Teaching committee for
Computer science, Artificial intelligence,
and Quantum Computing

Meeting on Friday 27 June, at 10:15-12:00

Participants: Jakob Lykke Andersen (JLA), Jacopo Mauro (JM), Marco Chiarandini (MC), Casper Bach (CB), Marco Peressotti (MP), Lars Rohwedder (LR) (from point 4 onwards), William Elbæk Mistegaard (WEM) (for point 1 and 2), Robin Kaarsgaard Sales (RKS), Gustav Bech Christensen (GBC)
Cancellations: Flemming Hoffmeister (FH)

Minutes

1. Approval of the agenda and selection of note taker.

   The agenda was approved and JLA was selected as note taker.

2. Welcome to Quantum Computing.

   WEM and RKS were welcommed into the committee. WEM is education responsible for Quantum Computing.

3. Information from IMADAs Teaching Coordination Group.

   Process for changes to course descriptions. A new model is being tested: teachers will submit request for changes by a separate form. A select few will then get edit permissions for all course descriptions and implement the changes in Odin (currently JLA for this committee). The course responsible teacher is still expected to develop their courses and maintain the course descriptions by submitted change requests. The goal is to streamline the process, increase quality of course descriptions, and minimize risk of changes that are problematic in the overall education context (e.g., exam form and academic prerequisites).

4. Exam form for bachelor's projects (both CS and AI).

   JLA proposes to change the exam form to be project with oral defence, also for students working alone. The committee discussed the proposal and decide to postponed the final descision until the August meeting, where the semester evaluation from the 6th semester on CS is available.

5. Proposal of a template for thesis projects.

   JLA reported on discussions with Kristian Debrabant. We can make new rules for our educations, but currently the situation is as follows.

   - The project description is made to convince the UvU and head of studies that the student and superviser has a reasonable plan for the project, with a proper academic level, and adheres to the learning goals set in the course description.

   - The student and supervisor is afterwards not bound by the project description, and are free to take the project in a different direction if relevant.

   - The supervisor is responsible to guide the students towards a high academic level according to the learning goals.

   - In particular, the grading does not depend on the project description, but solely on what is finally handed in.

   - The external examiner does not by default see the project description.

   The committee discussed the current situation for project descriptions. JLA will clarify further points with Kristian Debrabant:

   - How do we communicate the purpose of project descriptions to teachers?

   - Are there particular explicit judgement criteria for approving project descriptions in the UvU?

   - How the requirement for extra work in Master's projects reexams are handled.

   - How ISA descriptions are supposed to be used.

6. Revising the template for course action plans.

   The committee discussed the current template for course action plans, and had the following comments.

   - The field "Har der været foretaget en midtvejsevaluering på kurset?" seems unclear. If the answer is supposed to be simply yes/no it feels unnecessary. It could have more value if teachers are supposed to comment on what the mid-way evaluation revealed and what has been done.

   - It is not clear which elements of the evaluation a teacher is supposed to comment on. Which things are considered interesting?

   - The field "Behandlet af undervisningsudvalget på" is currently unused. Should it be used? Who is using the information? Teachers are sometimes submitting PDFs, making it complicated to use.

   - It is not clear who is really supposed to be the author of the action plan. The teacher? the teaching committee? the study board?

- Teachers should be made explicitly aware that the evaluation (except comments) and the action plan become public documents, and should write them accordingly.

7. Composition and tasks of the committee.

   The item was postponed to the August meeting.

8. Status on new educations in Vejle.

   JLA reported on the progress.

9. Status on of master's educations in Odense.

   JLA briefly reported on the feedback from the sections.

10. Any other business.

    None.