

Faculty EWI (EEMCS)

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS

Meeting NR. 177

Date: Tuesday 11 April 2023

Location: Online (Via Teams)

Time: 10.45 – 12.30

Present PC members: Rom Langerak, Anna Sperotto, Nikolaos Alachiotis, Jelle van den Wijngaard, Mikulas Vanousek, Krystof Mitka, Mohammed Elhajj

Present not PC members: Vadim Zaytsev, Eline Meijerink, Marloes van Grinsven (all management CS), Padberg (registrar) Niels Rotmensen, Daniel Jonker (Inter-Actief), Jakub Kościółek (minutes maker),

Absent PC members: Daniël Floor

Absent not PC members: All study advisors, Sharon Vonk

1. Opening and Determining agenda

- a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10:51.
- b. Daniel Jonker introduced himself as a candidate board of Interactive regarding education

2. Announcement PD

- a. Zaytsev has a few updates.
 - I. On the 18th of March there was “Beverwedstrijd”, which is an algorithmic thinking competition. University of Twente hosted the finals of this competition this year and organized motivating lectures for participants.
 - II. On the 20th of March, there was TCS talk for people who are currently in the selection procedure and numerus fixus and study groups has been officially started.
 - i Study groups are a new concept, which is all about dividing new students into groups of 5-10 people and giving them material to study and Tas help to prepare them for the upcoming academic year.
 - III. On the 22nd of March there was an EEMCS wide brainstorm of the future of the faculty
 - IV. On the 27th of March there was an extra meeting of the program committee where numerus fixus was mainly discussed
 - V. On the 30th of March there were Open Days for the Master which was well attended not only by University of Twente students.

- VI. On the 31st of March and 1st of April there were Open Days for the Bachelor, which was specifically well attended by international students.
- VII. On the 31st of March there was the official end of the Teaching Assistants' training.
 - i There was a feedback session after that from the students, which was unanimously positive
 - ii There is a system under development, which will allow students to have a profile with all their completed trainings and let teachers pick students with specific trainings
- VIII. University of Twente will be hosting Informatica Olympiada this year by Peter De Boer
- IX. Zaytsev attended the session about International Student Barometer
 - i Session was recorded and Zaytsev can share it
 - ii Interestingly, the housing problem is much better in the Netherlands in comparison to other countries and Twente is one of the best region to find accommodation in the Netherlands

3. Income - outgoing correspondence

- a. There was an email from Ing Yanqiu Huang, who showed an interest in joining PC
- b. Updated Code of Conduct was received

4. Minutes of the 176th PC-CS meeting d.d. March 14th, 2023

- a. Van den Wijngaard proposed the segregation of individuals into two distinct groups: Programme Committee members and non-members. Additionally, he recommended clarifying the roles of individuals who are not part of the Programme Committee.
- b. Action points:
 - i. 610: The action point is kept.
 - ii. 621: There was verbal report and it is nicely represented in the minutes. Remove the action point
 - iii. 622: The action point is kept.
 - iv. 625: Still waiting for the teacher to approve the document. The action point is kept.
 - v. 629: The action point is kept.
 - vi. 631: Remove the action point.
 - vii. 632: The document is still under preparation. The action point is kept.
 - viii. 633: The action point is kept.

5. Numerus Fixus 2024

- a. After additional meeting programme committee advised picking Mandatory Matching for the next year's selection procedure

6. Proposed Changes – Module Cyber-Physical Systems

- a. There are proposed changes to a module called Cyber Physical System due to maintenance, student comments, and the addition of another Embedded System module and a Robotics Master program that has interest from computer science students.

- b. Computer science students interested in the Robotics Master program can take the normal Premaster program for half a year or choose the Cyber-Physical Systems module with a specific control choice.
- c. The curriculum working group provided positive feedback on the changes, but Sperotto raised a concern about possible overlap with machine learning in both modules.
 - a. Machine learning is a popular topic, and it is likely that students would take both modules. The Robotics Master program is open to students but taking the Cyber-Physical Systems module would be a pathway toward the Robotics Master program, while taking the Intelligent Embedded Systems module would be a pathway toward the EMSYS Master program. Informing students about these pathways and choices is emphasized as important.
- d. Padberg-Heskamp asked if there is no overlap between those modules as students can choose them as minors
 - a. Zaytsev stated that it is possible, however only if students themselves have chosen a particular module and specifically made the same choices within the modules, which can be easily checked.
 - b. Langerak added that machine learning parts are not identical and are in slightly different contexts, so it should not be a problem
- e. Van den Wijngaard noticed that this is up to the lecturer to distinguish such case
 - a. Langerak stated that it is not a problem as students will get machine learning from slightly different angles
 - b. Zaytsev made an analogy to security within the modules that are not overlapping because teachers of security talk among themselves and they know what is being taught at each point.
- f. Zaytsev noted that this topic has been already discussed at the reflection meeting after this module

7. New Master Course – Learning Analytics

- a. Sperotto was wondering a couple of things after receiving the email
 - a. Why do we need a separate course for learning analytics rather than incorporating it into existing analytics courses?
 - b. How can the course be successful given its broad target audience with varying backgrounds?
 - c. Why is the maximum obtainable grade for repair work limited to a 6?
- b. Langerak noted that obtaining a limited grade after resit is a common practice in module 2
 - a. Zaytsev agreed and added that this is normal as after the first submission of the project, students receive a proper checklist of things to improve, which makes the project much easier. However, everything depends on the project and motivation
 - b. Langerak added that module 2 has a lot of students so the repair procedure would take much more time
- c. Zaytsev stated that for him this course looks a little bit weak for master computer science students and he misses the clear “punchline” in terms of how it will benefit students' careers as computer scientists.
- d. Van den Wijngaard agreed and showed his concerns that students in data science will receive 5 credits for only a tiny bit of information about education and specifically about assessment in education and similarly, students in education science will get only a small introduction to machine learning.

- a. Van Grinsven also considered online comments about the need for more master's courses and the distinction between educational science and computer science. While the proposed course aims for a generic background, it would be helpful to know which specialization it ties in with, especially for existing master's programs that are organized around specializations.
- b. Zaytsev suggested that it is the responsibility of the students to make sensible choices in selecting courses, but the current description of the proposed course only seems to fit into the data science and technology (DST) specialization. However, it may not be strong enough for DST students to benefit from it. He suggests that the proposal could be revised to target specific specializations more explicitly
- e. Van den Wijngaard noted that the collaboration with Finland seems to be a summer course for anyone interested in the field and that modeling the proposed course after that may not be the most effective approach. He suggested that if the course is offered, it may make more sense to integrate it into an existing module as a final project.
- f. Langerak proposed that he will forward these comments to the teachers, and it will be discussed later

8. QualityControl

- a. There are 3 reports about module reflections
 - a. WebScience module is looking for a new coordinator
 - b. Intelligent Interaction Design module seemed impressive with around 650 students
- b. All the modules are struggling with too low SEQ input and people not showing up on CEEPs
 - a. Vanousek suggested an incentive scheme that will give students a push to give feedback. As an example, he proposed delaying grades from the module if the students have not filled out an evaluation form
 - i. Langerak stated that there should be more intrinsic incentive, such as showing students what has been changed.
 - b. Van den Wijngaard noted that people tend to complain more than give positive feedback and that low attendance in SEQ and CEEP should be taken as a positive thing for the students
 - c. Jonker proposed to introduce a feedback form at the beginning of the module/course, encouraging students to provide feedback throughout the course as it happens. This will ensure that the feedback is fresh in students' minds and will lead to more accurate and useful feedback for the teachers and coordinators.
- c. Langerak proposed making long action point from that **@Everyone Gather ideas on how to improve module evaluation**
- d. Result from QAI: Cybersecurity Management
 - a. Module was online this year, which was preferred by the majority of students, however for the next year the module coordinator would like to make the module offline, which is also connected with ending the collaboration with Delft
 - b. Zaytsev added the note that the University of Twente is in process of ending collaboration with Delft and next year will be the transition year before completely splitting Cybersecurity modules
 - c. Vanousek mentioned that most of the work on the curriculum has been outsourced and it works well

- d. Van den Wijngaard noted that the question: "The feedback during the course gave me sufficient information for further learning: in the SEQ is vague and students may not know if it refers to preparation for the exam or further learning after the course"

9. Master -EER – part A 2023-2024

- a. Padberg-Heskamp asked who is responsible for checking if a student who is auditing for Cum Laude has any reported fraud.
 - a. Van Grinsven noted that there is a process in place for determining academic misconduct, which is ultimately decided by the exam board.
 - b. Langerak proposed to move forward as this is issue of Examination Board
- b. Langerak had questions about Article 4.4, as he found "Only if an examination is passed and the student still wants to take part in the subsequent examination" vague
 - a. Van Grinsven clarified that this is after obtaining a passing grade and not passing the exam
- c. Van den Wijngaard suggested changing wording from 'precise' to 'unrounded'

10. Bachelor – EER

- a. Zaytsev reported that last year, a visualization of important aspects of the program was proposed and refined through discussions. It was confirmed to cover all program-intended learning outcomes. Recently, the visualization has been made the main point with 1K of each process.
- b. Zaytsev added that the previous list had some repetitive points, and some important points were only mentioned once. The new list has a better structure, the same level of abstraction, and no extremely long or short points.
- c. Langerak noted 2 issues
 - a. Section 5.1 which is about binding recommendation states that every student is expected to have a laptop
 - b. In annex 2 about the double degree programme, there are still course codes missing for some modules
- d. Van den Wijngaard noted that Rule 1 under Section 5.1 is redundant
- e. Vanousek asked why compensation stated in Section 8.1.4 cannot be undone and why it cannot be automatic.
 - a. The question was answered by stating that students should think this decision through, and they can do it at the end of the academic year. Moreover, in case of failing many units, students should have a choice of which one they want to resit and which they want to compensate

11. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

- a. Mitka asked if the results of SEQ can be published as it can be beneficial for students to choose the electives/minors based on that.
 - a. **@Zaytsev Investigation of the possibility of publication SEQ results for elective**
- b. Mitka proposed adding a point to EER about sharing the answers to exercise questions during the course.
 - a. Langerak stated that it can be really restricting to different types of courses and that this issue should be forwarded to Zaytsev and Meijerink

- c. There will be 2 students leaving PC: van den Wijngaard and Floor. There is a need to search for new candidates.
- d. Langerak closes at 12:39.

Action points PC CS meeting 177

Nr.	Given in month	Meeting	Description	Responsible	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
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
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
634	April 2023	177	Gather ideas on how to improve module evaluation	Everyone	
635	April 2023	177	Investigation of the possibility of publication SEQ results for elective	Zaytsev	