Minutes PC CS Meeting 156

Date:

Tuesday 11 May 2021

Location:

Home/ Microsoft Teams conference room

Time:

10.45 – 12.30

Present:

Staff: Sabine Padberg, Marloes van Grinsven, Arend Rensink (previous Program Director, joined at 11.02), Sharon Vonk, Anna Sperotto, Elena Mocanu, Erik Tews, Jan van Helvert, Vadim Zaytsev (Program Director),

Students: Joris Kuiper, Willem Schooltink (Educational affairs), *S*ander Bakkum, Marten Voorberg, Jayanshi Tripathi

Secretary: Robin Waterval

Guests: Tirzah Dekker (temporary program coordinator), Rosan Maas (Candidate Educational affairs)

Absent:

Rom Langerak

1. **Opening and Determining agenda**
   a. Bakkum opened the meeting at 10.46
   b. Rensink's successor (Zaytsev) is attending the meeting. He has not yet been publicly announced as the successor.
      i. *Zaytsev shortly introduces himself to the committee*
   c. Dekker will help out Van Helvert and Vonk until the summer holidays.
2. **Announcements**
   a. By (former) Programme Director
      i. There is a shortage of minors across all studies. This is on the agenda for point 7.
      ii. The number of pre-enrollments for the bachelor and master are ever increasing.
         1. Programme management is still in the process of hiring more teachers and coordinators for all the bachelor modules.

2. A numerus fixus is now being considered for TCS as it looks like we will be the second largest study at the UT next year. The largest study (Psychology) is also looking at a numerus fixus.

3. Next year group size in rooms is nationally capped at 75 people.

    iii.   This will be Rensink's final meeting.

3. **Incoming/outgoing correspondence**
   a. In an extra meeting the following pieces were discussed. The result has been appended to the piece.
      i. New course - Interactive Theorem provers for Software Verification - positive advice
      ii. Name change of Advanced Algorithms and Computational Complexity - positive advice
      iii. Changes to the DST programme - positive advice
      iv. Master EER 2021-2022 - Advice and remarks
   b. M-EER with implementation
      i. *There are no comments on the specific implementations of the Master EER.*
   c. Relevant procedures for module coordinators
      i. Programme management is making a document outlining the responsibilities and the timeline for module coordinators.

4. **Minutes of the 155ᵗʰ PC-CS meeting d.d. April 6ᵗʰ 2021**
   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. 534: Done. Discussion will take place at agenda point 5.
      iii. 539: Is in progress.
      iv. 545: Done. Discussion will take place at agenda point 11.
      v. 546: Done. The mail has been sent and Kuipers is working on it.

5. **Teacher and student input subject integration**
   a. This point was picked up after a complaint that was made at Inter-*Actief*.
   b. The module coordinators for the first six modules have given their opinions and feedback on the current structure.
   c. There have only been a couple of students (4) that filled in the survey for students.
   d. Students feel like the modules where subjects are linked together with a small assignment are not truly integrated.
   e. *Rensink joins the meeting at 11.02*
   f. Currently a semi-official working group is analyzing the modules to see which math topic fits which module best, to increase the integration of math. They will report their findings at a later moment.
   g. There is also the tradeoff of the size of study units and making sure that the unit is well balanced e.g. having to resit a significant portion due to failing a small portion.

h. To resolve the issue there are essentially two options: 1. Improve the integration of subjects so that they are linked together well; 2. Split up the subjects into smaller study units to make sure every unit is well integrated.

i. The PC realises that changing everything up is not possible before next academic year.

j. Bakkum suggests including the integration of the subjects in module evaluation and QAIs.

k. **@Programme management: Try to include more explicit questions on integration of subjects in the SEQ.**

6. **Bachelor EER 2021-2022**

a. The EER working group outlined the changes in the bachelor EER

b. Faculty section has similar changes as the master EER.
   i. The big change is in proctoring. The working group suggests the PC gives the same advice as was given for the master EER. The PC agrees.

c. Double degree (TCS/AM)
   i. It is mentioned that a student can leave one 5.0 per study year if it is compensated by another grade to above a 6.0 with the bachelor assignment at least a 6.0. This gives students the option to finish a minor with a 5.0.
   ii. Van Helvert explains this is to make the regulations more similar to the AM regulations. This pass/fail regulation has not been mentioned for the minor; this should actually be 6.0 or higher. Van Helvert will make a note to reflect this.

d. *The EER has been approved with the mentioned change by the PC.*

e. **@Bakkum: Write a formal letter to approve the EER and send it to the programme management.**

7. **Alternatives for TCS minor**

a. All programmes are having issues to place all students in the (preferred) minors.
   i. This seems to be a symptom of the increased number of students (at the entire UT).
   ii. Another symptom for the shortage is that an exchange minor is not possible with the current covid regulations.

b. There are a couple of solutions (for our programme) to the problem:
   i. Increase the number of students in the internship minor;
   ii. Allow more elective modules to be done as a minor;
   iii. Increase the number of minors that are of interest to TCS students.

c. Although the choice is now more limited due to minors filling up very fast (some even before sign-up opening or within 20 minutes after), the continuity of the study is not in danger at the moment. Therefore it is best to look at long term solutions instead of short term solutions.

d. Solutions being worked on are:
   i. All (UT-wide) minor modules are looking at ways to increase the number of students;

        ii.   Programme management is also looking to introduce new minors so that students have more choice in minors.

    e.   Many of the minors are not of interest to TCS students and are only picked because their preferred minors are already full, which also increases the stress on these minors.

    f.   *The PC approves that the programme management allows TCS students to do electives for both minor slots in the upcoming semester in case the preferred minors are already full and after they have consent by the examination board or study advisor.*

        i.   If this is also necessary for the second semester of next academic year it should be up for discussion again at the PC.

8. **Update Working group on strengthening decentralized participation March 2021**
   a. A working group instated by the university council sent an update on how they plan to improve decentralized participation (faculty councils/ programme committees etc.)
   b. The working group has some plans to help the various processes by increasing support from a central UT-wide level.
   c. They will focus on program committees after the summer holidays.

9. **Scan on student wellbeing during Covid-19**
   a. Tripathi and Kuipers had a meeting with someone from the executive board about student wellbeing.
   b. The main suggestion they made was to start opening up with tutorials to re-introduce the social aspect to studying, which should help first year and international students a lot, as they do not have that yet and seem to suffer the most.
   c. Currently students need to wait quite a while (1-3 weeks) before a study advisor has time to discuss the issues. The quality still seems to be good, but the availability seems to be bad at the moment.

10. **Timely submission of changed Modules/Courses**
    a. This topic was requested by Langerak to be discussed.
    b. Langerak mentioned that a couple of changes to courses/ modules were handed in quite late. Therefore he would like course coordinators for next year to be more aware of the timeline of changes.
    c. The document mentioned at 3.c will most likely also include these guidelines.

        i.   Separate documents will be created for the Bachelor and the Masters. The document for the bachelor will be written first.

        ii.   The entire process may take a while, because there are quite some unwritten procedures as well.

11. **QAI / CEEP**
    a. Planned Interviews:

        i.   B-M2: Software systems has received a big overhaul, so that could be interested - Kuiper and Mocanu

        ii.   M: Managing big data - Tripathi and Tews

        iii. M: Requirements engineering processes - Voorberg and Sperotto

        iv.   M: Cloud networking - Bakkum and Langerak
   b. Documents from the CEEP have been put in the relevant folder.

12. A.O.B. and Proposal items next meeting
   a. /

13. Questions and Conclusion.
   a. Mocanu: Our research group is looking at standardised cover pages for the theses and was wondering whether this is also done in other groups.
      i. Zaytsev is in favour of the idea, but it should also be possible for a student to design their own cover page.
   b. Rensink says farewell to the PC. He really liked the mutual cooperation with the PC.
   c. Sperotto: Our group noticed a big decline in students for Q4, even in courses which normally reach their cap. We were wondering whether this is also happening in other groups.
      i. Van Grinsven is looking into the matter w.r.t. Students that are enrolled in the program, but did not enroll in courses for Q4.
      ii. Not all results are in yet, but there are other courses that have not seen a decrease in the number of students.
   d. Tripathi: Does Rensink maybe have an update on the transitional rules, because he was not yet in the meeting when we discussed that action point.
      i. Van Helvert was in charge and has not written a rule yet.
   e. Bakkum closes the meeting at 12.30

Action points PC CS meeting 156

Nr.	Given in		Description	Responsible	Deadline
	Month	**Meeting #**			
539	March 2021	154	Formulate a transitional rule for students to make it clear that the students can choose either Cum Laude system to determine eligibility for Cum laude.	Programme management	April 2021
547	May 2021	156	Try to include more explicit questions on integration of subjects in the SEQ.	Programme management	June 2021
548	May 2021	156	Write a formal letter to approve the EER and send it to the programme management.	Bakkum	June 2021

Long term action points

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	
LT2	March 2021	154	Keep track of the WSV plans, to make sure the proposal is taken into account.	December 2021
LT3	March 2021	154	Discuss the "Industrial Advisory Board", "Hybrid education", "Number of students" and "Academic Skills" sections from the programme development plan of CS.	

The agenda point is discussed starting at 40:08 minutes into the recording.

Numerus Fixus is first discussed at about 43:40 by Voorberg, where he mostly attributes the problems to the number of students.
Rensink replies that this is not only due to the number of Computer Science students, but that the university as a whole is having issues with the number of available minor spaces. All study programs have a shortage.

This should be reflected in 7.a and 7.a.i.
If the PC feels this does not cover the topic, I would suggest to add the following as line 7.a.i.1: Putting a Numerus Fixus on computer science will therefore not resolve the issue since the issue affects all study programs.

Sperrotto also shortly discusses the number of students around 53 minutes. She mentions that we can offer students to do something else instead of the remaining available minors. She also says that her minor was filled up entirely (30 spots) 20 minutes after the enrollment opened.

This should be reflected in 7.b and 7.c

Some other things are being discussed about the minors.

Voorberg discusses the number of students again at 55 minutes, referring back to the point Vonk made earlier that the problems are exacerbated due to minors abroad not being an option. He adds that the problem would have arisen anyways if we continue to grow as we do now. With the speed our program grows now, we would have to accommodate 100-200 extra minor students every year. He believes all other options are only temporary fixes and will result in a loss of educational quality until a numerus fixus has been implemented.
Rensink replies that he thinks that Voorberg is a little too pessimistic. Introducing a new minor does not mean inherently that it is of worse quality than existing minors. He does agree that the capacity should be increased across the board.
Zaytsev adds that giving students more options for their minor should also relieve the stress on certain minors.

Since Rensink and Zaytsev countered Voorberg's argument, I chose to omit that from the minutes and incorporated their statements (among with some other statements not part of the numerus fixus discussions) in lines 7.b and 7.d.
If the PC feels this does not cover the topic, I would suggest to add the following as point 7.e (which causes the previous points 7.e and 7.f to become 7.f and 7.g respectively): Introducing a Numerus Fixus to computer science would slightly reduce the increasing stress on available minor spaces in upcoming years.

Numerus Fixus/number of students in Computer Science is not being discussed afterwards. The next agenda point is discussed starting from 1.14.40