

Minutes Educational Committee

21 December 2015

Present:

Siegfried Nijssen
Amr Ali-Eldin
Michael Lew
Tobias Kappé
Max? (MediaTech)
Frédérique de Paus
Isaura van den Berg

Absent:

Simone Cammel
Elisa Partodikromo
Tobias de Jong
Jeroen van Oorschot
Erwin Bakker

To do:

Siegfried	Communicate lecturer Evolutionary Algorithms about assistants
Siegfried	Send email to other EC chairs + Tobias about levels in Complex Networks
Siegfried	forward written evaluation + oral evaluation to lecturers.
Siegfried	Regarding cheating in ICTiB: find out with Abdel what is communicated to the surveyors
Siegfried	Tell people you can get an exemption for Software engineering via exam committee
Siegfried	Inform lecturer about comment on System development & project management.
Siegfried	Inform lecturer Cross Cultural management about comments

- 1) Opening: 13.00hrs
- 2) Agenda: OK
- 3) Status oral evaluations:
 - a) Results oral evaluation CS both years will be discussed hereafter
 - b) Results oral evaluation ICTiB year 1 will also be discussed in this meeting
 - c) Results oral evaluation ICTiB year 2 will be discussed in the next meeting
 - d) The oral evaluations of Mediatech have been delayed until January due to exams.
- 4) Results oral evaluation CS
Carried out by EC members: Siegfried Nijssen, Amr Ali-Eldin. Elisa Partodikromo was present as well.
 - a) General comments:
 - Adjust 2 comments in issue box to: “significant students have little programming background, but most have” and “some students need more courses on advanced web programming such as data structures, etc.”
 - Some students come from outside Leiden: differences in levels in scripting and understanding data structures.
 - Background not necessarily sufficient enough: future students should have right expectations. Therefore we should facilitate them with the right information. Collect names of these students (via Elisa?) to understand how to improve knowledge.

b) Courses:

1. Databases and Datamining:

- One of the most popular courses despite some of the written comments.

2. Evolutionary algorithms:

- Some critical comments about the assistance during the course; assistants had difficulty with language, seemed not knowledgeable enough or offered little guidance. Last year this course received similar comments.
- How to deal with this: lecturer should be made aware of this issue. Siegfried will communicate this to Thomas. Suggestion: next year different assistants?

3. Complex networks/ practicum complex networks:

- Common course with physics and mathematics and divided into three parts: comments are critical about the differences in difficulty for each part. Students of CS found Aske's part too simplistic whereas physics part was way too hard. Math was OK. EC waits until results of the exam, to see if the feedback of students becomes clear from the results as well.
- To understand whether the differences in levels were experienced by all the students from institutes, we need the feedback from them as well. Siegfried will send an email to other EC chairs with Tobias in cc.

4. Systems development

- Too soft for CS; after attending first lecture many CS- students stopped following this course. Description of the course was perhaps implying a more technical course. Siegfried will inform the lecturer.
- Raises the question whether there is a better way to inform students? Should students attend the very first lecture of everything in an 'orientation week'? Now students are informed via: online study guide; blackboard.
- But perhaps an information day at the beginning of each semester is also an idea? In case there will be an orientation week: lecturers shouldn't schedule any group meetings and/or assignments.

5) Results oral evaluation ICTiB year 1:

a) General comments:

- Wasn't the programme too soft? In the oral evaluation session there wasn't really a consensus. CS students told the courses had little hard skill programming aspects, but then again the programme offers the possibilities to do so. Background of students varies; have they all sufficient background?
- The structure of the programme is group assignment oriented: much overlap in structure with the applied science (HBO)-version. Students can now easily hide behind their group mates. Students should also have an individual assignment to better show ones abilities. A solution is to have an individual assignment combined with a group assignment.
- Same comments for some lectures of ICTiB as last year. How to encourage lecturer to improve? Should the directors also be informed? Keep track of changes and communicate to management that there are no improvements.
- Schedule for the whole year should be known at the beginning of the year. Judith experienced some difficulties with the external lectures. But now changes are communicated in real time with the Google calendar.
- Current students expressed their wish that ICTiB should stay in Leiden until they've finished their study. Moving to The Hague in 2017 is most relevant for this year starters, but then again they will start writing their thesis instead of going to lectures.
- Cheating:

Already discussed with Aske and Judith that the cheaters are in particular people with a HBO background. Surveyors don't notice or don't say anything about it. Perhaps there should be more surveyors? Siegfried finds out with Abdel what is currently being communicated to them.

b) Courses:

1. System development & project management:

Outdated and material was contradicting. Theoretical course: difficult to keep it dynamic.

Siegfried: communicate comments to lecturer.

2. Software engineering:

Although the context may differ, some of the course material is also in system development.

It is also quite boring for CS students. Will this become an elective? Or there is the option to change for a substitute course via exam committee or via study coordinator. Siegfried: tell people you can get an exemption.

3. Change management:

Missing in comments: lecturer gives his own view on topics.

4. Cross cultural management:

Not really a course as it was a onetime event. Feedback with mixed opinions: awareness was raised as the information was really valuable, but the lecturer was sometimes really straightforward and should perhaps have conveyed the information in a different way.

Siegfried informs lecturer.

6) Questions before closure of meeting

-

7) Closing: 14.20 hrs

Next meeting:

February 2016, date to be announced.