

Faculty EWI (EEMCS)

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS

Meeting NR. 172

Date: Tuesday 8 November 2022

Location: Microsoft Teams

Time: 10.45 – 12.30

Present: Rom Langerak, Anna Sperotto, Daniël Floor, Jelle van den Wijngaard, Krystof Mitka (11:20), Vadim Zaytsev, Eline Meijerink, Sabine Padberg-Heskamp, Nikolaos Alachiotis (new staff member), Soban Asif, Mohammed Elhajj (new staff member), Marloes van Grinsven, Jakub Kosciolek, Andrea Rijkeboer-van Gemert, Niels Rotmensen, Sharon Vonk, Hannah Ottenschot (minutes)

1. Opening and Determining agenda

- a. The minute maker for this meeting is Hannah from the CreaTe/ITech PC due to the absence of the regular minute maker.
- b. New staff members, Mohammed Elhajj and Nikolaos Alachiotis, introduce themselves.
- c. Langerak opens the meeting at 10:49.

2. Announcement PD

- a. There are no changes to the agenda.
- b. Zaytsev has a few updates from the last month.
 - i. There was a graduation ceremony on Saturday 29th of October. The ceremony was very nice, with around 80 TCS students receiving their diplomas. The ceremony was moved to Saturday, which had pros and cons. Now, it was only with TCS. Every student got a small personal speech. All students brought friends, parents, etc. Overall, the event was a huge success. Looking at the growing number of students joining the program, it has to be seen how long this event can continue the way it is organized now, or whether it should be moved to a bigger location.
 - ii. There was a series of events in October to attract new students: The Open Days in October (~150 people every round, 4 rounds in total). The booked room was completely full. More Open Days will be in November for both Bachelor and Master, both online.
 - iii. Numerus fixus: Some things were set up for next year. There was an evaluation session, also with students who went through the numerus fixes process. There is still competition with other Universities going on, so their plans are still being looked into as well.
 - iv. Life-long learning (LLL): The appointment for a separate director for LLL is as good as done. Students will continue to take part in TCS education.
 - v. NEDAP: This was supposed to start last week, but somebody got sick so it was postponed. 3 Students are starting, which is around the minimum to start this program at all.
 - vi. Module board meeting: Some Mathematics people were also involved. A discussion was held about the mathematics line. Quite some action points came out of this meeting. Both the TCS and Mathematic sides have an interest in closer collaboration and synchronization of what both programs do.

3. Income - outgoing correspondence

- a. There was no in- or outgoing correspondence.

4. Minutes of the 171st PC-CS meeting d.d. October 11th, 2022

- a. Page 5: Van den Wijngaard notes that under point 8, no action points were handed out to hold interviews, so he forgot to do this. The action points will be written down in these minutes.
- b. Action points:
 - i. **583:** The CEEP is adding two new members, so they can be asked if they can take on master courses. This action point will stay so updates can be given in the future.
 - ii. **597:** This was done and will be discussed under point 9. Can be removed.
 - iii. **603:** This is on the agenda. Can be removed.
 - iv. **604:** Langerak has sent an email to Joris that this will be discussed. Can be removed.
 - v. **605:** This is on the agenda, but the document has not been sent yet. Zaytsev will give an update and afterward the document will be sent. The action point will be removed.
 - vi. **606:** This will be discussed during agenda point 8. Padberg-Heskamp adds that there was nothing to collect. Can be removed.
 - vii. **607:** This is on the agenda and can be removed.
 - viii. **608:** Not necessary anymore and can be removed.
 - ix. **609:** Will be discussed during agenda point 12. Can be removed.

5. SEQ and Teachers Reflection

- a. Zaytsev reminds the PC of the flow of things: The module /course ends. Information from students is collected from the SEQ. Then, the SEQs and overall statistics are sent to the teachers. The email that is sent to them also includes words of encouragement to share the form with students on Canvas. This email also includes a form for reflection for the teachers, who are encouraged to fill in this form and send the results back to Zaytsev. The teachers are also encouraged to publish the results of this form on Canvas. Some of these things happen, and some do not. It is not always easy to read these evaluations. Personal statements should not be put on public display, but this is okay for numbers and statistics.
- b. For further notes, it is easiest to distinguish between the process for the Bachelor and Master.
 - i. Bachelor: The reflection form has been replaced with a reflection meeting with the module coordinator, program coordinator, and program director. Other teachers can also be included. During this meeting, questions are asked and notes are made, which will be the basis of the evaluation that is written. Whether this will be shared with students does not matter that much, but it does make sure there is an agreement between the program and the module/course coordinator about what needs to be and will be changed.
 - ii. Master: During the PC meetings it was discussed that it would be nice if the flow is changed. Zaytsev's proposal is that the SEQ stays the same, but that the email to the teacher would contain the statement that the **PC** will put the results without open answers on the Canvas for all Master students. The teacher will be asked to write two documents: some explanatory text that they might want to attach to the evaluation, and the internal reflection. The explanatory text can be published on Canvas next to the results, but the internal reflection will not be made public. The internal reflection is gathered similarly to the Bachelor's and this process can stay the same. This way, concrete appointments can be made without publicly overpromising that certain things will change. There will be a page on the Master Canvas with all the TCS courses. Students can "shop around" and see the grades that were given to courses.
 - iii. For this quartile, it will be specifically requested if it is okay to publicly post the results of the evaluation since this was not the case before. In the future, it should be assumed

that this will be the case. The hope is that this process will increase transparency and encourage teachers with helping in this process.

1. Langerak asks if the reflection meeting results in a report and whether this report can be sent to the PC.
 - a. Zaytsev will ask teachers if this is okay.
2. Floor mentions that most courses are mandatory, so the grades would not influence the choice of students. However, for the electives, there is a choice. So, it would be good to publish grades for the electives as well.
 - a. Zaytsev agrees that publishing the SEQ results including explanatory text by the teacher would be beneficial for electives.
- iv. Van den Wijngaard remarks that the process is very well thought-out. Langerak agrees.
- v. Langerak notes that this process should be clearly written down, so next PCs can also easily implement this process. This does not need to be a novel, but a short explanation of what should be done and who is responsible would be great. Zaytsev will take a look at this.
 1. **610. AP Zaytsev:** Write down a clear overview of the process of obtaining, discussing, and publishing the results of the SEQ and teacher evaluation for future PCs

6. SEQ and CEEP

- a. There were some difficulties finding the relevant documents. There is space on the server, but this place is often empty. It should be clear who is responsible for getting these documents and from whom the PC receives the documents.
 - i. Zaytsev thinks that Meijerink is a good candidate for this since she is involved with the CEEP. Meijerink agrees: if the PC is in need of information from SEQ and CEEP, they can contact her.
 - ii. For the Master, Van Grinsven can be contacted.

7. Mandatory TA training

- a. A mail was sent by Joris Kuijper about TA trainings being mandatory for TAs without them being paid. The question is twofold: is this legal? And does the PC agree with how it is done now?
 - i. Zaytsev answers that he was in contact with the legal department of the UT. They noted that the trainings are paid for by the UT. This is a way of indirect payment for the students. Regarding the contract that students sign (sometimes before they have the training), there could be an information issue since it might not be clear that these trainings are mandatory and not paid. The answer will not be found in the CAO because the contract for TAs explicitly states that many of the paragraphs of the CAO do not apply to TAs. So: It is legal that the University does not pay TAs since the University pays for the trainings.
 - ii. However, Zaytsev has in his mind to expand these trainings and offer more courses in the future. He thinks it is a good idea to discuss with the PC to start paying TAs to attend these trainings. He suggests that the PC makes the formal decision that TAs will be paid for the trainings. Hopefully, this will open the door to TAs wanting to do more of these trainings in the future.
 1. Van den Wijngaard agrees. Langerak as well.
 - a. The PC decides to start paying TAs for trainings in the future.
 2. Floor asks if this will also apply to the current TAs. Zaytsev agrees that this will be the case. He will make sure that TAs know they can declare these hours.

8. Bylaws PC - Updated version

- a. Van den Wijngaard dug up an older version of the bylaws of the PC, and Padberg-Heskamp found an even newer version. In 2019, there was a revision of the bylaws. At this point in time, the CS PC was the only PC with bylaws. Currently, more PCs have adopted and adapted these bylaws. This means that the bylaws of other PCs are based on the one of TCS, and comparing the bylaws from TCS to those from other programs might not be very useful.
- b. Langerak included bylaws from other PCs for the rest of the PC to read and made some small changes to the current bylaws. No big changes were made: some small English corrections were made, article 2.4 was adapted and a brief description of the quality interviews was added. The updated version of the bylaws has been sent to the PC.
- c. Van den Wijngaard thinks the bylaws look good the way they are now. However, it is good to look at the structure of the folder in general. The fact that the updated version was only found after digging means there might be some structure lacking. Langerak mentions some cleaning up was already done, but it can still be checked if there are any “cobwebs” on the server.
 - i. **611 AP Langerak:** Check if there are any “cobwebs”/old documents left on the server and clean them out if necessary.
- d. Zaytsev has a minor linguistic comment. The term “chairmen” can best be changed to the neutral term “chair” or “chairperson”. Langerak will change this.
 - i. **612 AP Langerak:** Change the term from chair in the updated bylaws to “chair” or “chairperson”
- e. Padberg-Heskamp adds that the P-drive has been updated. Only the new bylaws can be found there. Langerak will send the updated version to be uploaded on the P-drive.
- f. The PC officially accepts the updated bylaws as the new bylaws of the PC.

9. QAI

- a. Real-time Systems 2 (Anna/Krystof)
 - i. Sperotto mentions that she and Mitka have tried multiple times to get into contact with the teacher of this course, but there was no reaction at all.
 1. Langerak mentions that the responsible teacher is a part-time teacher. This means that there is a big chance that there is a “shadow”/stand-in teacher to back up this teacher.
 2. Zaytsev says that the usual way is to go to the boss of this teacher. In this case, this is Anna-lucia. Sperotto and Mitka will try to contact the teacher this way.
 - a. **613 AP Sperotto:** Contact Anna-Lucia about the teacher of Real-time Systems 2 not being responsive about the QAI
- b. Security Services for IoT (Rom/van Wijngaard)
 - i. Since there was no action point for this, this was not done yet. Van den Wijngaard will do this today.
 1. **614 AP Van den Wijngaard:** Arrange QAI for Security Services for IoT
- c. Performance Evaluation (Daniël/Rom)
 - i. The QAI was late since this course starts next week. The course scored pretty high overall, which was a surprise to the teacher. Floor took the course himself and thinks that this is most likely due to an increase in motivation from the students. Nonetheless, quite some changes have been planned for the course. Since it is mostly a theoretical course at the moment, more practical parts will most likely be added, such as simulations. The tutorials used to be given by someone else, which was not received that well. The teacher decided to take over these tutorials and structure them better.

Overall, it feels that the course is in good hands and that good improvements are on the agenda.

- d. Network Systems (Daniël/Rom)
 - i. This course scored pretty low, with a 5.6 average. This was not surprising to the teacher. Since COVID, the course has been scoring lower and lower. The introduction of online education seems to have had a large impact on the decrease in the grade for this course. The response rate of teachers/TAs is lower in online settings. Students also had complaints about the exam, since they got new material only a few days before the exam took place. This year, there are additional problems due to the Open Days also taking place around the exam time, decreasing the preparation time even further. The teacher is looking into flipping the classroom by providing the students with prerecorded lectures so the students can more easily prepare. The students will be updated on this as well. Overall, while the module scores low, a lot is being done to improve it.
- e. Langerak notes that it was a great experience to do the QAs physically.
- f. Langerak asks if it can be expected to have the results from the other QAs next meeting already.
 - i. Van Grinsven hopes the results will be there at that time. It is especially unclear if the results will be there a week in advance already. She will ask if the results will be ready.
 - ii. Floor mentions that the deadline for students to fill in the SEQ is November 21st.

10. New Staff Members PC

- a. Working groups
 - i. There are two working groups: Curriculum and Education. It would be good if Elhajj and Alachiotis could be assigned to one of these groups. Especially the working group Education is currently lacking staff members.
 - 1. Alachiotis says he would like to join the Education workgroup.
 - 2. Langerak mentions Elhajj might be suited for the Curriculum workgroup due to his security background. Elhajj agrees.
- b. Floor mentions that Matthijs (a potential new student member) has indicated he is not interested anymore to join the PC. It is a good idea to message the friend of Mitka whether they are still interested in the position.
- c. Padberg-Heskamp will contact the new student member if they want to be part of the committee.
 - i. **615 AP Padberg-Heskamp:** Contact the new student member for the PC.

11. New minute makers

- a. Jakub Kościółek and Soban Asif will be the new minute takers. They will divide the workload, so they will not be present during meetings together. Padberg-Heskamp will be in contact with them after this meeting.

12. Meeting 17 January 2023

- a. There will be a physical meeting at University, followed by a lunch. After the meeting in Citadel, there are around 15 minutes to go to the UPark hotel, where the lunch will be.
 - i. Floor, Van den Wijngaard and Zaytsev will not be present.
 - ii. There will be at least one other lunch this year. It will be made sure that next time, at least Floor, Van den Wijngaard, and Zaytsev will be present.

13. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

- a. Floor mentions that the online exam environment was also discussed during the QAIs. Students have mentioned that the current environment is not that good. A new platform is being developed. It is good to ask students and teachers what their preferred platform is.
 - i. Zaytsev mentions that it is often the case that there is enthusiasm for new programs. It should be investigated whether the new platform is actually better than the current one, or similar but with some hype around it.
 1. Floor mentions that it seems that the new program, Anubis, is working great. It is also used in module 3.
 2. Langerak suggests checking what the preferred platform is during the module board. Zaytsev will do this.
 - a. **616 AP Zaytsev:** Discuss the online exam environments (Remindo, Anubis) at the module board
- b. Van Grinsven asks if the minutes could include page numbers. This will be done.
- c. Sperotto mentions that a colleague has noted a difficult situation regarding the online environment. There was a misunderstanding with a student, who afterward complained about the quality of the course and the correctness of the slides in Discord. This created a snowballing effect, and other students joined in on the discussion. The colleague did not take this well, and it has affected her personally. She struggles with finding a professional way of discussing this with the students. Sperotto mentions that there are certain ways that teachers expect students to behave, but that there might be situations in an online environment that teachers are not prepared for. This worries Sperotto. She asks if this is something to discuss or take a position in. It is not about Discord per sé, but about having a platform where students can talk with each other and easily display their opinion and agree with others who mention complaints.
 - i. Van den Wijngaard thinks this is a very good point and has some experience with this as well. He thinks it is good to discuss this point during the next meeting, so PC members can think about this before starting a discussion.
 - ii. Langerak mentions this is not the first time this point has come up. Problems with unwanted behavior on online platforms are not new.
 1. Zaytsev says that this is indeed the case. It is good to discuss this point. Whenever concrete things are happening, they should be dealt with in an appropriate way. However, the opinions of people/students in an online environment are hard to silence and this also should not be something the PC has an interest in.
 - a. Sperotto agrees that students should not be silenced, but is rather looking at whether there are ways to professionally deal with this.
 2. Langerak adds that he remembers there being a code of conduct for behavior on online platforms. Zaytsev confirms this. In general, how students/teacher should behave in an online platform is good to look at and discuss.
 3. For the next meeting, Sperotto will look into this problem further and make sure there will be a document to discuss during the next meeting. Meijerink shared a link, <https://www.utwente.nl/en/eemcs/education/social-safety/>, which can be used as a basis for this.
 - a. **617 AP Sperotto:** Look into code of conduct/preferred behavior on online platforms such as Discord
- d. Mitka mentioned that he and his team went to the Benelux programming competition. They progressed to the next round, and were the only group from the UT. He asks if the communication with the student party that is organizing these rounds can be improved since it

is hard to get funding, for example for reimbursing train tickets. Mitka wonders whether the UT could be represented better by supporting competitive programming during events like this and likewise activities. Right now, Better Be is paying students for this competition, but this is not via the University.

- i. Zaytsev is not sure this is an issue for the PC. He did not know that this competition exists. The competition being organized by students might explain the lack of promotion. The UT could be made interested, which will hopefully make sure that students can be refunded and increase promotion.
- ii. Van den Wijngaard mentions that the first rounds of the competition are organized by Inter-Actief, so they can be contacted about this. Zaytsev will take a look at this.
 - 1. **618 AP Zaytsev:** Contact Inter-Actief about the promotion of the Belenux programming competition brought up by Mitka
- e. Langerak closes the meeting at 12:10.

Action points PC CS meeting 172

Nr.	Given in month	Meeting	Description	Responsible	Deadline
583	June 2022	168	Discuss the possibility of CEEP panel evaluations in the master courses.	Van Grinsven	July 2022
610	November 2022	172	Write down a clear overview of the process of obtaining, discussing, and publishing the results of the SEQ and teacher evaluation for future PCs	Zaytsev	December 2022
611	November 2022	172	Check if there are any “cobwebs”/old documents left on the server and clean them out if necessary.	Langerak	December 2022
612	November 2022	172	Change the term for chair in the updated bylaws to “chair” or “chairperson”	Langerak	December 2022
613	November 2022	172	Contact Anna-Lucia about the teacher of Real-time Systems 2 not being responsive about the QAI	Sperotto	December 2022
614	November 2022	172	Arrange QAI for Security Services for IoT	Van den Wijngaard	December 2022
615	November 2022	172	Contact the new student member for the PC	Padberg-Heskamp	December 2022
616	November 2022	172	Discuss the online exam environments (Remindo, Anubis) with the module board	Zaytsev	December 2022
617	November 2022	172	Look into code of conduct/preferred behavior on online platforms such as Discord (e.g. https://www.utwente.nl/en/eemcs/education/social-safety/)	Sperotto	December 2022
618	November 2022	172	Contact Inter-Actief about the promotion of the Benelux programming competition brought up by Mitka	Zaytsev	December 2022