflections on the open questions (along with the quantitative information that is already put online) on Canvas.**

       iv. If these answers are put online, then the students should be made aware.

       v. The PC should be careful that not all open answers should just be made public, as they might contain sensitive information. Rephrasing the answers might help preserve their anonymity.

6. **Master Courses maximum number of participants**
   a. *The document was sent in by Van Grinsven. She gave her notes to Vonk, because Van Grinsven could not attend the meeting.*
   b. Most of the courses in this overview are close to their cap. This means that exchange students might not always get a spot in the courses. Since they work with a first-come-first-served principle this is especially noticeable for students that come here by February, because they can only sign up very last minute.
   c. Security services for IoT is not in the overview, but does have a student cap.
   d. Cristian expects more students than the cap. They will send in a solution for next meeting.
   e. From this overview it is not clear how big the issues are. Since there are relatively few courses with a cap, there may be many more courses that students could take.
   f. Currently the scale of issues is unclear.
      i. Do the teachers for these courses even get more requests than their cap?
      ii. Could the teachers change their course to increase the cap?
      iii. Could the first-come-first-served principle be changed based on priority (some students need it for their master, others choose it as an elective)?
      iv. Would the quality really suffer if the cap was removed?
      v. Are there more courses with caps that are not in this overview? E.g. teachers manually enrolling students after they have emailed the teacher until they decide the cap has been reached.
      vi. When the cap is reached, how many extra students are rejected?
   g. Will be further discussed next meeting. Rensink and Van Grisven will be there again and can share their knowledge.
   h. **@Padberg: Keep the Master courses maximum number of participants on the agenda.**

7. **Reflection**
   a. **Module pearls and the houses system**
      i. Evaluation looked good. A lot of things were addressed.
      ii. Houses system will be discussed at a later moment.

8. **Ubiquitous Computing move from Q3 to Q4**
   a. There was an email that the course was moved to Q4.
   b. This was the result of the suddenly of Nirvana. Although it is not ideal, the PC respects the decision and is okay with it.
   c. It is unclear whether there have been complaints as a result of this development.

      d. **@Langerak: Ask Rensink whether there were complaints as a result of Ubiquitous Computing moving from Q3 to Q4.**

9. **Programme development Computer Science**
   a. It is a list of points that influence the quality of the programme. The PC has been working on most of these points over the year already. The document does not include the findings of the audit, but the PC was already aware of all problems found in the audit.
   b. In a couple of weeks this will be discussed with the educational dean.
   c. The development plan looks good to the PC.
   d. Other than what is mentioned in the plan, Vonk is currently working on an inventorisation of what trainings Teaching assistants get when starting off as a TA.
   e. Another point that could be improved upon is the knowledge about fraud/plagiarism in the master. A lot of students don't seem to be aware of what counts as fraud or plagiarism.
      i. During the master kick-in they give some attention to the topic.
      ii. It is on the bachelor canvas page. It could also be added to the masters canvas page.
      iii. It could also be addressed by looking at the academic skills within the masters.

10. **A.O.B. and Proposal items next meeting**
    a. /

11. **Questions and Conclusion.**
    a. Langerak closes the meeting at 11:55

Updated action point list

Nr.	Given in	Description	Responsible	Deadline
46 6	November 2019	Put "Quality control for courses not under our jurisdiction" on the agenda for next meeting.	Padberg	December 2019
47 6	December 2019	Make an announcement that the language code of conduct can also be found on canvas.	Rensink	January 2020
47 7	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
47 8	December 2019	Reply to Jan Willem Polderman about the double degree master programme document.	Rensink	January 2020
48 0	January 2020	Ask whether the teachers would be fine with putting the reflections on the open questions (along with the quantitative information that is already put online) on Canvas.	Quality Control teams	February 2020
48 1	January 2020	Keep the "Master courses with a maximum number of participants" on the agenda.	Padberg	February 2020

482	January 2020	Ask Rensink whether there were complaints as a result of Ubiquitous Computing moving from Q3 to Q4.	Langerak	February 2020