

## *Faculty EEMCS*

### **MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE - CS**

#### **Meeting Nr. 171**

<b>Date</b>	Tuesday 11 October 2022
<b>Location</b>	Microsoft Teams
<b>Time</b>	10.45 – 12.30 hour
<b>Present</b>	Rom Langerak, Anna Sperotto, Daniël Floor, Jelle van den Wijngaard, Krystof Mitka, Vadim Zaytsev, Sanne Spuls, Eline Meijerink, Sabine Padberg-Heskamp, Sander Koomen (minutes)

#### **1. Opening and Determining agenda**

- a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10:47.
- b. There are no comments on the agenda.

#### **2. Announcements**

- a. Zaytsev has some announcements from the staff. Since we are now way into Q1, the staff is busy setting up the numerus fixus for next year and is finishing up a document, it can be found on the website already. The staff is working with the same setup as last year, and is looking at an evaluation of the numerus fixus of last year to see how this was experienced. Last year the setup of Eindhoven and Groningen was copied, but that may still not be perfect. Last year 400+ students started, of which 42% did not get a positive BSA, so almost half of these student will not start year two of the bachelor. This year there are 270 students, which means the houses will be a bit smaller and there could be nicer ways to get them to come to campus and work on the labs.
- b. Regarding Q2: the hiring of TAs is going on actively, and we are slowly moving to situation where we have several trainings instead of having one big training. Cooperations with facilitators are being set up, to teach TAs about soft skills such as assessing a project group's dynamic and giving feedback, while code reviews and the like can be done by us instead. Teachers would then be able to select TAs with the right competences.
- c. The university will let study programmes set up their own situations for a possible resurgence of COVID-19: Green, orange, red and black. This is both a blessing and a curse, as this means a lot of freedom but not a lot of guidance from the university. Exams will always be physical, even in the worst scenario,

other things can become online. Once the document with these decisions is official, it will be shared with this PC.

- d. Since the SEQs from last year are in, it might be nice to know that from the top five courses, there are three courses from Computer Science, and even the number one course is from Computer Science.

### **3. Income - outgoing correspondence**

- a. Regarding the comments of the PC on the Intelligent Embedded Systems proposal: Faizan thanked us for comments, and he will send another mail with all of the changes once implemented.
- b. Regarding the piece of text for a new member: Three candidates reacted, this will be discussed under agenda point 11.
- c. Regarding the mandatory TA training: There was a message from our previous vice-president, this will be put on the agenda for next time. It is currently not clear whether or not TAs should legally get paid for trainings, and even if it is legal to not pay them, whether or not the programme could still do this anyway. There have been some issues with this in the past so it would be smart to get informed on whether or not this is allowed. Zaytsev will ask the university lawyer and the faculty dean as there may be a precedent or an EEMCS policy on this. Langerak will react to Joris Kuiper that this will be fully discussed during the next meeting.
- d. **@Zaytsev: Talk to university lawyer and EEMCS dean regarding mandatory payment of TAs for training**
- e. **@Langerak: React to Joris Kuiper's letter stating it will be discussed next meeting.**

### **4. Minutes of the 170 th PC-CS meeting d.d. September 13th 2022**

- a. Langerak made some short minutes because there was nobody to write them. The main points should be clear.
- b. Page 1: Meijerink mentions that the minutes say the SEQ results for Q4 were not available. Padberg-Heskamp mentions this is correct, because they were available to CES but not yet distributed to the programme committee.
- c. Page 2: Mitka's name is misspelled everywhere. Padberg-Heskamp will update this.
- d. Action point 583 will remain, as Van Grinsven is not here today. The report from action point 597 is still forthcoming. Action points 589, 590, 592, 594, 595, 596, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602 have all been done and can be removed. Long-term action point 3 is on the agenda.

**5. Study load Double Degree**

- a. This was put on the agenda regarding action point 589. Meijerink sent a report regarding these numbers. It is difficult to make an estimate on drop-out rate, as quite a few of students drop out but the influx is also relatively small. The main reason students drop out is students' expectation management. Many students do not yet know which of the programmes to follow so they do both, which is of course more difficult. The changes in curriculum only mention TCS since we do not have a lot of influence on the curriculum of AM. There is no evaluation regarding this with students or teachers yet, this is being planned at the moment and will likely take place next week. This will be done in a previously used format. Mitka mentions the report is good, and that it is nice to see the amounts of students and drop-out rates. As anticipated it is a bit hard to read any results from this, as the COVID years were especially hard for double degree students as well. Double degree students do not know that much about each other except for students that are in the same year. People that have done it in the year before could support first year students, and having a stronger community of double degree students can only be a positive thing. A lot of double degree students struggle with the second module as it is definitely the hardest module in both programmes.

**6. Programme development plan of CS**

- a. This was put on the agenda regarding action point LT 3.
- b. Zaytsev explains the programme development plan is part of faculty-wide Quality Assurance, to summarize main activities that happen inside the programme that may not be completely obvious. This has been discussed with the vice-dean of education and the head quality assurance officer in March. Since it is now October and next year this will also have to be written, it might be good to through it and know what should (not) be in there. No decisions or anything have to be made for now but this is piece of external communication that is good to discuss internally.
- c. Numerus fixus: It worked well, and we avoided the phenomenon of a tsunami year. The largest year was 400 students last year, and with the numerus fixus at 400 we are expected to have fewer students this year which came true. Computer Science studies all over the country had a bit of a dip. We went from no control over the influx to much more control over the quantity of students. This document can be tweaked once per year to stay up-to-date. We want to accept anyone, but also only have serious students.

- d. Quality of TAs: This is regarding the workshops and trainings for TAs, to deepen their competences and professionalize them. Funding/reimbursement is an issue, but that is being worked on.
- e. Digital testing: Cuttle worked quite well, as well as Remindo. There was a very unsatisfactory experience with Proctorio (monitoring software), as small scale pilots were very underwhelming and the technical support was non-existent. Numerus fixus was done with a warning of proctoring but this was not yet done.
- f. Industrial advisory board: we have this for the masters but not for the bachelor. This is being set up and there are several steps to do this, and we mostly want to focus on local companies. These companies can then for instance supervise final projects.
- g. Academic skills: this has been simplified quite a bit, as it was not received very well by students. Skills in presenting, technical documentation, explaining solutions etc. are very important when working in the field. There will be one coordinator per module, with a simple procedure where students go to the workshop and submit something, or have an exam. Otherwise these students fail the module.
- h. Mathematics: a task force was formed here at the programme committee. Some module coordinators did not know who gave the math part in their module. This was a bit disheartening to hear, and there is now a person from the mathematics part working with module coordinators to reduce this breach. It is fine that study units can be separate but a module's teaching team should still stand united.
- i. Lifelong learning: There is some progress on this, in general the position of the UT is to make this into a separate programme. Starting next year there will be a situation of having two electives from our programme, as well as a choice of minors.
- j. Data Science: this is a very low priority point, and it will likely be removed next year.
- k. An updated version of this document will be handed in around March, so it will be discussed then. If you have ideas on what to put in this, send Zaytsev an email.
- l. Langerak suggests talking about academic skills in the next meeting in November.

## **7. Annual Report PC 2021-2022**

- a. There is a first draft, containing the activities of last year, as well as a small bit of reflection and quality assurance. This has been commented on by Van den Wijngaard and Floor. There are no additional comments, so it will be sent to the educational team.

## 8. QAI

- a. *Blockchain and Distr. Ledger Technology* by Maarten Everts: Van den Wijngaard wrote a report on this. It was evaluated very highly by students, Van den Wijngaard talked to the teacher how this came to place. There were some nice ideas applied to the course, which could be good to apply to more courses as they were very generalizable. For example: there was a game of Capture The Flag running throughout the module, as well as some additional challenges for motivated students with the possibility to win a small prize. The teacher also used bonus material like coming up with exam questions. Langerak mentions it would be good to keep a mental note of this teacher, as he could be great for the educational day.
- b. *Performance Evaluation and Network Systems* by Pieter-Tjerk de Boer: The report on this is still forthcoming by Langerak and Floor. Performance Evaluation starts again in the next module so Floor is not sure if this is still interesting to evaluate. Network Systems could be more interesting.
- c. As for new courses to evaluate, the PC is currently a bit understaffed so Langerak suggests evaluating one master course and one bachelor module. Van den Wijngaard mentions modules 4 and 8 were evaluated last year, and that those do not necessarily have to be evaluated again. Instead, two master courses might make more sense.
- d. Security Services for IoT has a very high grade from 15 participants, while Real Time Systems 2 was done last year as well but did not do very well this year. Last year's interview can be used as input here to see if changes were made. Langerak and Van den Wijngaard will pick up Security Services for IoT, while Sperotto and Mitka will pick up Real Time Systems 2.

## 9. Quality assurance and teacher reflection

- a. Langerak explains that in the past, a teacher would be solicited to fill in a reflection form after their course's SEQ, so that the SEQ results minus specific comments but with the teacher's reflection would be put on the Canvas page as a show of reflection to the students. However, at the time this needed a lot of pushing by programme management. Something that came up during the quality assurance interviews is to make these results and reflections publicly available to students so that they can make an informed decision whether courses are suitable for them. Insurance on this can be done in the quality assurance interview. Van den Wijngaard argues more transparency is good, and this forces teachers to look at their course if it is not that good. To skip the asking and pushing, forcing teachers to post the SEQ results could also be done. Langerak explains this is already included in the EER but it still needs pushing.

- b. **@Zaytsev: Write document on regulations for teachers regarding posting of SEQ results and teacher reflection**

#### **10. Regulations PC**

- a. Langerak explains these regulations were set up 10 years ago and are currently outdated and still in Dutch, so these could be updated and translated if the PC wants to. It could also be made part of the annual PC cycle to look at this and see if it needs additional updates. For instance, the bachelor and master Telematics is still mentioned, this should be removed. The work groups are also a bit outdated but this is already up for discussion on the agenda.
- b. Zaytsev explains it is generally good to have these rules, but they would also need to be synced with WHW so that these documents do not contradict each other. Van den Wijngaard suggests looking at the regulations of other PCs within the faculty, as they might be more up-to-date or could have procedures interesting for this PC. It is not clear if these documents exist for other PCs. Padberg-Heskamp will collect these documents if they exist.
- c. **@Padberg-Heskamp: Collect regulations of other programme committees for comparison**
- d. **@Langerak: Translate and update PC-CS regulations, and compare with WHW for compatibility**

#### **11. New Members**

- a. For the new student member, there was interest from Mathijs. He is on study trip now but has communicated he will reflect during this trip. Floor will try and confirm if this is happening. If Mathijs declines there is another student who is still interested as well.
- b. For the two teacher positions, there are currently three interested teachers but only two positions. Langerak will have a conversation with all three together to see if something can be worked out.
- c. **@Langerak: Have an informal physical meeting with all interested teachers together to sort out the problem of having two PC positions and three candidates.**

#### **12. Workgroups PC-CS**

- a. Contrary to regulations there are now 3 work groups. It is decided to remove the quality assurance work group as this is done in small subgroups anyway, and instead have the following distribution: Sperotto (as president) and Langerak will be the members of the curriculum workgroup while Van den Wijngaard (as president), Floor and Mitka will become members of the EER workgroup. When the new teacher and student members will be known, this can be re-evaluated.

**13. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion**

- a. Mitka asks if the other student who applied to be a member would get the position if Mathijs does not join, because this was not yet communicated. The answer is yes, Mitka will communicate this.
- b. Padberg-Heskamp announces there is currently a call for a new minute maker for the PC-CS on the Inter-Actief website, as well as having sent an email out to all CS students. For the next meeting Hannah Ottenschot from the PC CreaTe/I-Tech will make the minutes.
- c. Zaytsev announces that in two days there will be a new head of department of CS, namely Marieke Huisman. This will take place at 15:30 in GY Ideate. Langerak will congratulate her on behalf of the PC.
- d. Langerak proposes having an on-campus meeting as exception to see the new members, with lunch in maybe the U-Park Hotel to get to know each other, then go back to online meetings afterwards.
- e. **@Langerak: Organize first meeting with new members in U-Park hotel, organize lunch on campus after meeting.**
- f. Langerak closes the meeting at 12:25.

*Minutes PC – CS Meeting 171*

**Action points PC CS meeting 171**

Nr.	Given in		Description	Responsible	Deadline
	Month	Meeting #			
583	June 2022	168	Discuss about the possibility of CEEP panel evaluations in the master courses.	Van Grinsven	July 2022
597	Sep 2022	170	QAI Performance Evaluation	Floor	Oct 2022
603	Oct 2022	171	Talk to university lawyer and EEMCS dean regarding mandatory payment of TAs for training	Zaytsev	Nov 2022
604	Oct 2022	171	React to Joris Kuiper's letter stating it will be discussed next meeting.	Langerak	Nov 2022
605	Oct 2022	171	Write document on regulations for teachers regarding posting of SEQ results and teacher reflection	Zaytsev	Nov 2022
606	Oct 2022	171	collect regulations of other programme committees in EEMCS for comparison	Padberg-Heskamp	Nov 2022
607	Oct 2022	171	Translate and update PC-CS regulations, and compare with WHW for compatibility	Langerak	Nov 2022
608	Oct 2022	171	Have an informal physical meeting with all interested teachers together to sort out the problem of having two PC positions and three candidates.	Langerak	Nov 2022
609	Oct 2022	171	Organize first meeting with new members in U-Park hotel, organize lunch on campus after meeting.	Langerak	Nov 2022