

Faculty EEMCS

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE - CS

Meeting Nr. 161

Date	Tuesday 16/11/2021
Location	Microsoft Teams
Time	10.45 - 12.30
Present	Rom Langerak, Elena Mocanu, Anna Sperotto, Erik Tews, Joris Kuiper, Willem Schooltink, Jelle van den Wijngaard, Bugra Yildiz, Vadim Zaytsev, Sharon Vonk, Eline Meijerink, Marloes van Grinsven, Sabine Padberg, Andrea Rijkeboer, Patrick van Oerle
Notulist	Patrick van Oerle

1. Opening and Determining agenda

- a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10:48

2. Announcements

- a. The second quartile has started, and the teachers are wrapping up the first. The worst thing about the new quartile is the 75 people capacity. Most teachers were somewhat prepared for such circumstances, so no major problems have occurred yet.
- b. There was an extra meeting with some members of the PC, mainly about the structure and separation of parts of certain bachelor modules. This will be discussed further at agenda point 7.
- c. The most important update on the Numerus Fixus is that a company has been chosen to take the entrance exams. It is the same company that handles the exams in, among other universities, Delft and Eindhoven.

3. Incoming/outgoing correspondence

- a. We already had the discussion last time, and we accept the letter about the EER-CS as a conclusion of the discussion.

4. Minutes of the previous PC - CS meeting

- a. The new student members for the different workgroups will explicitly be named at the AOB.
- b. Action points 557, 564 and 566 have been concluded.
- c. Zaytsev will give the final touch on action point 555, which will be put on the next meeting's agenda.
- d. Action point 565 will be concluded a couple of days after this meeting, and the responsibility is shifted to Langerak.

5. Annual report

Minutes PC - CS Meeting 161

- a. The reflection is missing. Van den Wijngaard will talk to last year's student members to ask whether they have any comments or reflections that need to be included.

@Van den Wijngaard: Talk to previous PC student members about the functioning of the PC and what could be improved.

- b. There were more QAIs than previous years. Langerak will include a short reflection on these.
- c. The document, including the reflection part, will be put on the next meeting's agenda.

6. Master Courses and Bachelor Module

- a. Both quartile 3 and 4 are fine to teach Ubiquitous Computing and have been taught in the past years. The quartile the course is given doesn't have a significant impact on the quality or general planning of master courses, and the proposal is therefore accepted.
- b. The programme has been low on socio-technical courses the last few years, so the Introduction to Cloud as Infrastructure would be a good addition to the programme. The only feedback is that it is doubtful whether the course title reflects the content and socio-technical nature of the course well enough.

@Langerak: Forward the feedback on the new Introduction to Cloud as Infrastructure to the UT's mentor of this Master specialization.

- c. As described in the document sent, the topics taught in the Data and Information module occur in multiple tests and have a lot of overhead. In the proposal, there are three tests instead of four, and the topics are divided more logically. Since the change benefits both the students as well as the teachers, the proposal is accepted.

7. Module integration

- a. We will discuss whether to split up the second-year modules this meeting, so the mandatory modules 5 through 7 and Programming Paradigms. The other electives will be discussed another time.
- b. Last academic year, a [complaint was filed at the Inter-Actief website](#) that TEM 2.0 was not correctly implemented in the programme. This complaint has reached over 100 signatures from students, indicating that there is a desire to split up modules from a student perspective.
- c. Splitting up modules gives students more responsibility to plan their studies themselves, which is something students want more. Students can still pass every course in one go, and failing one subject still allows students to follow the entire module the year after. Students are only given more possibilities to study as they like.
- d. It has been decided on a faculty and UT-wide level that TEM 2.0 should be implemented to give students more freedom to plan their studies, which has not yet been done in our programme.
- e. On the separation of Module 5, Tews thinks the proposed solution will only work as a short-term solution. CAO and OS potentially have a lot of integration and can be combined in one project, which is currently not implemented well enough

Minutes PC - CS Meeting 161

to justify the integration. Kuiper proposes to also split up ICT & Law, arguing that only reviewing the project from a legal perspective doesn't justify the integration with the rest of the module.

- f. After a vote, it was decided that we advise the Programme Director to separate ICT & Law from the project. The separate components will be CAO and OS, each with their own project, and ICT & Law.
 - g. Since there are no objections, the proposal to split up Module 6 is accepted as presented.
 - h. It is deemed that Module 7 is already split up sufficiently, so the proposal to keep the status quo is accepted.
 - i. The proposal to split up Programming Paradigms is also accepted, with the sidenote that the names of the components are still subject to change if more fitting names are come up with. Another note made is that Functional Programming and Logic Programming have little overlap. Zaytsev argues that the differences and commonalities between both paradigms will be emphasised more and therefore justifies the integration between those courses. This has been agreed upon by the module coordinator.
- 8. WSV plans**
- a. The Faculty Council, together with the study associations, have organised an input moment about the WSV plans, so depending on the outcome of this not a lot of input is needed from the PC.
 - b. The proposed plan of the hardware acquisition for certain modules has already been implemented this year.
- 9. QAI**
- a. Introduction to Quantum Computing was received very well by the students and has received various compliments from students.
 - b. The evaluation doesn't contain a lot of information on what exactly went well and how the teachers handled various situations. Since other courses can benefit from this to also be improved, we will receive an updated version of the report next meeting. This updated version will also include more positive reflection.
- 10. A.O.B.**
- a. We have planned the next meeting on campus. Depending on the restrictions at the time of the meeting, we will decide whether to have the meeting online or on campus.
- 11. Questions and Conclusion.**
- a. Langerak closes the meeting at 12:30

Minutes PC - CS Meeting 161

Action points PC CS meeting 161

Nr.	Given in		Description	Responsible	Deadline
	Month	Meeting #			
555	July 2021	158	Discuss and evaluate the PILOs of all modules.	Zaytsev	December 2021
565	October 2021	160	Inform what the current plans for next year with the WSV money are with Cynthia.	Langerak	December 2021
567	November 2021	161	Talk to previous PC student members about the functioning of the PC and what could be improved.	Van den Wijngaard	December 2021
568	November 2021	161	Forward the feedback on the new Introduction to Cloud as Infrastructure to the UT's mentor of this Master specialization.	Langerak	December 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.	
LT4	October 2021	160	[Vonk] Gather the platforms used in communication to students throughout the various modules to check how many different platforms are used.	