Meeting SAT Computer Science 21 June 2023

Present:

- Marco Carbone (HoSP KCS)
- Therese Graversen (HoSP BDS)
- Luca Maria Ariello (HoSP KDS)
- Marius Thomsen (Student rep., BSWU)
- Theodor Christian Kier (Student rep., KCS)
- Sofie Kramshøi Nielsen (Student rep., KSD)
- Juraj Septák (Student rep., BDS)
- Maja Styrk Andersen (Student rep., KSD)
- Lena Winther Jensen (Student rep., KSD)
- Mette Holm Smith (Observer, Prog Coor BDS/KDS)
- Allette Bjørn Bundgaard (Observer, Prog Coor SWU/KCS)
- Marc Kellaway (Prog Coor KSD) (Minutes)

Absent:

- Dan Witzner Hansen (HoSP BSWU)
- Louise Meier Carlsen (Co-HoSP BSWU)
- Patrick Bahr (HoSP KSD)
- Simon Johan Skødt (Student rep., BSWU)
- Paolo Tell (Guest, faculty)
- Jesper Bengtson (Guest, faculty)

1) Approval of agenda
Since Patrick was absent the KSD course evaluation was moved to the next meeting. On request from Marc, point 7 was moved to the top of the agenda. Apart from this, the agenda was approved.

2) Approval of minutes from meeting 25 May 2023
No comments have been received, so the minutes are considered approved.

7) SAT-meetings in the autumn
It was agreed to keep the SAT-CS meeting in the autumn semester at the time-slot Wednesdays 14:00 – 15:30. The first meeting was set to week 36. [Due to the Study Board meeting that week, the first meeting has later been moved to week 37.]

3) Information
Nothing for this point

4) Update from study programmes
Juraj: I do not really have anything from BDS. I asked around but haven't heard anything. No complaints.

Marius: Two sets of SWU-students have reached out to me. One concerned the tendency for the re-exams to be harder than the ordinary exams. I have checked, and the failure rate is in general double or more, with the grades also being markedly lower.

Therese: That is to be expected, as it is not the same cohort of students.

Marius: The students also feel that their teacher has had a condescending tone when asked about the reexams, which does not seem appropriate. The other thing was that the students are not pleased with being signed up automatically for the re-exams when failing a course.

Mette: This should be addressed in the Study Board. As we have seen with the lowered registration requirements, these things are not set in stone, but that would be the right place to address it. The issue about the teacher not being nice about the re-exam is the kind of thing that should be addressed to the head of the study programme, preferably by the students experiencing this themselves.

Allette: Also, if a student feels that they have not been examined fairly, they have the option to file an exam complaint.

Marc: I have heard the story of re-exams being harder before, but as the ILOs are the same for the ordinary exam and the re-exam, one shouldn't be harder than the other. And as Allette said, if a student feels they have been tested outside the ILOs, they can file an exam complaint.

Maja: I have started a dialog with Thore on behalf of the KSD students regarding workload pressure and the issue of mandatory assignments. He is up for a dialog, and I thought I would bring it up here to get some input on how to handle this in a good way, and who should take part.

Therese: I have discussed this with Riko also. As he is the course manager, he should be kept part of it.

Maja: I will invite them both to an SAT meeting, and will try to make different cases to discuss beforehand.

Marius: This is not necessarily as big a problem for the SWU-students, as we have projects at the time, but I know it is an issue for the KSD- and BDS-students.

Juraj: What are the issues exactly?

Maja: The mandatory exercises each week putting pressure on the students.

Allette: Are the extra exercise lessons also mandatory. I am curious if the teachers express that expect you to join both.

Maja: They are not mandatory, but the KSD-students feel that the need to join them in order to be able to do the mandatory assignments.

Theodor: I just have two things from KCS, now that the exams are almost over. A few of the electives have not informed the students on how the exam will be handled – or informed the students wrongly regarding the form for the group exam, as is the case with Ethical Hacking. A bigger point is that in the CS department most electives have D-type exams, which make the exam schedule hard for the students, with both a hand-ins and oral exams often close together.

5) Course evaluations spring 2023
BDS, KDS, KCS only. BSWU and KSD will be on the agenda for the next meeting, when Dan, Louise and Patrick will be present.

<u>BDS</u>

Therese: First some overall comments. The response rate was generally good except for two courses. We should work on getting these better, but overall, this is a vast improvement from last semester. The scores are generally good.

- <u>Reflections on Data Science</u> is low, but that is probably because it is one of these more "fluffy" courses that the students do not like. Some changes have been made to Applied Statistics, which is

scoring better than last year. The course still has a few problems, but I am aware of this. There were lots of text comments, which is always more helpful than the score itself.

- Algorithms and Data Structures was generally well received, but there are still issues with the course being tailored more to SWU than BDS and KSD, so the students are still a bit unhappy, but it is better than last year. Perhaps we can still make a push for more Python. There were a few comments on the content – I will take this with the CM.
- Applied Statistics has been changed to be much more interactive, and this has been well received.
- First Year Project unsurprisingly had some issues and confusion regarding the content.
- Data Visualisation and Data-driven Decision Making is generally a good course, but maybe we should push for revising the content, as some students have commented that it is a bit too much focused on Google-stuff. There has also been comments on the fact that that among the speakers and videos were no women nor people of color.
- Large Scale Data Analysis has had quite a few changes after Maria took over the course, but the students are generally happy.
- Reflections on Data Science: I am thinking of changing the content a bit further down the line, but the lectures are new and need to land on their feet first.

Juraj: What were the issues with Reflections on Data Science?

Therese: There is an overlap with Data Science in Research, Business and Society. The problem is that the technical prerequisites are not clear enough, so people see the course at repetition.

Juraj: Regarding Data Visualization, I think there is a connection between the strong focus on Google and the teacher not coming from a technical background, so it gets kind of fluffy and not so technical during the course. But then for the exams there is a different focus on the more technical stuff, which gives a kind of disconnect.

Therese: I'll talk to the CM about this.

KDS

Luca: The positive ones were Data Science in Production and Geospatial Data Science. Electives generally get a higher score, but these still have very high and good scores. We have improved things from last year from the suggestions, and I think the material and exercises sessions are both excellent.

As for the negative ones –

- Algorithmic Fairness is below the bar in the scores. There is a substantial decrease from last year, which is possibly due to poor planning. The course had four different lectures due to maternity leave, so there were various issues with overlap in content and the mandatory activities being too hard. It will probably be better next year when the course gets back to the main teacher again.
- Advanced Machine Learning has gotten much better than the very bad feedback last time, but the score is still too low. There are still complaints of too much material and too much confusion. The course has been improved a lot, though, and I do not think we should make it smaller, as in the end people seem happy with what they have learned. Perhaps it is a matter of framing, to make it more coherent, rather than cutting content.

Marius: Both courses are at the same time. Is there alignment between the two in regard to workload?

Luca: Maybe we should reform KDS at some point and consider moving or changing some of the mandatory courses. It should be possible to have a different structure, but these things take time to implement. The workload should be manageable. People complain, but they do manage it, and am very happy about the courses in the end.

Mette: We are also missing a representative from KDS. People can also join as guests. We should discuss this at some point.

KCS

Marco: There are no mandatory courses on the 2nd semester, so the evaluation has only been of electives and specialisation courses, with no courses that everyone takes. 60-70% of the courses are specialisation courses, the rest electives, and people are in general happier with courses they choose themselves. Given that, the overall evaluation is very positive. Five courses are under the bar, but the response rate is also a bit low, so this doesn't say much.

- Computer Systems Performance went very well, with only positive comments.
- Cryptographic Computation and Blockchain have only one person responding, with no comments. People performed well at the exams.
- Cryptography: The students were really unhappy since teacher had to leave for 3 weeks due to a family issue and gave remote lectures, which were not organized very well.
- Ethical hacking: The score is almost ok. Most students complaining about the course not being very structured, but this is meant to be a very open course, centered around choosing an individual project. Perhaps the teachers could give more support, but as this is a master level course, we expect people to be able to run on their own.
- How to make (almost) anything is not very technical, but extremely popular.
- Industrial Scrum Master Training got a high score too. It is run together with the Second Year Project on SWU. I think the general feeling is that it is extremely well organized, and also very directly usable for the students.
- Linear Algebra and Probability did well, but since it is a math-course, there are the expected comments from some students who find it too heavy – especially the parts about probability.
- Modelling Systems and Languages: The teacher had some personal issues, so there were some hiccups, but not many responses for the evaluation. A big complaint is that the course is part of a specialisation, but didn't mention the specialisation at all, so students feel it was a bit of a wasted effort.
- Software Architecture: I do not know what has happened here, as it usually has much better scores. There are some comments that the course was badly organized. I will investigate, but I believe it won't happen again next time.

Theodor: I agree with everything Marco said for the courses I have taken. Response rates are all over the place, but of the four courses I had, only one told the students they needed to do the evaluations. I think there is a clear correlation – the response rate gets higher if the teacher mentions the evaluation.

Marco: I blame myself for this. I didn't push the teachers directly to do this, though it was mentioned at a department meeting. Maybe the feedback for me is to do a little poking when we get to the evaluation next time.

Theodor: One course didn't have any teaching when it was time for the evaluations. The timing was a little off here.

Marco: We did send out an email to the students on the evaluations.

Theodor: I also tried to say it to everyone.

Marius: Most teachers seem to forget to mention it.

Lena: Thore did mention it in the lecture and recommended that we did the evaluations.

Maja: I think there is a difference between mentioning it, and actually giving time in class to do the evaluations though.

Luca: And place it at the lecture where you're going to discuss the exam – then everyone will show up!

6) Programme specific ILOs for final projects

Marc: The background for this is that the head of the external examiners committee has complained that the ITU does not have programme specific ILOs for the Thesis and Bachelor's Projects. The HoSPs have been tasked with coming up with a suggestion for these ILOs, and for the Computer Science Department have agreed on making joint ILOs for all programmes with considerations for the different levels and individual programmes. The suggested ILOs are found in the appendix. As SAT, your role is not to approve the ILOs, but to give your eventual input for the Study Board, who will then decide on the new ILOs at their next meeting.

Therese: After discussing this between us, we have been trying to distill the key things we should discern and the key differences between master and bachelor level.

Marco: Basically, we have made a compact thing for all the CS programmes.

Therese: Everybody needs to be able to say what they need to look at. It is important to be able to define a problem and narrow the scope, including explaining the background. But at the MSc level you also need to able to relate to the current state of the art and the current resources, and be able to explain why you have chosen the specific method. At BSc level you do not necessarily need to do this - it is fine to just use a given method - but at MSc level you are also expected to somehow adapt your method. And similarly, at BSc level you just need to be able to give a basic discussion of your project, where at MSc level you also need to relate it to the start of the art.

Marco: We discussed the next to last point a lot. We chose to include "report clearly" as a way of forcing you to communicate in a clear way.

Marius: This is even more the reason that we should have written guidelines for all projects. Why did you not decide to make ILOs for the individual programmes?

Therese: The key is: what is it to write a project? The scope is so broad, so what can parse as SWU also can parse as BDS – it is more a question of focus.

Marc: Also, this makes is easier for students writing projects together across different programmes.

Marius: Regarding the phrase about using "appropriate scientific terminology." It feels very odd to say that you need to do this.

Therese: It is about striking the right balance. It comes back to the demand to communicate in a clear way.

Marco: It is also important to understand what this is for: The student and the censor.

Maja: I think it is great with the flexibility across the programmes.

8) AOB

Marius: We've had a discussion on the exam in the SWU First Year Project. There has been a big difference between the two censors. One has been very harsh, one very soft. Not all people are happy with that.

Marco: It can happen, unfortunately. Usually, the lecturer the has to bring the balance. But this is easier with a written exam, and can be hard with an oral.

Marius: This is the first time the lecturer is running this exam, so perhaps it will be better with time.

Allette: Dan and Louse are in contact with course manager to help work on the course.

Marco: I have a task for everyone! I think it would be good, during summer, before the next meeting, that we all think about how we want to use these meetings, and how would like to work. And then take it as a point for the next meeting. I can also give a short talk on the ITU governance and decision structure at the meeting.

Marius: It could also be a good idea with a general information like this available for everyone.

Maja: It could also be good to have the year cycle for the things we need to get through.

Marc: I think it is a very good idea. You should also keep in mind that the current structure for our meetings isn't fixed. Apart from the yearly things we need to do, you can structure the meeting as you like. The point is noted for the next agenda, and I will look into making some sort of year cycle for SAT.