Meeting SAT Computer Science 1 February 2019

Minutes Approved

Present:

- Marco Carbone (HoP CS/SDT)
- Søren Debois (HoP SEN)
- Emma Arfelt Kock (Student rep., CS)
- Laura Caroline Cholvat (Student rep., SWU)
- Theodor Christian Kier (Student rep., SWU)
- Anders Stendevad (Student rep., DS)
- Paolo Tell (Faculty rep.)
- Mette Holm Smith (Prog Coor DS/SD)
- Ieva Jasaityte (Guest – SDT DE)

Absent:

- Liselotte Lagerstedt (Prog Coor SEN)
- Dan Witzner Hansen (HoP SWU)
- Jesper Bengtson (Faculty rep.)
- Allette Bjørn Bundgaard (Prog Coor SWU/CS/SDT)
- Natalie Elaine Schluter (HoP DS)
- Philippe Bonnet (Faculty rep.)
- Sara Gjerløv (Academic supervisor)
- 

Minutes:

1. **Approval of agenda:**
   
   Approved

2. **Approval of minutes:**

   Minutes from last meeting approved

3. **Information: A) ITU Quality Policy:** Executive Management have signed the ITU Quality Policy for 2019: Appendix 3. Only minor changes. The amount of female student to be admitted to SWU and DS has been adjusted (Development Goal 1.2)

   A new predicate on teaching formats has been added to Quality Standard 2.11. The new standard will be implemented on all study programmes during 2019.

4. **Update from study programmes: / Students.**

   **SWU:** 1st year exams passed well besides maybe one exam complaint in Projektarbejde og kommunikation. Algorithm and Data Structures this semester. Students are a bit confused about the exam form. Former students comment that it will be more clear throughout the semester. 3rd
semester’s exam period have been a bit rocked. Intro to DB Design exam had a new format and need more communication from the teacher. Students have talked to Björn. Mobile and Distributed Systems: Besides some uncleanness and changes of the scheduling and length of the take-home exam and some miscommunication in report and code weight students like the new exam format.

Current semester: Group formation on Second Year project did not work out. It did not scale to the number of students and was not well communicated. Also a bit of confusion about the content of project topics.

DS: Student representatives try to make it easier to communicate about issues. The First Year Project exam form have been unclear to the students but seems to be communicated better after the course started.

SDT second year: Exam went well. Awaiting grades for a few courses.

CS: The grades are very late. How can we make sure that students get their grades in time? CS had four written exams on mandatory courses due to large number of students. Can we spread out the written exams? One was before Christmas and the last three 4th, 7th and 9th January. Subsequently, the period for written exams has been extended from one to three weeks.

5. Course Evaluation Autumn 2018: SD, CS and DS /Heads of programs

SD: (Søren) Introduction to Programming and Discrete Math did well with no significant criticism. Software Engineering tend to get very high or very low evaluation. It is not possible to hear the teacher: Make sure to have a proper room in Autumn 2019. Workload too high: Let the students self-report hours spend on different part of the course.

CS (Marco): Four mandatory courses: Algorithm design and Security went well. PCPP did almost good but got some minor criticism. Advanced Programming: The problem is communication with some of the lecturers. Comment from Emma: Scala is the problem also. Too much time spend on configuration before starting coding. Do it in Haskell like on DIKU. In addition, bachelors would like to learn Haskell as well and other functional languages.

Big Data Management: Too mixed groups with different backgrounds from DIM and SD. In the joint project SD students end up doing the coding and DIM students the GDPR content.

Cross Disciplinary Team Work got a very bad evaluation 2.82 and need to be fixed before it is mandatory for 400 students in Autumn 2019. In the Autumn 2018 pilot a student that did not attend the course at all but ended up passing with very little effort. Subsequently, Head of programs have been informed about the discussion in SAT.
Security 2 did a bad evaluation probably based on expectation that it is a continuation of Security 1. but it is not. Even if content and ILOs are stated in the course description a change course title might be the solution order to communicate different content?

**DS:** Natalie not present. Postponed.

**6. Evaluations of study programmes and projects, Autumn 2018:** Appendices 6a, 6b, 6c and 6d. If SAT find there is a need for immediate action based on information and results from the reports, please get in touch with the Education Group. If not, the reports are part of data and input for Study Programme Reports and Education Portfolio Report in 2019.

- No comments to the reports.

**7. Course Evaluation Report spring 2018, comments:** On last meeting, SAT agreed that members are invited to give comments on this meeting, if they find it relevant. Appendix 8.

- No comments to the report.

**8. Meeting dates in Spring semester 2019:** Proposal from last meeting: It seems that both student and staff members are free to meet on Friday afternoons in spring 2019. If possible, meetings should be scheduled just ahead of the study board meetings. Thus, the following Fridays would be a suggestion: 1. March, 5 April, 3 May, 7 June, 21 June at 13.00 – 14.30.

- Paolo will not be available last two meetings due to exam.

**9. AOB:**

- OwnCloud. SAT suggests that the SAT group uses the new wiki solution instead of Owncloud. Students are not interested in having to synchronize agenda and minutes since 2012 to their computer.

- It is difficult for SAT – students, head of programmes and faculty - to have communication and discussion of DS items when Natalie does not attend the meetings. Marco will talk to Natalie again before next meeting.