Faculty EWI (EEMCS)

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE – CS

Meeting NR. 188

Date: **Tuesday, 9th of April**

Location: Online (Via Teams)

Time: 10.45 – 12.30

Present PC members: Rom Langerak, Vadim Zaytsev, Mariska Frelier, Alachiotis Nikolaos, Jakub Kosciolek, Mikuláš Vanousek

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

Absent PC members: Mohammed Elhajj, Anna Sperotto, Krystof Mitka,
Absent not members: Eline Meijerink, Kishan Thakurani (Minute Maker)

1. Opening and Determining agenda
   a. Langerak opens the meeting at 10.45

2. Announcement PD

   a. Zaytsev announces that the first round for incoming students is now finished. They had the mandatory matching events both on campus and online. The people who visited the campus got a tour, and the ones online experienced the Zoom set up. Altogether, the event was pretty successful and the prospective students took active participation. The next matching event will be held on the 31st of May. At the moment there are around 1000 of applicants and it is expected that around 600 of them will receive positive advice, which is still not binding, but in the end in September there is an expectation of 300 - 400 people.
   b. Reaccreditation of the cluster of Computer Science has started. Around the beginning of the next year they will need to write a self assessment report and in the end - there will be an actual visit with a panel of people.
   c. Start of the critical reevaluation of the curriculum. Additionally on a 'UT view on assessment' document. A first draft has been assessed and now a second one is in the works.
   d. According to Keuzegids, the master of Computer Science is the best in the Netherlands, second year in a row. Langerak asks for more details. The categories where the Computer Science program exceeds the most are: curriculum and atmosphere and

additionally the examination category is notable. Also there is a plus in the content and assessment categories. Zaytsev explains that it is rather difficult to get a plus for big programs like ours so the UT program is doing very well.

e. Quartile 3 is soon over and exams are coming up. Module 12 is also coming up and this will be one of the biggest student conference in a long time with around 250 students who enrolled in the Research Project. Some of the tracks of the conference reached their limit within 3 minutes. Later the limits were extended as they were not enough to accommodate all of the students.

3. Incoming - outgoing correspondence

4. Minutes of the 187th PC-CS meeting d.d. March 12th 2024

i. 610: Close to finishing. Action point kept
ii. 646: Action point kept.
iii. 651: Action point kept
iv. 683: Action point kept.
vi. 687: Action point kept.
vii. 688: Planned. Action point kept.
viii.691: Action point kept.
ix. 692: On the agenda, however was not discussed due to lack of time, so kept for next meeting.
x. 693: Action point kept.
xi. 694: Action point kept.
xii. 695: Action point kept.

5. Industrial Advisory Board TCS

Zaytsev was present at 2 meetings: one was held in January and was an introductory meeting with the purpose of explaining the curriculum to the board. Some of the people from the board are UT alumni, some more recent than others. Zaytsev made it clear that the purpose of establishing such an advisory board was not because there are concerns regarding the program, but because it was advised to establish such a board at the previous accreditation. During the next meeting the focus was on the elective courses. The board was of the opinion that the Programming Paradigms elective should be a mandatory module as they expect university graduates to be familiar with functional programming and compiler construction. The board mentioned that the UT graduates are more mature and independent compared to Saxion graduates. This cannot be said regarding internship positions as it is more random, and there are candidates that are still junior and some that are very good.

This feedback is particularly useful as reevaluation of the curriculum is in progress and having the feedback of advisory board as foundation for some decision is helpful. The list of the people who are on the board can be found online and potentially there will be a report of the meeting added later.

6. M - EER 2024-2025

    a. The first comment mentioned by Vanousek was regarding Article A3.6. It was not clear whether the conditions from section b and c regarding the amount of overlapping credits are the same. Van Grinsven explains that this is done to prevent students to make the combined programme unbalanced by taking too many courses from just one programme. Padberg remarks that it used to 30 credits. Van Grinsven explains that it used to be 20 credits of internship and 20 credits of courses or 30 of courses, however it made it unfair for some students that are only allowed to do courses as in some master programmes within EEMCS there are requirements for former students of applied universities that prevent them from doing internships. This is year it was decided to make a more general rule.

        Additionally, regarding the same article it was not clear what is meant by 'examiner requirements' and is it different from 'examination requirements'. Van Grinsven explains that for the final master project a student needs one examiner and a senior examiner, along with 2 examiners fro, two different research chairs. A senior examiner means that they have assessed at least 10 master students before and completed the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ). Langerak adds that it was indeed unclear that these were requirements on the examiners so a recommendation will be made for a reformulation. Vanousek makes a suggestion to include a more detailed explanation. Langerak mentioned that such explanations usually go into additional materials. Van Grinsven adds that the only reason why such details are mentioned in the EER is for students that wish to do a combined degree, especially with a degree outside EEMCS.

    b. The next comment was made about the article A5.1 where there was a typo identified. Additionally, a reformulation was suggested for another part of the article as the repeated use of the word 'determined'

7. B - EER 2024 - 2025

    a. The first comment made was a small typo in the faculty section, where there is an 'en' used instead of an 'and'.

    b. The work group felt that the explanation provided for section 11 was too short and not very clear. The explanation that was given to the working group cleared things up a lot so they suggested including some of that in the EER. Vonk explains that the intention is to keep the EER short and to provide all of the instructions on how to deal with the articles on the website. Frelier asks whether it is mentioned anywhere that the instructions are on the website, adding that students can get confused with the UT rules and dividing the places where people can find information can make matters even worse. Vonk agrees and mentions that it is possible to mention this within section 11.

    c. Additionally, the first 2 sentences of the section essentially mean the same thing and are redundant. The board group did not really understand whether it was meant in the section that the student has to first ask permission from the module coordinator and then submit a request for the examination board to allow them to take the module. Vonk explains that it is meant that the student has the right to disagree with the decision. They first have to fill in a request for the bachelors coordinator and then if they disagree,

go to the examination board. Vanousek thinks that this should be specified in the EER and whether or not it means that the student disagrees with the decision. Vonk adds that it is rather difficult to formulate rules regarding that as when the decisions are made, the motivation and the plan that the student hands in are both taken into consideration. Generally, all requests up to 15 credits will be approved, and in case of between 15 and 20 students need to pay close attention. In case of more than 20 credits, an even more detailed approach is desired as most of the students fail to deal with this kind of workload. Vanousek suggests that it should be mentioned that this section is not for double degree students.

d. The next concern was about the sentence 'There will be consequences' which the board group found to be unclear and suggested to be specified what are the consequences. Vonk explains that for example if a student submitted the request too late or the board disagrees, they are able to remove them from the canvas website. It is difficult to list all possible consequences, because they differ a lot from situation to situation. Zaytsev explains that the consequences of not filing a request are very clear - the ECTs do not count, which has happened before in other programmes and it is desired to put such rules in the EER so that it is mandatory to talk to the programme coordinator and receive advice on whether or not taking a certain amount of credits is doable or not. Frelier asks whether it is needed to fill in requests for modules like Study Tours that overlap but not completely. Vonk answers that it is indeed the case, otherwise the rules become unclear and unmanageable. Vanousek emphasizes that the goal of the rule is to prevent students from failing certain modules due to too high of a studyload. Vonk adds that it is also the case that certain students commit to group projects, but then abandon them due to high workload for other courses and then the other students who are indeed taking the course seriously are left without partners. Vanousek suggests that this issue should be handled separately, for example adding a clause saying that successful completion of the module would only be possible if the group project receives a passing grade. Also the section seems to add more extra work for students and for programme management. Zaytsev reacts by saying that the extra work for the programme management should not be a concern, especially since this suggestion is coming from their side, additionally if the students are not able to put in the effort to submit a request then maybe they are not even able to support the studyload of more than 15 credits that they are trying to request. Frelier adds that she agrees with Vanousek, adding that if she would do more than 20 ects then she would make sure the project team would not be affected by that. She expects a lot of students to have trouble adapting to the rule. Vonk explains that this is not the case for the majority, and they have tried to exclude the rules, but students did not follow the advice of the management and proceeded with the intended study load and failed everything. Zaytsev adds that this is a general rule that deals with all sorts of situations and generally the advice is to first talk to the study advisor. Frelier suggests trying out this rule for a year to see how students will deal with it. Vonk asks whether Vanousek and Frelier would be willing to help in creating the instructions that will go on the website for Section 11 to ensure students have a clear understanding of how to deal with this regulation. Additionally, Langerak suggests that it is either specified what are the consequences in this section or that it is important that a request is submitted timely.

e. Vanousek comments on section 12 saying that the communication about the registration for graduation modules is not clear enough. Vonk mentions that it is indeed stated on the canvas page of the bachelor's programme. Vanousek thinks that is not a good communication channel as most students are not interested in those notifications. Vonk replies that one of the reasons why it was decided to be included in the EER is that often students miss the Canvas notifications. Frelier adds that she also has seen a lot of problems with communication and thinks that is a problem that should be addressed. Vanousek adds that not only the formulation of this section has issues, but he also thinks that the approach of the programme management is wrong. Langerak asks to clarify how the request for students to register in advance is wrong intent. Vanousek explains that the changes in the EER introduce punishment for this issue instead of a solution. Vonk rejects this and clarifies that this section is included as clarification for the scenarios when students register late and it is no longer possible to accommodate them into a Design Project or there is no supervisor for them in the Research Project, therefore it needs to be clear that the consequences might be that the student is excluded from participation. Additionally, this is not a new rule, but rather a new additional explanation. Vanousek acknowledges that it was indeed a misunderstanding. Vonk adds that the announcement for registration is done multiple times via canvas and during information sessions, she does not feel like there is anything more she can do to improve the communication and increase awareness about this. Langerak asks whether or not they should give recommendations regarding this section. Vanousek suggests adding an explanation why registration is necessary. Langerak suggested including that on the website. Frelier agrees. Zaytsev adds that registering a month in advance is also best for students as it allows them to choose a project that they want to work for. Vanousek adds that because the EER states the communication channels used for announcing the deadlines for registration the discussion about effective communication is relevant. Langerak explains that in documents as such, these communication channels are the minimum ways of communication. Frelier adds that by formulating things in such a manner, the students that have read the EER are aware where to find this information.

f. The last thing that was discussed was the new picture introduced by Zaytsev. He explains that now the layers have names which give more guidance on how to read and interpret this picture. The concepts in the right part are new since they did not align with what was there from the biomedicine program. It will be necessary to indicate where these things are addressed in the programme for the reaccreditation. Langerak asks about where they are introduced. Zaytsev explains that some align with the career skills course, others are taught on many occasions.

8. A.O.B / Questions and Conclusion

a. Jonker announces that Langerak won the Computer Science part of the Decentral Educational award.

b. Vanousek proposes to introduce the discussion about effective communication to students on the agenda of the PC.