

Faculty EWI (EEMCS)

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS

Meeting NR.

Date: Tuesday, 12nd of March

Location: Online (Via Teams)

Time: 10.45 – 12.30

Present PC members: Rom Langerak, Anna Sperotto, Krystof Mitka, Alachiotis Nikolaos, Jakub Kosciolk, Mikuláš Vanousek, Mariska Frelie, Mohammed Elhajj

Present not members: Sanne Spuls (Study Advisor), Marloes van Grinsven, Daniel Jonker (Inter-Actief), Sharon Vonk, Sabine Padberg (Registrar),

Absent PC members:

Absent not members: Vadim Zaytsev, Eline Meijerink, Kishan Thakurani (Minute Maker), Felicia Burlacu (Minute Maker),

1. Opening and Determining agenda

- a. Rom opens the meeting at 10.45

2. Announcement PD

- a. Sharon announces that the first mandatory matching event was held on 1st of March both online and on campus for the future generation. Before the event students were supposed to make assignments and fill in a questionnaire which were discussed at the event. Other activities were: speed date with programme management, teaching assistants, students etc. As a result almost all students got positive advice.
- b. A revision of the curriculum for the academic year of 2025/2026 is being held at the moment. The change will consist of splitting the Core component of the first year modules into smaller study units.
- c. Last week students were sent their second Binding Study Advice and somewhat about 50% of them got a positive recommendation.

Sperotto asks about the maximum number of students to be expected in September. Sharon explains that there will be other matching events happening in the future as students can enroll until the summer. So around July it will be more clear around how many students can be expected to come.

3. Incoming - outgoing correspondence

4. Minutes of the 186th PC-CS meeting d.d. February 13th 2024

- i. 610: Action point kept.
- ii. 646: Action point kept.
- iii. 651: Action point kept
- iv. 683: Action point kept.

Sharon gave a quick overview of the meeting, especially about the fact that the board was in favor of Career Skills and electives. However they have advised to make the Programming Paradigms and DS&AI modules compulsory.

- v. 686: On the agenda for the meeting.
- vi. 687: Action point kept.
- vii. 688: Action point kept.
- viii. 689: On the agenda for the meeting.
- ix. 690: Done.

5. Master a- New course Green Software Development b- Planned changes for specialization Software Technology

- a. Sperotto thinks it is a good and complete proposal, even though it would already start in quartile 4. Vanousek suggested mentioning the programming languages that are compared in the course to make sure it aligns with the rest of the study. Sperotto agrees and mentioned that the prerequisites description could be more detailed (include names of programming languages) and therefore more helpful for prospective students. Miitka asks about seminars by students. Rom explains that these are sessions when students give presentations on different topics. Frelier mentions that naming programming languages in the prerequisites might put people off if they do not have experience, which is undesirable especially because the languages would be used only for comparison from the perspective of environmental footprint. Grinsven would like to see some measure in regards to testing in pairs and that the teacher has a clear understanding of which students did which part of the assignment. Also, it will probably not happen in this academic year as it is a very short notice. Mitka asked about the weights and the grading of the components. Rom will contact the teacher and will discuss the comments and questions.
- b. Sperotto asks whether in the second point it is mentioned that the student could also choose not to do the Capita selecta, which is indeed the case. The rest of the changes are reasonable. Rom clarifies that changes like these always happen due to changes in the staff and topics evolving and their goal is to keep the course in alignment with the learning objectives. Rom will tell the programme management that the PC has taken positive note of the changes.

6. Guidelines Multiple Choice

Currently there are some regulations for the multiple choice questions: they do apply guessing correction by default but the teacher can disable it. Faiza agreed that the communication to students about the guessing correction, specifically that it is applied by

default, should be more clear in the form, at the beginning of each exam. The other idea about ensuring that the knowledge of the student is accurately measured, by instituting a minimum number of answers to each question was rejected as it is best to be left as responsibility of the teacher. The examination board thinks that it is enough to examine each evaluation in order to ensure quality of examinations.

7. Work group EER

- a. Vanousek gives an overview of the work group. There have not been many concerns as the majority of the members were working last year as well. Mitka suggested that the internship module should be better described as an option that can be done as part of the minor, especially regarding the 5 credits regarding the reflection component. Vanousek asks about what version of the EER applies to the students. Sharon explains that the most actual version applies to all students and if necessary some transitional arrangements will be involved.
- b. Another point discussed was the new rule that is being considered about the maximum number of ECTS a student can take at once, and needs to get permission from the study advisor or the programme coordinator to do otherwise. Sharon commented that this will be included from September in the Bachelor specific part of the EER regarding students taking more than 15 credits in a quartile.
- c. Vanousek asks about whether the visualization diagram of important parts of the bachelor discussed in the April of 2023 will be included in the EER as intended. Rom commented that the work group should not go that far as to review the meetings for the previous version of the EER. Sharon adds that the visualization table is indeed included in the EER.

8. QAI and SEQ

- a. QAI Intelligent Embedded Systems: Frelier commented that a lot of the issues found were due to the fact that the course is new, given the first time and the administration already knows how they want to rethink or solve some of the issues discussed. Rom added that it was a good idea to include the teachers in the discussion as they have a big influence on the course. Frelier sees a scheduling issue with this, although it is up to the module coordinator to invite the teachers as well.
- b. QAI Security and Cryptography:
Vanousek points out that it was a very nicely rated course, even though it was the first time the course was given at the UT. The teacher made the course material from scratch, despite the material being available from the previous iterations at Delft University, which is why Vanousek believes the course was such a success. One weak point was the math level of the students, which was also noted by others too. The teacher suspected that he was too lenient in grading as a lot of students passed, and he thinks it might be because of the late start of the course (because of illness). Next year an extra research assistant might be hired to

conduct some of the grading. Additionally, the teacher would like to have flipped classrooms in the next iteration of the course. Grinsven agrees with the teacher on the topic of mathematics and emphasizes that it is hard to control things like that with students that are coming from other universities. Rom added that since they are revising the curriculum for the bachelor, it would be a nice idea to take feedback from master teachers regarding the math level of UT students.

c. QAI Data Science & AI:

First, Kosciolek mentioned that there were some improvements regarding the order of some lectures to make the relationship between components more clear. The main issue was that teachers with technical background had trouble teaching ethics components and with the examination. For the next iteration, it was planned to work with the teachers from the ethics group. There was also a problem with TA as students are leaving, or are not always available every year.

d. Rom proposes to choose the 2 bachelor modules for which to perform QAIs from the following: Software Systems which got a 7.2 grade, Intelligent Interactive Systems with a 7.5, Cyber physical Systems with a 6.9 and Web Science with a 7.6. Rom suggests taking a fixed module and one elective and as there were some changes implemented to the Cyber physical Systems module it would be useful to conduct a QAI. Vanousek will be responsible for it with Nikolaos. Rom proposes for the second module to be Software Systems and to invite one or two teachers. Elhajj and Kosciolek will be responsible for it.

- i. Grinsven gave some explanation on some of the lower grades. For the Software Systems, there were supposed to be substitute teachers due to absences. Some organizational issues were encountered in cybersecurity management which is done by Deloitte. Still the SCS group did their best to still offer the course, however next year the course will be discontinued so therefore Cybersecurity management is not a good course to evaluate. And lastly Data Science had a lot of issues because of the size and the new tests.

Rom proposes to evaluate the Data Science course to investigate what happened there. Grinsven suggests involving Maurice and Faizan as they are teaching this iteration. Mitka suggests taking Data Science and Managing Big Data as they have very different grades despite being pretty similar from the titles. Rom agrees. Frelier got kicked out of the meeting and she would like to switch with Kosciolek to do the QAI for the Software Systems. Rom supports Mitka's proposal and volunteers to participate in the QAI for Managing Big Data along with Mitka. Sperotto and Kosciolek would be responsible for the QAI for Data Science.

9. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

Vanousek suggests adding an evaluation for the trial run of the advanced version of the Software Systems as well. Sharon comments that it did not really happen. Rom adds the fact that it will not happen until the program is redesigned as they are planning to abandon the concept of modules. This will be further discussed in the future when Zaytsev will come from holidays as there will be a lot of issues to be solved.

Action points PC CS meeting 187

Nr.	Given in month	Meeting	Description	Responsible	Deadline
610	11/1/2022	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 2024
646	7/1/2023	180	Contact organizers of events such as BAPC	Jonker	
651	9/19/2023	181	AI policy	Grinsven	
683	11/14/2023	183	Report on the 2nd meeting of the Industrial Advisory Board of TCS	Sharon	
687	01/16/2024	185	Carry out QAI for Cyber risk management	Rom/Mariska	
688	01/16/2024	185	Carry out QAI for Design of Software Architectures (Vadim should respond before May 2024)	Krystof/Mohammed/Nikola s	
691	03/12/2024	187	React on the report about operating systems grading	Zaytsev	
692	03/12/2024	187	Carry out QAI for Cyber physical Systems	Vanousek/Nikolaos	
693	03/12/2024	187	Carry out QAI for Software Systems	Frelier/Elhajj	
694	03/12/2024	187	Carry out QAI for Managing Big Data	Mitka/Langerak	
695	03/12/2024	187	Carry out QAI for Data Science	Kosciolek/Sperotto	

