Faculty EWI (EEMCS)

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS

Meeting NR. 191

Date:	**Tuesday, 9th of July**
Location:	Online (Via Teams)
Time:	10.45 – 12.30

Present PC members:	Rom Langerak, Vadim Zaytsev, Mariska Frelier, Alachiotis Nikolaos, Jakub Kosciolek, Anna Sperotto, Krystof Mitka,
Present not members:	Marloes van Grinsven, Sabine Padberg (Registrar), Sharon Vonk, Felicia Burlacu (Minute Maker), Eline Meijerink

Absent PC members: Sanne Spuls (Study Advisor), Mohammed Elhajj, Mikuláš Vanousek
Absent not members: Kishan Thakurani (Minute Maker), Daniel Jonker (Inter-Actief)

1. Opening and Determining agenda
   a. Rom opens the meeting at 10.47

2. Announcement PD

   a. Zaytsev announces the finish of quartile 4, but there are still extra resits scheduled for the end of the month.
   b. On the 1st of July, the last extra matching event was held for the students that applied for the next year. There were around 50 people at the online event. The administration is also dealing with exceptions (internal switches of programmes). Around 300-400 students are still expected to start in the next academic year. In mid-september the final number will be known.
   c. There is some progress on the discussion about dutch tracks. Most directors are interested except Zaytsev for reasons discussed at previous meetings. There is a possibility that some of the parts of the experiment will become mandatory. Experiments are going on regarding the implementation of the dutch tracks. Zaytsev's position is that even after implementation, English would still be used in terminology, or if not then the taught terminology will not be on the international level making the students less employable.
   d. On the 24th of june there was the Strategy day of the discipline of comp science. Education was discussed, and Zaytsev discussed about the change in curriculum of TCS. Some of the people were interested, raising questions.

3. Incoming - outgoing correspondence

    a. Outgoing, letter of agreement with EER changes

    b. Outgoing for the Dean of Education regarding the vacancies at the PC CS

4. Minutes of the 190th PC-CS meeting d.d.June 11th 2024

    i. 610: Action point removed

    ii. 651: On the agenda. Action point removed.

    iii. 687: Report needed. Action point kept.

    iv. 691: Action point removed.

    v. 693: Report needed. Action point kept.

    vi. 696: On the agenda. Action removed.

    vii. 697: On the agenda. Action removed.

    viii. 698. On the agenda. Action point removed.

    Other file

5. Overview of the process, obtaining and publishing results of the SEQ a-SEQ procedure b-BSC SEQ pilot

    a. The Quality Assurance team started discussions regarding the SEQ procedure. Langerak asks whether the programme management is supposed to pursue the teachers regarding the procedure. Zaytsev explains that in the past, teachers were asked to write a reflection. What will change is that the results of the SEQ will be published for the students to see them, so teachers will be more motivated to add a reflection if they wish to. That will serve as an annotation to the grade

    b. Seq pilot for mod 4 both TCS and BIT and some module of EE. The new version is a reduced questionnaire of one page. The expectation is that more people will complete it, but the pilot is still on going. The questions are boiled down to the points that are important for the teachers.

6. React on report of Operating Systems grading

    Zaytsev answered an email about the grading of module 5. Some assessment schemes are not fitted, as teaching assistants are grading part of the assignments which makes the grades of low quality and inconsistent. He will take it up with the new teachers and coordinator. It is a bigger problem as a lot of TAs are used in grading. Some of the issues can be solved with better rubric, but it creates a lot of work for all parties involved. This is also discussed in the revision of the TCS curriculum, particularly giving the TAs tasks that are more suitable for them, like giving feedback and guidance. Langerak was also cc'd in the email, and this will be discussed at the next meeting.

7. AI policy

    Grinsev presented a proposal, however Zaytsev updated it. Zaytsev explains that after ChatGPT came out, there were some people that got concerned and tried to forbid it from the campus entirely, but that is not possible as there is some research on AI happening at the

university. The policy was that if you use any kind of AI, you should include a declaration in the deliverable. One question that was raised, was that the person sending the deliverable is already taking responsibility for it. Additionally some of the very basic tools use AI. One reason for such discrepancies, it that the policy was written in a rush. The new policy would have three principles. First principle is that when the teacher or student has their name on any deliverable, then they are responsible for it.The 2nd is that if the use of AI is a part of the methodology the person responsible should describe it in detail to make the research replicable. Finally, every study unit can have a different approach - some would allow to use it, some advice not to. And that should be mentioned in the module guide or osiris. It is a one page document.

Mitka asks about the 3rd principle, if it means that all teachers are responsible for the use of AI in their course, and brings up the topic of AI checkers. Zaytsev does not include ai checkers in the proposal, and whether the deliverable is checked - is up to the teachers.

8. Bachelor TCS Curriculum

Zaytsev explains that there was discussion with a couple of ex programme directors about the curriculum of the universities in the Netherlands. Pretty much all universities teach the same concepts, only the naming differs. There are a lot of positive things about the curriculum at the UT, for example the structure of modules. However there is still controversy about failing an entire module if you fail one part of the module. The TOM approach has some positive points and some negatives. It is an idea to form 2 semesters, and in one semester - there will be 2 modules held. In one basic stuff and theory with exams will be given, and in the other resits and more advanced things where exams are not that needed will be given, and a project which will be viewed as learning by doing and will not that rigorously tested by tas. Then higher principles will be delivered and given to teaching teams to see if it is possible to be implemented. Ideally an easily explicable curriculum will be developed with less complex assesment schemes easy to organize.

Frelier says it sounds great, there are some points where she would disagree, and is interested in the implementation of the part regarding the projects.

Langerak also says TOM aims to have less testing, but it is not the reality and it is desired to actually reduce it.

Frelier also mentions some of the pressure is not caused by the university.

Koskiolek adds regarding reducing the stress from exams, that perhaps students should be exposes to stress to learn how to deal with the real world. Zaytsev explains that the aim is not to exclude it, but to reduce it.

9. QAI Ceep: a- Cybersecurity & Cybercrime b- Networks c- Programming Paradigms

There are no points to be discussed now as there are no pressing points.

10. Reflection in Internship

There was a discussion with 15 students about the internship. Mitka discussed the four main topics. First, about the duration of the internship, the internship part is now 10 ec and 5 ec is the reflection, however some say they had 40 hrs per week of internship, so they had to do the reflection report outside that time. Second - about the course itself, most people do the internship abroad, so there are only online sessions. There is a desire for more contact.

Relevance was also discussed, some say that they did a a basic website front end job and it was hard to connect that with the ethical aspects from the reflection. Lastly, a lot of the feedback was standard feedback, and it would be nice if it would be more detailed. There are more points in the document with suggestions. The new document for the career line was received and looked good so far, and it is really important for the career line to make sure that students are persuaded that it is useful for them. Langerak suggests sending the document to the PC and discuss it.

11. New PC members

There is one new prospective student member. There was an announcement composed, but it is not sure if it was actually delivered. Mitka could forward the message to the programme direction to put up on the canvas page and to InterActief. For the staff members, there is little progress, there are 6 interested members. The faculty board and the faculty council agreed to have a selection committee with Sperotto and Alachiotis as part of it. There was some concern about the big number of PC members in the selection committee that would possibly cause a click formation. The faculty council would like to have a non pc member, but that there should be a proposal for that. Langerak sent an email about this. He suggested involving Louise as an ex programme director. There was no answer regarding this. Langerak doubts that it is possible to resolve this until September. There is a possibility that a temporary chair person will take over. Sperotto also thinks it is not possible to solve everything until September and asks about the other committees that are searching for members like BIT. Zaytsev says there was no actions taken yet, and proposes to reach out again to the candidates and see what is their preferences regarding the vacancy at TCS and BIT and hope that there will be 2 candidates interested in TCS only to avoid any kind of selection procedure.Langerak asks Sperrotto if she can reach out to candidates as she and Alachiotis are the ones responsible for this. She also mentioned that the other committees are the examination board of BIT and Program Committee of BIT. Zaytsev will talk about this with Faizan, the educational director of BIT. Grinsven adds that the board of BIT are looking for members from specific groups. Langerak asks Zaytsev to check with Faizan and Alma from Create about this. Finally, Sperotto will send emails to the candidates together with Alachiotis explaining everything and that it is taking longer than expected.

12. New meeting dates

Langerak will be at the meeting after the holidays to say goodbye. Padberg sent a preliminary arrangement of meeting dates with some on campus to get to know the new staff. Langerak thanks the students for their work and asks what are their future plans. Mitka will join an AI master at the University of Amsterdam and is searching for housing. Burlacu is following with a Data Science master at the UT. Kosciolek is moving to the Hague for work and Frelier will continue working on her Bachelors. Padberg booked several rooms for the first couple of meetings, all on Tuesdays from 10.45 - 12.30. The dates could be adjusted as per the availability of the new members.

13. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

Action points PC CS meeting 191

Nr.	Given in month	Meeting	Description	Responsible	Deadline
687	01/16/2024	185	Write the QAI report for Cyber risk management	Langerak/Frelier	September
693	03/12/2024	187	Write the QAI report for Software Systems	Frelier/Elhajj	September
699	07/09/2024	191	AI Policy document	Zaytsev	