

Faculty EWI (EEMCS)

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS

Meeting NR. 189

Date: Tuesday, 14th of May

Location: Online (Via Teams)

Time: 10.45 – 12.30

Present PC members: Rom Langerak, Vadim Zaytsev, Mariska Frelier, Mohammed Elhajj, Jakub Kosciolk, Mikuláš Vanousek, Anna Sperotto, Krystof Mitka

Present not members: Sanne Spuls (Study Advisor), Sabine Padberg (Registrar), Sharon Vonk, Daniel Jonker (Inter-Actief), Felicia Burlacu (Minute Maker)

Absent PC members: Alachiotis Nikolaos

Absent not members: Eline Meijerink, Marloes van Grinsven, Kishan Thakurani (Minute Maker)

1. Opening and Determining agenda

- a. Rom opens the meeting at 10.45

2. Announcement PD

- a. Zaytsev announces that the dean of EEMCS retired. The interim dean is Peter Veltink. Interviews for the dean position have been held and hopefully soon the new dean will be announced.
- b. Operational director of EEMCS Stephan Maathuis quit and joined Saxion university as dean. He worked at the university for 30 years and his work was highly appreciated. The applications for his position closed. The interim director now is the current director of LISA.
- c. The preparation of the second round of mandatory matching is in progress. Study groups are happening at the moment for the people who signed up before January. On the 31st of May the event on campus will be held and the application deadlines are closed. There are always exceptions, like students that want to switch programmes. There is an estimation of approximately 40 people on campus, and 200 online. And if all of them will get positive advice, then the year will start with more students than last year.
- d. There have been some more reaccreditation meetings. Academion was chosen as the evaluation bureau. Now the formation of a panel of seniors that are acquainted with the Dutch educational system, but are not affiliated with any university nor have been for the

last five years. After the panel is formed, a self-evaluation report will be written and finished towards the beginning of the next year. Towards the end of next year there will be a visit of the panel on campus. The process will include taking random theses that have been written at the Bachelor's and Master's level, assessment form from BOZ and other documentation for checking.

- e. The Research project module has started. As 160 TCS 50 BIT students have joined, the organization was challenging this year. Zaytsev for example supervises 8 people.
- f. The graduation ceremony dates moved. Good organization is still in progress. The process is very individual as each student has to go up the stage, and with that consideration the graduation ceremony would have to happen in both WA1 and WA2 and take up the whole day. Alternative setup is still discussed
- g. On 15th, the Digital Society Institute is holding a session at lunchtime. They want to formulate the AI mission of the UT. They want to formulate a mission and then discuss the attitude taken towards the use of AI.

Vanousek suggests to split the graduation ceremony and do the grouping based on companionship, for instance as double degree students are very connected. Zaytsev thinks that they could split it but then some students will miss the ceremony for their friends. One idea is to split the speeches and then have a joint party. The final solution is still to be discussed, as it is not known whether the rooms are going to be available.

Frelier agrees with the concerns mentioned above, and suggests that making the party a bit longer would allow students to take advantage of the overlap. Additionally she mentioned that some parts take up a lot of time, like the photo session.

Vanousek also suggests creating short blocks with breaks in between so that anyone can see all of the ceremonies of their friends and not be there for the whole day.

3. Incoming - outgoing correspondence

Two advice letters from the EER discussion.

Email by Vonk about new teachers. Vonk explains that it is just informing the PC, as the module changed slightly.

4. Minutes of the 187th PC-CS meeting d.d. April 9th 2024

i. 610: There will be a pilot for the new short design of the SEQ together with the Bcs of Electrical Engineering in quartile four of TCS and module eight of EE. It will focus on the information that the teachers need. If the pilot is successful and a higher participation rate will be achieved, an implementation on the faculty level could take place.

Vanousek suggests giving feedback on the draft of the new SEQ before the pilot takes place.

Zaytsev agrees and explains that at the moment the Quality Assurance team is now putting the new communicated version in Unisys and after that a draft will be available.

Action point kept.

ii. 646: Action point removed due to lack of time

iii. 651: Still in progress. Action point kept

- vi. 687: Report needed. Action point kept.
- vii. 688: QAI happened but reaction from teachers is still needed about the summary of the meeting. Action point kept.
- viii.691: Action point kept.
- ix. 692: On the agenda. Action point removed.
- x. 693: Report needed. Action point kept.
- xi. 694: On the agenda. Action point removed
- xii. 695: Report needed. Action point kept.

5. Clear communication for signing up

Vanousek affirms that the communication at this moment is pretty good, however it can be improved. He thinks that the reason why people have missed the announcement about signing up for the graduation modules is because often such Canvas announcements concern only a very small group of students from the programme. One suggestion is to make the announcements targeted, although this can be quite a difficult task.

Vonk mentions that they have been experimenting with targeting in the past, however due to the presence of exceptions, some people ended up missing the announcements.

Mitka agrees that it is rather difficult, and maybe this could become a design project.

Vonk gives the example of pre master students that also participate in the Research Project, therefore it is difficult to identify all of the target groups for announcements.

Frelier is also familiar with the issue, but argues that the students are more at fault for missing information, because they often forget to check them as usually such announcements do not contain relevant information. She suggests that the bigger task is how to attract the students' attention to announcements, for example by establishing it as a critical line of communication from the beginning of the Bachelor's.

Mitka says that he is okay with receiving announcements that are not relevant to him, however for important announcements the email and Canvas announcement could be flagged as important/urgent. Zaytsev adds that the Canvas announcements do not support that option.

Vonk explains that it is also difficult to decide what is to be considered important, as different students have different study priorities. Mitka explains that at the moment the emails are sent to everybody, so marking them as important for some groups of people could be helpful.

Vanousek asks whether the announcement about the graduation module was just on Canvas.

Vonk explains that it was only a Canvas announcement as a reminder, but also mentioned on the website of TCS, information page and in the Osiris catalog.

Vanousek adds that there are four ways to communicate with students: Canvas announcements, Canvas inbox, email and for some modules - Discord. He asks what each channel represents in the communication with the programme management and how to decide what information is communicated through a specific channel. And why an announcement that could lead to study delay was communicated through Canvas as opposed to email.

Zaytsev explains that most things are communicated through Canvas, and if there are emails sent, usually those are hand written by the coordinator and targeted towards specific students. Discord and the rest of the channels are extra.

Jonker adds that there is not much more that the programme could do, and it becomes the student's responsibility to look at the communication channels.

Vanousek highlights what Frelier said before, because this was the first canvas announcement that was of high importance as it might lead to study delay. Vonk says they never announced that missing a registration deadline would lead to study delay. It is also mentioned in the EER that it is mandatory to register in time and failing to do so might have consequences.

Frelier asks how big of an issue it currently is as it seems to be a very difficult problem to solve. Zaytsev said that this issue was discussed at the module board and it was mentioned that important things should be announced once instead of spamming as it induces panic. Kosciolek asks how many students got study delays as a result of not registering in time. Langerak answers that there have been none, as even in extreme cases where students realize on the Monday of the Design Project that they have not registered, they have been accommodated.

Vonk also says that there are also students that register without meeting the prerequisites and they have to go to the Examination Board to get an exception. Vanousek acknowledges that he thought the problem was much more severe, however the summary of the EER chances says that introducing this matter in the EER is meant as a punishment, as opposed to what the programme management said. Langerak explains that is not meant as a punishment, but to raise awareness that sometimes it can be impossible to accommodate a student. Vonk adds that in the EER it is mentioned that there might be consequences of not registering in time.

Langerak explains that sometimes when a student is late it might be difficult to find a design project group. The problem persists with the supervisors of the project, as they miss emails too and are frustrated when information is missed. Kosciolek adds that he was also a bit late for the design project, but everything was sorted out in the end. From his perspective, making the students worry a bit would make them rush such things. Zaytsev mentions that there are cases when students who are late, also have to go to the Examination Board which only has meetings once a month, which makes the student a month late. In this case, nothing can be done.

Vanousek adds that a potential solution to people not reading the module guide, is to avoid mentioning things that are in it at the introduction session, so that people are encouraged to read it. Langerak says that this would be too severe, and it is not what they are trying to promote. This is why he tries to give the information a couple of times, although there are people who still do not pay attention. Additionally, discussions on this topic have been held several times, and it will always be an issue that every institution is struggling with.

6. QAI and SEQ a- Managing Big Data b- Cyber-Physical Systems c- CEEP Report Cyber-Physical

- a. Langerak says there are a couple of CEEP reports, but it is not in the procedure to discuss them unless there is something that was noticed.
- b. Mitka says this was a discussion with Doina Bucur as it was one of the best rated courses. She did the whole course alone and tried to hire a TA but they got fired for not showing up. She used transparent grading where students can access a live document where they can see how she grades other students. The names are anonymized by a hash function . And a transparent dashboard - where people can see how much CPU time is used by other project teams and report on this. Some of the parts of the course

are going to be written about in a paper. The only issue was that the number of students is increasing, so the teacher doubts if she can still do it alone, or how to hire TAs that will be responsible and suitable. Langerak also mentioned that she involves a lot of contact time with students. Jonker mentioned that the hash function used for anonymization of student names is too simple, as by knowing the student number of others you can decipher the hash. Vanousek adds that a hash function is indeed not suitable for this as if you know the input, you can figure out the output.

- c. Vanousek summarizes that it is an elective for EE and TCS, so it is difficult to make it challenging but doable for students from both programmes. They have developed an in-house educational simulator which turned out to be too complicated for students, therefore it will be simplified next year. Students mainly chose the embedded machine learning elective as the model-based control one includes a lot of math. There is an initiative to standardize robot hardware which would enable students to work with the same platform for multiple modules and use their previously acquired skills. Lastly, the module coordinator asked why these things are done (QAI), and what about the CEEP. Vanousek explained that it is a way for the PC to stay in touch, however she answered that Langerak and Zaytsev are already familiar with what is happening in the course as they communicate frequently. It is important to know why these things are happening. Zaytsev explains that it is always good to evaluate the teachers as the content of the course usually doesn't change, and asking why certain things are done is a good thing. It is when a good answer is not possible to provide, then this should be stopped. Langerak adds that the PC is not responsible for the quality of the courses, but safeguarding the process of quality control, and this is a lightweight way to ensure that the process between the programme management arranging the quality control and the teachers reacting to the feedback is actually happening. It is a good way to talk about what is happening in education.

7. New student and teacher members

Langerak explains that this needs to be discussed, as several people will be leaving. Padberg says three teachers whose contracts are going to expire in September. Sperotto confirms that she will be continuing. It is assumed that Nikolaos will also continue his work. Elhajj will leave the university in October so it was decided not to renew his contract for just a period of two months. Langerak will also step back as a chair, so he will also leave the position at the PC. The final person for the chair is still to be finalized. A new staff member for the PC is needed, in the past there have been two volunteers for the position. Zaytsev suggests asking them again, as they both picked up new tasks. Vanousek and Mitka are leaving the committee. Kosciolke will also leave. Vanousek adds that had very little info about the PC when applying for the position, and this is a good opportunity to improve the onboarding process. Kosciolke agrees with the onboarding process. Frelier says that there is a high chance that she will not have time next year, so she will give an answer in a month. Mitka suggests that the student members should start scouting for new student members. Frelier suggests organizing an activity. Padberg also mentioned another student that was interested in October. Jonker adds that they are already involved in a lot of positions at the university.

New minute maker will also be needed, due to uncertainty about the continuation of studies at University of Twente. Zaytsev affirms that they have the best computer science programme in the country and explains that by following the IST specialization, the pre master's delay can be avoided. Langerak will talk to the teachers who volunteered in the past for the position of chairperson. It is a preference that the positions are filled without elections as they need considerable effort.

8. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

- a. Mitka will be looking into the reflection component of the internship, and maybe other reflection components. Zaytsev says it was the first year for reflection for internship. He suggests that they talk about this matter.
- b. Vanousek reminds that he has sent a document summarizing the issues with the OS module in November, but has not received any reaction yet.
- c. Zaytsev announces that Paul Havinga, the head of Pervasive Systems group has passed away. He was at some point the head of the PC, and designed some study units and strived for some major things in the programme. He left quite a mark on this programme.
- d. Langerak announces that there will be programme specific master EER discussion next time.