Faculty EWI (EEMCS) MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS Meeting NR. 176

	Tuesday 14 March 2023
Date:	Online (Via Teams)
Location:	10.45 – 12.30
Time:	Rom Langerak, Anna Sperotto, Vadim Zaytsev, Eline Meijerink, Sabine Padberg, Nikolaos Alachiotis, Muhammad Soban Asif, Sanne Spuls, Marloes van Grinsven, Jelle van den
Present:	Wijngaard, Mikulas Vanousek, Krystof Mitka
Absent:	Mohammed Elhajj, Daniël Floor, Sharon Vonk, Niels Rotmensen

1. Opening and Determining agenda

a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10:57.

2. Announcement PD

- a. Zaytsev has a few updates.
 - I. Several events took place in order to improve the visibility of the University and Computer Science in general, such as the Mathematics Olympiad finals and algorithmic thinking final that took place at the University of Twente.
 - II. On the 15th of April a Computer Science Olympiad will also take place at the University of Twente.
 - III. According to the StudieKeuze which is an education analysis institution, the Master of Computer Science offered by the University of Twente is ranked the highest within the country.
 - IV. There was a UTQ ceremony that took place meaning the program has more teachers that are qualified to teach.
- b. TA's:
 - I. TAs were to be provided education in specific competences. The one for facilitator has concluded which was composed of 3 sessions and was completed by 16 TA's. In the upcoming weeks there will be a 4th session where they will be provided with certificates and asked how the training is being used in practice.
 - II. There is a change in the TA hiring process. Initially tasks were created which were then done by TAs at a convenient time and on these tasks, hours were submitted for approval. Now the TAs will have a contract with the University which will have a fixed number of hours. This change will fully be in effect by the 1st of September.
- c. On the 22nd of March there will be a faculty strategy meeting which will take place and it will also have a session on education that will define the strategy for the faculty in the upcoming years. Zaytsev will propose some ideas such as the students of Computer Science having a home base which would eliminate scheduling problems. He will report about this in the next meeting.

3. Income - outgoing correspondence

a. There is no in- or outgoing correspondence.

4. Minutes of the 175th PC-CS meeting d.d. February 14th, 2023

- a. There are no comments about the previous minutes.
- b. Action points:
 - i. 610: The action point is kept.
 - ii. 621: The action point is kept.
 - iii. 622: The action point is kept.
 - iv. 624: Has been done. It can be removed.
 - v. 625: The action point is kept.
 - vi. 629: The action point is kept.
 - vii. 631: The action point is kept.
 - viii. 632: The action point is kept.

5. TCS Selection Procedure 2023-2024

- a. Zaytsev proposes the following:
 - I. Zaytsev will provide a formal document to the members of the programme committee stating more formally the issues addressed under the agenda point and, his motivation and the proposed selection procedure for next year.
 - II. Numerus fixus was introduced two years ago as the number of incoming students was becoming overwhelming. It had the effect of discouraging potential students and therefore this has over the past two years caused a significant decrease in the final number of students that enroll for the Bachelor of Technical Computer Science.
 - III. The scalability issues that the faculty is working on will then not be applicable if the rate of students enrolling would keep on decreasing.
 - IV. Zaytsev proposes that due to the above reasons he will be proposing to the Executive Board to not have numerus fixus for the selection procedure of the upcoming year but instead have a matching procedure.
 - V. As a pilot for the matching procedure, Zaytsev has introduced study groups which students in the selection procedure have been invited to participate in. Every study group will receive a TA to guide them with the topics of the group.
 - VI. Zaytsev also proposes that in the upcoming years the programme could be opened to people that are better with other topics and provide them with a preparation program, allowing to cater for people with different profiles.
- b. Van den Wijngaard remarks that he agrees with the ideas of the study group and the overall new selection procedure. However, he does suggest that there should be a way to implement the numerus fixus when it may be required as a sudden massive influx of students would likely cause problems which was why the numerus fixus was being used in the first place.
- c. Mitka remarks that one of the potential reasons that the enrollment rate may have fallen during the numerus fixus was that the application deadline shifted from July to February due to the deadlines of the numerus fixus exams.
- d. Rom suggests having the numerus fixus exam as a safeguard incase of a massive influx of students that try to enroll. However, Zaytsev argues that the preparation of the exam is costly, and the resources could be better spent elsewhere.
- e. Meijerink remarks that the numerus fixus was introduced during the massive influx of students because the quality of education was being compromised.

f. Meijerink remarks that there should be a separate meeting scheduled to discuss the matter in more depth. Langerak and Padberg-Heskamp will oversee organizing this meeting.

6. Code of conduct

- a. Sperotto reports on the code of conduct slides:
 - I. Zaytsev altered the language used in the slides to make it more accessible for students.
 - II. A presenter note was added to the slides in order to explain to teachers the reason and the contents of the slides as well as suggestions that they could mention while presenting the slides.
- b. Van den Wijngaard remarks that the values represented in the slides are accurately depicted. However, he suggests that there should be additional rules or repercussions that could be introduced in case the code of conduct is broken. Sperotto claims that the number of students that break the conduct is usually very small, and the idea of the slides is not reprimand students but rather discourage them from breaking the code of conduct by having guidelines.
- c. Langerak addresses the point "Be aware of the difference in behavior between professional and personal environments" in the slides, stating that this may be unclearly formulated. Sperotto explains that the modules usually use Discord which is also often used for other personal communities as well. This may blur the lines of conduct that are used in these communities in personal time and the Discord servers used during the modules.
- d. Van Grinsven suggests that it would be beneficial to include some of the points mentioned in the presenter note to the main slide.
- e. Sperotto also suggests having the slides included for academic skills.

7. Reporting online exam environments

- a. There was a demo that took place for the online exam environments where De Boer presented Anubis which was developed by him.
- b. Zaytsev explains that the Anubis system is minimalistic, and he is willing to use it for one of his own courses. However, it does not contain all the features yet to be able to replace Remindo.
- c. This was brought to attention to the module board and thus the module coordinators are aware of the capabilities of both Anubis and Remindo. Therefore, the use of only one of the systems cannot be enforced as they both have their own advantages.

8. Overview of the process of obtaining, discussing, and publishing the results of the SEQ

a. Zaytsev proposes to postpone this point.

9. Quality Control

- a. Langerak states that there were some issues in the module evaluation of module one discerning academic skills and the involvement of teachers in practical's. Zaytsev addresses the issue of involvement of teachers in practical's stating that there can be some administrative considerations to fix the issue.
- b. Meijerink states that the Data science and AI course is open to all programs and there is a discussion to offer the course twice a year. However, this is not feasible in the short term.
- c. QAI interview of the research project will be conducted by Langerak and Van den Wijngaard.
- d. QAI interview of Cyber Security Management will be conducted by Alachiotis and Vanousek.
- e. QAI interview of Interactive Theorem proving will be conducted by Sperotto and Mitka.

- f. Vanousek reports on the QAI interview of the module Computer Systems:
 - I. Erik Tews, the module coordinator of Computer Systems was very dissatisfied with the way the module went due to conflicts he had with his supervisor.
 - II. He also had complaints about the process of getting more hardware as it arrived late.
 - III. He states that there were significant changes to the module that increased his workload immensely which were detrimental to the module and would like to revert these changes.
 - IV. He states that the possible improvements that could be made to the module are introducing operating systems earlier and paying more attention to Assembly.
 - V. There is also the idea of introducing RISK 5 to the module in order to make computer architecture and operating systems more coherent.
 - VI. He states that the students complained that the mathematics of the module did not feel integrated, however he does not know how to resolve this by himself.
- VII. He states that covid is seasonal and therefore in order to keep staff and students safe there should always be remote options available for them to join through.
- VIII. The attendance for mathematics lessons was low and the results were poor. The module coordinators believe this is a recurring issue across all modules for mathematics courses.
- IX. Erik would like to redesign the Computer Systems module.
- g. Van den Wijngaard and Mitka remark that students prefer Discord over Zulip because it is difficult to follow all threads at the same time in Zulip.

10. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

- a. Vanousek proposes for students to have a more standardized way of presenting information across modules and requests this to be an agenda point.
- b. Langerak closes at 12:36.

Action points PC CS meeting 176

Nr.	Given in month	Meeting	Description	Responsib le	Deadline
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	April 2023
621	November 2022	173	Report the result of the discussion on online exam environments	Zaytsev	April 2023
622	November 2022	173	Discuss with Zaytsev the recommendation to upload lecture notes before the lecture	Floor	April 2023
625	December 2022	173	Carry out quality assurance interview for Data Science & Artificial Intelligence	van den Wijngaard/ Alachiotis	April 2023
629	January 2023	174	Organize a meeting with the master's teachers about the IoT related courses	van Grinsven	April 2023
631	February 2023	175	Plan the meeting to make a summary of issues from last year's PC minutes, which may result in changes to the EER	van den Wijngaard	April 2023
632	February 2023	175	Prepare written report about New Year's event outcomes	Zaytsev	
633	February 2023	175	Proposal standardized information	Vanoušek/ Meijerink	May 2023