

## Meeting SAT Computer Science 7 June 2019

### Minutes Approved.

#### Present:

- Marco Carbone (HoP CS and SDT)
- Søren Debois (HoP SD and SEN)
- Laura Caroline Cholvat (Student rep., SWU)
- Theodor Christian Kier (Student rep., SWU)
- Emma Arfelt Kock (Student rep., CS)
- Anders Stendevad (Student rep., DS)
- Jesper Bengtson (Faculty rep.)
- Liselotte Lagerstedt (Prog Coor SEN)
- Mette Holm Smith (Prog Coor DS/SD)
- Allette Bjørn Bundgaard (Prog Coor SWU/CS/SDT)

#### Absent:

- Paolo Tell (Faculty rep.)
- Natalie Elaine Schluter (HoP DS)
- Dan Witzner Hansen (HoP SWU)
- Philippe Bonnet (Faculty rep.)
- Sara Gjerløv (Academic supervisor)

#### Minutes:

**1. Approval of agenda:** Agenda approved.

**2. Approval of minutes from meeting 3 May 2019:** Minutes approved.

#### 3. Information:

##### Marco:

- Research Project Guide for CS/SD is ready. Marco would like Emma to read and give feedback. Emma will send feedback to Marco 10 June.
- Research Project Workshop for CS/SD is in first week of the semester: Information meeting followed by 1.5-hour supervisor presentation of projects.
- CS is also planning a specialization meeting in November.

#### 4. Update from study programs: / Students.

DS: Anders: Nothing from the DS students. No response from Natalie when writing to her. SAT discussed students' expectations and tasks for Head of Programme with regard to contact with students: There is no formal protocol for interaction between Head of Programmes and students; besides, Head of Programme is obliged to come to SAT meetings. SAT suggests Anders to try to set a protocol with Natalie.

SWU: Laura: Fourth semester exams and course events have been overlapping in May: Second Year Project: Software Development in Large Teams and functional Programming had celebration events, which is great, but teachers need to coordinate it. Important to tell teachers so they know next year.

Theodor: Second Semester students had a very stress full May:

9 May: First Year Project: Code hand in.  
16 May: First Year Project: Project hand in.  
20 May: Algorithm and Data Structures: Exam.  
27 May: Systematic Design of User Interfaces (UI design): Code and report hand in.  
June: two oral exams.

SAT discussed the schedule and did not find it differs from previous years. The problem may arise from teachers expecting students to be able to use more time in May than is available. UI Design may not expect students to put three weeks of project writing in the exam period. SAT suggests that UI-design presents the project description earlier in the semester or alternatively to submit the UI design project before the examination period starts.

First Year Project: Several students are unhappy with the exam. SAT suggests that students send a formal complain to SAP; In addition, students can contact Dan and the teacher and discuss the problem. In general SAT emphasis that examiners are the ones to plan and conduct oral exams with regard to questions and focal points during exams. With regard to the specific course, non-coding may be over-emphasized in the course description, as coding is naturally an important part of the course.

CS: Emma: CS students have taken specialization courses. No complains.

#### **5. Course evaluation spring 2019 DS and SD: V/Head of Programs.**

DS postponed to next meeting.

SD: Søren presents highlights:

- Intelligent Systems Programming (ITP): Low score. When scrutinizing the data, SD students seems to like the course, whereas remaining SDT students do not. There is no obvious reason. The course runs parallel with Algorithms and Data Structures (ADS) and topic wise ADS ends where ITP begin. However, the comments do not reflect this as a problem.
- Image Analysis and Machine Learning: Only few students answered, one was very unsatisfied and this draws the score down.
- Introduction to Database Design: Søren will talk to course manager about the comments.
- Algorithms and Data Structure: Score in lower green area: DS students comment on the Java/Python issue. Exercise sets will also be available in Python next year. Very large number of students think the course has too many students.  
Comments from SAT: Having such a big course on purpose means that both TAs and teachers are prepared for it and take care to provide online helping tools and provide feedback from either TAs or teachers.  
Marco: Does it work with co-teaching three different study programs? Søren informs that students seem to get even results even if they find different topics on the course difficult.  
SAT concludes that co-teaching the course does not seem to be a problem.
- Functional programming: A small group students are dissatisfied, but no comments hints as to what causes this.

## **6. Pre-approval:**

Søren explains:

A) Partnership agreement with EPITA (Paris): At EPITA courses are only available in “packages”. For SD students going on exchange, the courses abroad will be part of their specialization. Søren finds that the level of the course packages is not sufficient for a specialization.

SAT looks at the course structure and topics and agrees that EPITA as a partner should be cancelled for SD. In addition, Marco thinks that the agreement should be cancelled for CS too.

B) Søren asks SATs opinion on the present practice for assessing credit transfer at SD:

Present practice: The courses must have technical content, because SD is a technical program with limited time for students to learn technical skills.

Marco informs that Study Board discussed the need for a common ITU practice and decided that each program decide on a practice for the program.

SAT discuss the practice and two points of views emerge:

A) In general, it is important to insist on technical skills closely related to the study program. This is even more important on SD, as students already spend a lot of time on non-tech courses during their bachelor.

For SD it might be possible to loosen a bit, if courses have a close relation to the bachelor background.

B) For electives, things should be as free as possible to allow students responsibility for their own education. For mandatory courses, things should be strict.

SAT could not reach agreement and decided to continue on next meeting.

**7. Evaluation Reports, Final Projects and Other Projects:** Postponed to next meeting.

**8. AOB:** None.