Minutes PC CS Meeting 153

Date:
Tuesday 9 February 2021

Location:
Home/ Microsoft Teams conference room

Time:
10.45 – 12.30

Present:

Staff: Rom Langerak, Sabine Padberg, Marloes van Grinsven, Arend Rensink, Sharon Vonk, Jan van Helvert, Anna Sperotto, Elena Mocanu (joins at 10:55), Erik Tews

Students: Niek Khasuntsev, Joris Kuiper, Willem Schooltink (Educational affairs), Sander Bakkum (joins at 10:51), Marten Voorberg (leaves at 12:13), Jayanshi Tripathi

Secretary: Robin Waterval

Guest: Eline Meijerink (leaves at 11:05)

Absent:
/

1. **Opening and Determining agenda**
   a. Langerak opened the meeting at 10.46
2. **Professionalization TA**
   a. Last year before the summer holidays, all students were asked whether they wanted to be a TA. Any modules that they already have been a TA for have been noted down as well. Working permits had been applied for preemptively for students that needed one, so that international students can easily be a TA as well.
   b. Students that did not have a lot of training yet received a DISA training in collaboration with CELT. This training should give a new TA the tools (although not TCS specific) they need to be a good TA.
      i. The DISA training was renewed recently, because students did not appreciate the previous version. The renewed version has gotten positive responses from students.

1

      ii.   This training can be given for groups between 7 and 15 students.

   c. Meijerink also takes care of the administrative side of being/becoming a TA.

   d. For the future Meijerink is looking into the option of giving the TAs the possibility to give a preference for the subjects they want to help out with and some rating systems.

   e. When a module coordinator needs TAs for a module, Meijerink helps out with the overview of who might be interested. The module coordinator usually then selects TAs based on e.g. experience or certain grades for a subject.

   f. There are currently no systematic checks how well a TA does their job as this is usually handled within a module. There are ideas on implementing a feedback option in the horus application, where students can provide feedback on the quality of the help offered by a TA.

   g. *Meijerink leaves the meeting at 11.05*

3. **Announcements**

   a. by Programme Director

      i.   The educational day has been organised for teachers recently. On this day some topics were discussed, which will be sent to the PC for discussion soon.

          1. One of the topics is the math line throughout the bachelor.

          2. Another topic is the option to study some master courses for micro-credentials as post-academic education.

      ii.   The programme has been requested by the university to make an industrial advisory board for the programme. A proposal for this board will also be sent to the PC for discussion.

      iii.   The national student Questionnaire has been sent out again. Last year it did not take place, but so far the results are a little worse than two years ago.

      iv.   Teachers have been asked to fill in a survey on how much hours every teacher spends on teaching.

      v.   A programme development plan for TCS is being written, which would include the previous topics for example.

   b. Joris Kuiper will be a new student member of the PC and is currently attending the meeting.

4. **Incoming/outgoing correspondence**

   a. An incoming mail was received from the course of Empirical security analysis and engineering. They took the considerations of the PC into account with regards to the timing of the course, but they had good reasons for giving it in Quartile 1, so they did not change it.

5. **Minutes of the 152th PC-CS meeting d.d. January 12th 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.   516: Now that a new member has joined and others will not join for a while, a moment will be planned together with TAQT.

      iii.   525: 3 out of 4 groups have made an appointment.

      iv.   526: Will be discussed at agenda point 8.

      v.   528: Done. New plans will be made at the end of the calendar year. Furthermore, whenever the PC wants to provide feedback or input they are welcome to do so.

      vi.   529: Will be discussed at agenda point 10.

      vii.   530: Is in progress, will be done before the next meeting.

    c. *The minutes have been approved with the mentioned change.*

6. **Easing of the Binding Recommendation**
   a. A meeting was held on short notice to discuss the easing or the Binding Recommendation. Most of the members of the PC was involved, which resulted in an advice that the programme management could take into account.

7. **Bachelor TCS - Internship as a Minor**
   a. Last academic year an internship for a minor was held as a pilot. The internship has received positive feedback from the examiner, students as well as the companies. Programme management would therefore like to implement it as an option for the future as well.
   b. The current examiner is only available in Quartiles 1 and 2, but Vonk already received questions whether it would be possible for Quartiles 3 and 4 as an alternative to Programming paradigms.
   c. Currently there is a limit of 15 students per quartile, due to there only being one examiner. Furthermore, TalentIT, the foundation that arranges the spots at the companies, can only guarantee up to 15 spots per quartile.
      i. Should the interest in the minor grow, there are possibilities to find extra examiners.
   d. *The PC thinks it is a valuable addition to the programme and therefore approves of the plan.*

8. **Cum Laude**
   a. The Programme directors of our faculty are now in agreement with the plan that is currently on the table. The plan is to use a weighted average of an 8 or more, excluding the internship and final project, where the internship would require at least an 8 and the project at least a 9.
   b. The feeling exists that it is quite easy to get a high grade for the internship.
   c. Van Griven made an overview of grades of the last two years and only at Electrical engineering a 9 is received regularly for the internship. For the other programmes this is dependent on the final project grade.
   d. *The PC approves of the plan if the weighted average is further specified.*

9. **Internet Security**
   a. The course currently runs twice per year, but the teachers realized it would be more effective to only have it once per year. With a bottleneck for the students in Q1 for the EIT Digital Cybersecurity master, the preferred quartile would be Q3.

      i.   The teachers are looking into the option of running a low-key version of the course in Q1 of next academic year, specifically for students that would otherwise receive many delays if they would take the course in Q3.

      ii.   This change can be communicated through the programme mentors or through the various specialisations that take the course.

   b. *The PC approves of the change.*

10. Quality Agreements / WSV funds

   a. Khasuntsev and Voorberg have written a plan to incorporate hardware in the WSV fund plans. The budget currently comes from the fund, which provides a problem for continuity. Voorberg envisioned lending the equipment to students, but the PC prefers giving it to the students.

   b. Other than the raspberry pi for module 5, it could also include the arduinos that are used in module 1, as well as some various components in the Master.

   c. @Voorberg: Rewrite the WSV proposal to reflect that the equipment is given instead of lent.

   d. In a future version of the proposal, it should probably include which courses' costs fall within the plan.

   e. *Voorberg leaves the meeting at 12.13 due to a crash.*

11. QAI

   a. Previous interviews

      i.   ADSA - Model Driven Engineering (Msc) by Bakkum & Langerak

          1. Was a small course. Mostly discussed the way of teaching during covid, which turned out well.

   b. Upcoming interviews

      i.   Smart Spaces (Bsc-M9) by Khasuntsev & Mocanu

      ii.   Secure Data Management (Msc) by Tripathi & Tews

      iii.   Modeling & Analysis of Concurrent System (Msc) by Voorberg & Sperotto

12. CEEP

   a. The first batch of reports have been sent. The panels work fine without the PC's intervention, but they can be used well for a QAI.

   b. One issue with the CEEP meetings is that students do not attend the meetings very often. They are already working on improving the awareness of the committee by staying in contact with the module coordinators and also students.

   c. The turnout for the meetings seem to strongly correlate with the promotion of the module coordinators.

   d. The CEEP currently sticks to the Bachelor modules, but in the past they were also involved with the master courses.

   e. Van Helvert will also archive the CEEP reports with the rest of the questionnaires.

13. A.O.B. and Proposal items next meeting

   a. Khasuntsev is thanked for his active participation in the committee.

   b. Tripathi suggests discussing the Cum Laude for bachelor next meeting due to the shift to half point grades.

   c. @Tripathi: Prepare the discussion about the bachelor cum laude for the next meeting.

14. Questions and Conclusion.
   a. Langerak closes the meeting at 12.26.

Action points PC CS meeting 153

Nr.	Given in		Description	Responsible	Deadline
	Month	**Meeting #**			
516	December 2020	150	Find a date where the PC can have a training at TAQT after the new PC members join.	Langerak	March 2021
525	January 2021	152	Invite the relevant course/module coordinator to a QAI.	Student Members	February 2021
530	January 2021	152	Arrange an extension until the end of the academic year on Bakkum's appointment to the PC.	Padberg	February 2021
531	February 2021	153	Rewrite the WSV proposal to reflect that the equipment is given instead of lent.	Voorberg	March 2021
532	February 2021	153	Prepare the discussion about the bachelor cum laude for the next meeting.	Tripathi	March 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	