Faculty EWI (EEMCS)
MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS
Meeting NR. 174

Date: Tuesday 17 January 2023

Location: Citadel H415

Time: 10.45 – 12.30

Present: Rom Langerak, Anna Sperotto (online), Vadim Zaytsev, Eline Meijerink, Sabine Padberg, Nikolaos Alachiotis, Muhammad Soban Asif(minutes maker), Sharon Vonk, Sanne Spuls, Marloes van Grinsven, Andrea Rijkeboer- van Gemert, Jelle van den Wijngaard (online), Mikulas Vanousek, Krystof Mitka

1. Opening and Determining agenda

a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10:55.
b. Brief Introduction by everyone present at the meeting.

2. Announcement PD

a. Zaytsev has a few updates from the last month.
    I.   There were a few parties thrown by the University, including the university wide breakfast in Ravelijn and a faculty wide lunch.
    II. There will be a program wide party on Monday the 23rd of January 2023. The event is meant to synchronize, have a review of 2022, and have a bright look at 2023 in terms of brainstorming and exchanging ideas.
b. Numerus fixus: There was a decline of about 20-30% in the number of people who are interested in studying Technical Computer Science at the University of Twente. In December measures were taken such as advertisements on the University of Twente website. With the result of these measures, there are currently 590 potential students. A survey will be sent out in February to assess the commitment of potential students. The exam will be held in March on campus and later online. Additional events, such as a pretalk are also being done this year to aid potential students.
c. Zaytsev addresses questions concerning the logistics of Numerus fixus which are asked by Vanousek and Mitka.
d. Langerak states that Zaytsev has preemptively addressed agenda point 9.
e. Zaytsev addresses point 2.b in Minutes PC - CS meeting nr. 173 which is about the investigation of the impact of changes to the rules for TA employment from flexible implement to contract based. He states that this should have been an action point. He updates that HR does not have a technical system to accommodate this change and therefore there will be no changes until April. From April onwards it becomes an optional change, and in August there will be a complete change.

3. Income - outgoing correspondence

a. There is no in- or outgoing correspondence.

4. Minutes of the 173rd PC-CS meeting d.d. November 13th 2022

a. Langerak notes that the page numbers are missing.

b. van den Wijngaard notes that the action points 623-625 have question assurance interview instead of quality assurance interview.

c. van den Wijngaard notes that action point 625 contains an error for his name.

d. Action points:
  i. 583: There is no news yet. The action point is kept.
  ii. 610: Zaytsev has written down the overview but has not yet sent it to Langerak. The action point is kept.
  iii. 611: This has been done except the one page. Can be removed.
  iv. 618: Zaytsev states that there is a meeting plan. However, action point is kept so that Zaytsev can report about it.
  v. 620: Has been done. It can be removed.
  vi. 621: The action point is planned. It is kept.
  vii. 622: The action point is not yet planned. It is kept.
  viii. 623: Has been done. It can be removed.
  ix. 624: Has been done, however the report has not yet been approved by the teachers. It is kept.
  x. 625: It is still being done. It is kept.
  xi. 626: It is still being done. It is kept.
  xii. 627: It is still being done. It is kept.

5. Workgroups PC

a. Langerak notes that Vanousek has not yet joined a workgroup.

b. Vanousek affirms that he will contact both van den Wijngaard and Sperotto about their respective workgroups and that he will join a workgroup by the next meeting.

6. QAI

a. Van den Wijngaard reports on QAI security services for IOT.
  I. "Security services for IoT" was highly rated in the SEQ.
  II. It also had a high response rate that was accomplished by asking feedback very often throughout the course as well as showing a screenshot of what the SEQ looked like reinforcing how important it is for next year students.
  III. The course is centered around reading and discussing papers. Students are asked to summarize the papers so that they have read it before a lecture and to incentivize them to do this well, they are allowed to then use these summaries during the oral exam at the end of the course.
  IV. They conduct an oral exam which is only possible due to the limited group size. After 45 minutes, the teachers take 15 minutes to discuss the results based on a set of well-defined criteria they filled in independently. The student's grade is set immediately unless there is a considerable disagreement between the teachers. In that case, all four teachers discuss the exam during the large final meeting.
  V. The advantages of this method of examination are the flexibility in terms of questions asked and question order. The oral exams were also advantageous during the Covid-19 restrictions, allowing the course to switch to online teaching promptly.
  VI. The obvious disadvantage of this method was the scalability. However, this is not an issue for the course as they limit the group size.
  VII. There was also a website that was developed that works alongside canvas. The first reason they do this is because they believe in open education. The second reason they

do this is because the website provides a clear structured overview of the course which is preferred by the students.

VIII. There were a few general remarks.

    i. There are several IoT related courses and it is recommended that teachers organise a meeting to discuss what they are teaching to avoid overlapping.

    ii. Secondly, Cristian teaches Advanced Networking, a less populous course with sometimes less than ten students. Thus, the SEQ is not sent out over anonymity concerns, but this is problematic because the course needs to receive feedback. The course is also only included in the course overviews if it is evaluated, which is important for visibility.

    iii. Cristian wonders whether it is feasible, in general, both economically and in light of shortages elsewhere regarding the growing student numbers, to offer such small courses.

b. Zaytsev responds to the report.

    I. He states that courses that have fewer people are easier to teach as less management is required. He has not received any signals from the faculty indicating the need to stop teaching these courses due to monetary concerns and therefore advices to keep giving these courses even when the number of students is small.

    II. For synchronizing the IoT related courses, he states that he can mention and make the IoT teachers aware of the different courses.

    III. Addressing the evaluation concerns, he states that SEF is usually done for large modules in the bachelor where in the middle of the module feedback from the students is acquired and is used to make changes for that instance of the module. He proposes SEF on demand for these courses where teachers of small courses could go to SEF to request the organizing of feedback which would therefore produce a report that could be used by the small courses.

c. Vanousek remarks that the visibility of the University can be improved by giving open courses such as those provided by the SSI website.

7. Module Intelligent Embedded Systems proposal

a. Langerak updates on the response by Ahmed of the proposal.

    I. It has been indicated how the module grade for Intelligent Embedded Systems is calculated.

    II. Examples projects have been added to the proposal.

    III. The timetable for the module has also been updated.

    IV. Commitment from staff members has also been addressed.

a. Alachiotis notes that in the learning objectives provided, a different word besides 'Understand' should be used because 'Understand' is not measurable.

b. Meijerink observes that in the Assessment Methodology it is stated that there is a final grade for the module. However, this is not the case as the module consists of three study units and therefore has three final grades for the respective study units. You then recieve a Pass/Fail for the module itself based on the sufficiency of the grades of the study units.

c. Meijerink also states that when a module consists of all 15 credits and not separate study units, then the module itself does have a module grade.

d. Langerak states that he will inform Ahmed about point 7.b.

e. Zaytsev states that the existence of the module has been approved in the sense of contributing to the end goals of the programme. The consequence of the Intelligent Embedded Systems would allow graduates of Technical Computer Science to be able to choose for the EEMCS master.

8. Social safety – code of conduct

a. Zaytsev proposes to postpone this point.
b. Sperotto provides a short update.
   I. She created a slide and shared it with Zaytsev and colleagues.
   II. One of the comments she recieved was including explanotory notes.
c. Sperotto states that she will contact Spuls for assistance.
d. The point is postponed to the March meeting.

9. Numerus Fixus

a. Zaytsev states there may be no Numerus fixus in 2024/2025.

10. Vision strategic and tactical plans & 11. Input PC for programme improvement

a. Zaytsev explains that the programme management and programme committee have a better overview and perspective of the programme as a whole. The result of this is the polishing of inconsistencies that may occur in the programme.
b. One example of the polishing of inconsistencies is the redesigning of the PILOs.
c. Zaytsev also states that after reviewing the programme offered by the University of Twente and other competing universities, he has noticed that the University of Twente is doing well in having a balance between Research, Engineering and Design in all modules. There are also two graduation modules that are promptly called Design project and Research Project. Starting from next year he proposes to have an Engineering project which will be an internship.
d. If there is a uniform view of Research, Engineering and Design in the programme, this would encourage teachers of all modules to make use of these terms and classify activities accordingly.
e. This would allow a slight redesign of the programme, such as offering more choices to students and spread teaching resources. For modules that are perceived to be difficult it will then be possible to make their components optional.
f. Regarding the National Student Survey (NSE) the university has scored lower than previous year on the question of how the study load is perceived.
g. Zaytsev requests the programme committee to investigate ways to improve the programme.
h. Vanousek proposes that the university could provide assistance to students by teaching skills such as task management and time management as there may be a discrepency between the percieved study load and the actual study load.
i. Van den Wijngaard proposes to schedule a separate meeting to discuss the study load of different modules.

j.   Mitka proposes to have tier lists of modules for second and third year students. The goal of this would be to get an understanding of the perception of a module by ranking them against each other.

12. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

a.   Zaytsev states that in the upcoming week the first meeting of the industrial advisor report will take place. He will report about it in the next meeting.

Action points PC CS meeting 174

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	February 2022
618	November 2022	172	Contact Inter-Actief about the promotion of the Benelux programming competition brought up by Mitka	Zaytsev	December 2022
621	December 2022	173	Report the result of the discussion on online exam environments	Zaytsev	February 2023
622	December 2022	173	Discuss with Zaytsev the recommendation to upload lecture notes before the lecture	Floor	January 2023
624	December 2022	173	Carry out quality assurance interview for Computer System	Vanousek / Langerak	February 2023
625	December 2022	173	Carry out quality assurance interview for Data Science & Artificial Intelligence	van den Wijngaard/ Alachiotis	February 2023
626	December 2022	173	Carry out quality assurance interview for Internet of Things	Mitka / Elhajj	February 2023
627	December 2022	173	Carry out question assurance interview for Limits to Computing	Floor / Sperotto	February 2023
628	January 2023	174	Investigate and join a PC workgroup.	Vanousek	February 2023
629	January 2023	174	Organize a meeting with the master's teachers about the IoT-related courses	van Grinsven	March 2023
630	January 2023	174	Communicate with Faizan about the misunderstanding concerning the module grade of Intelligent Embedded Systems	Langerak	February 2023