

Faculty EWI (EEMCS)

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS

Meeting NR. 190

Date: Tuesday, 11th of June

Location: Online (Via Teams)

Time: 10.45 – 12.30

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

Present not members: Marloes van Grinsven, Sabine Padberg (Registrar), Sharon Vonk, Daniel Jonker (Inter-Actief), Felicia Burlacu (Minute Maker), Eline

Meijerink

Absent PC members: Sanne Spuls (Study Advisor), Mohammed Elhajj

Absent not members: 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 final matching event was held on the 31st of May. The students who participated wrote a take-home exam meant to resemble Numerus Fixus in some way. Both the online and on-campus events were successful with around 70 people on campus and around 220 - 250 participants on Zoom. Zaytsev estimates that around 300 - 400 students will be enrolled at the start of the next academic year. At the moment, the decisions are being finalized. On July 1st there will be another event for the remainder of the people who for some reason did not participate in the others, but are still interested. Soon, the advice will be sent out about whether the programme thinks the student is a good fit or not based on their participation in the matching event and the answers given to the take-home exam.
- b. On the 27th of May the InterActief dinner took place where Zaytsev was present as one of the teachers. On the 30th of May the ENIAC speed-dating event took place where people who are soon going to be doing their research projects can match with

companies. There, Zaytsev, Faiza and Ahmed represent the university as a company. On the 18th of June a session will be held, where Roland van Rijswijk - Deij will give more information on the topic. On the 24th of May Dies Natalis took place.

- c. The revision of the curriculum is still in progress and during the next PC meeting there will be a discussion on the topic.
- d. The investigation of introducing dutch tracks is less relevant for the Computer Science programmes. However, on the 28th of May at the programme directors dinner, the director of the Psychology programme presented their plans which was interesting as they would profit from teaching in Dutch. Still, teaching Computer Science in English gives the students a competitive advantage on the market, which is not the same for psychology.
- e. The accreditation process is progressing. At the moment voting for the committee is taking place, however nothing has been finalized yet. The chosen people will then be invited.
- f. Versen the Dutch National Association for Software Engineering held two event in Amsterdam and on the 23rd of May Zaytsev was one of the speakers and talked about using projects to prepare the students for the industry. On the 7th of June a Sen Symposium took place where a student from the UT - Famke Driessen, won the second Versen Thesis Award
- g. New appointed dean is prof.dr.ir. B.R. (Boudewijn) Haverkort

3. Incoming - outgoing correspondence

4. Minutes of the 189th PC-CS meeting d.d.May 14th 2024

- i. 610: Action point kept. Will be done by the next meeting.
- ii. 651: On the agenda for this friday. Action point kept
- iii. 687: Report needed. Action point kept.
- iv. 688: On the agenda. Action point removed.
- v. 691: Action point kept. Will be finished by the next meeting.
- vi. 693: Report needed. Action point kept.
- vii. 695: On the agenda. Action removed.
- viii. 696. Still to be done. Action point kept

5. M-EER 24-25

The work group reviewed the changes and has nothing to object or further discuss, so the suggestion is to accept the changes. Langerak states that there is minor maintenance in part B of the EER asks about the I.1.5 on page 25, why was the article about admissions to the programme. Grinsven explains that they were advised to remove it. Langerak will send the official letter of consent and approval to ZAYtsev and the Faculty Council.

6. QAI and CEEP a - Design of Software Architectures b - Data Science

- a. Krystof was not actually at the meeting, but watched the recording. This was a transitional year because of that, Georgiana Caltais was still figuring out some of the aspects of the course. The feedback sessions will be different next year, longer and with better trained TAs. Better communication about some of the requirements was requested. Caltais thinks about introducing experts into the lectures which will make it more hands-on.
- b. Kosciolek mentions the high enrollment rate, because of the fact that the course is offered in 3 quartiles of the year. Due to the fact that there are a lot of people from different backgrounds, more logistics problems arise and grading is delayed. The teacher is thinking of reducing the number of exams from six to four and making the resit in the next module. There was an electricity breakdown and 200 out of 300 students had to stop the exam, so it was decided to redo the exam for all of the students. The teachers were very open to the use of ChatGPT, they were encouraging students to use it and providing guidelines for using it. This generated problems for TAs because they were presented with generated things and asked to explain it. Langerak asks if there are plans about introducing one more teacher. Kosciolek says they are looking, but there is no concrete action about it.

7. Investigating Dutch tracks for all BSc programmes taught in English

Langerak introduces the letter from the director asking about introducing dutch tracks. He thinks it is undoable for Computer Science, but there are possibilities f.e one could have the possibility to have examinations in English or ask questions in English. Zaytsev received another document from the Marking Team who have investigated the impact of such a change would be, market-wise. And the conclusion was negative for Computer Science. Additionally, he mentioned that the result was obvious, and there was an increase in interest once the programme was switched to English. There are many things that can be done to accommodate Dutch students who are uncomfortable with studying in English. Another is to better accommodate international students is to introduce them to the Dutch scene and industry. Frelier adds that she does not see a valid reason for which dutch tracks would be introduced, although there are some students who would want this. Zaytsev asks to meet some of those people. Frelier explains that their view regards the Dutch universities overall, and they are not studying at the UT. Her opinion is that it would be difficult to fit in the job market of Computer Science without having done your studies in English. Jonker confirms what was said previously about Computer Science being an international study. Frelier mentions that Leiden University is teaching in Dutch, so there is probably some interest in it. Zaytsev adds that there is a difference between teaching in Dutch on paper and actually implementing it. In the past there was such a scenario at the UT, however most of the lectures were given in English because the teacher was international. Langerak explains that the difference was that there was the possibility of answering questions in Dutch. As there are students coming from rural areas, they might need a year of introduction to English education, but this would cause a lot of effort. Zaytsev mentioned that even now, in the matching procedure there were students who answered in Dutch on the exam, and when presented with the task of grading them, he encountered difficulties due to the fact that he was not familiar with the Dutch terminology.

Langerak sums it up that there are no plans for dutch tracks and the PC agrees with it. Zaytsev will put in writing and will run it by the PC.

8. Benchmark monitor participation

Langerak introduced a report on monitoring of participation boards which was in Dutch. There was a request for the English version, but that was not possible. Only the benchmarks are in English. The research began in 2013 and monitors the activity of participation boards and the PC was investigated. One of the conclusions was that the salary for students is not high enough and it was difficult to find interested students. Also, it was reported that students spend around 7 hours monthly on the PC, and staff members - 6 hours. Also the amount of training increased recently, which was appreciated. Generally the work of the PC including communication and information of the programme management was satisfactory. In 50% of the cases there were no elections for the PC. 60% of the PC members were satisfied with their functions. Vanousek comments that the pay is not too low but he also spends less than 6 hours per month. Mitka agrees but maybe there are other committees that work more. Frelier wasn't even aware at the start that she would get paid, however she does work around 6 hours per month. Grinsven mentioned that the pay is not considered salary but compensation, that's why it cannot be equal to a full paid job.

9. New PC members

Langerak announces that the entire student part of the PC is leaving. Frelier asked the previous interested person and he declined, and there are no other people interested. Jonker adds that he found another person who will be replacing him, and he will be joining the next meeting. Vanousek also did not find any people interested. Mitka said the person interested prev did not say a hard no, he proposes to send an announcement. It was decided that the student members will come up with an announcement and Zaytsev will put it on canvas and also will be added on the InterActief website.

Rom states that there was an announcement for the staff positions and seven people reacted. So selection should take place. According to the rules the faculty council will determine the method of selecting the PC members and that the chairperson will be selected by the new committee. Langerak doesn't think he should take a role in this process, so he has talked with Sperotto and Nikolaos and they are willing to take the lead. Zaytsev also proposed to have it organized by the vice dean of education. Langerak one option is elections, but it has to be discussed if it is desired as in such a scenario the candidates will need to make a campaign. An alternative is creating a small selection committee and maybe ask someone from the faculty council to participate. Nikolaos suggested that the PC handles it on its own and asks what is the procedure if the PC decides to proceed with a method other than elections. Langerak explains that one option is to write a proposal, if they choose a selection committee then they could have some meetings with the candidates about their motivation and experience.

Last time they almost had to do elections, but the one dropped out so all the others were accepted. Sperotto would not prefer to organize elections or delegate either as they would not understand fully how the PC works, so selection manually by talking to them is what she thinks is best. Mitka asks what is different in direct communication with the candidates and selection. Zaytsev explains that Sperotto was against elections based on just voting. Grinsven suggests

maybe keeping track of chair representation, so there is no unbalanced representation. Also regarding master and bachelor teachers and researchers. Mitka suggests motivational letters. Langerak suggests oral discussion to keep the process lightweight and that someone from the faculty council should participate to ensure fairness. Langerak with Sperotto and Nikolaos will write a letter to the dean of education about the selection procedure. Zaytsev agrees with the suggestions. Langerak mentioned that Marieke Huisman also is in favor of selection, however the Educational Dean would probably prefer elections

10. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

- Mitka had two meetings with Zaytsev about the internship reflection, so they will follow up with some of the feedback hopefully by next meeting
- Vanousek will not be there for the next meeting. Langerak thanks him for his work on the behalf of the PC, as it is his last meeting.
- Zaytsev announces that weeks of education are going on and that in July there will be a conference on Software Technologies
- Langerak mentioned the Kickboxing workshop organized by InterActief

Action points PC CS meeting 190

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	July 2024
651	9/19/2023	181	AI policy	Grinsven	
687	01/16/2024	185	Write the QAI report for Cyber risk management	Langerak/Frelier	
691	03/12/2024	187	React on the report about operating systems grading	Zaytsev	July 2024
693	03/12/2024	187	Write the QAI report for Software Systems	Frelier/Elhajj	
696	05/14/2024	189	Inform the PC about the SEQ pilot remove	Zaytsev	
697	06/11/2024	190	Announcement for students about open position at the PC	Student Members	
698	06/11/2024	190	Internship reflection	Mitka/Zaytsev	