Teaching Committee for Computer Science, Artificial Intelligence, and Quantum Computing

Meeting on Friday 7 November, at 10:15-12:00

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

Minutes

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

   The agenda was approved and the note taker was agreed to be MC

2. Information from the Study Board (JLA)

   - The current study board is working on a description on how they function for the benefit of the new study board.
   - Prospective members of the new study board have been invited to the November meeting.

3. Information from the Coordination Group (JLA)

   The student council has suggested to have "semester introductions", where an older student gets 10-15 minutes in one of the first lectures in a semester to tell the current students about their experience with the semester. The student council will coordinate this. It will be done per semester not per course basis.

4. Proposal for new elective from FNUG.

   See proposed course description in Teams.

   The course was approved as professional perspective course in CS and AI Master educations in Odense. However, the committee remarks the possible lack of students for Fall 2026. MC sends comments on the course description to the teachers asking for improvements on the presentation of the contents of the course and the target audience.

5. Survey/clarification on use of ISAs.

   See PDF of mail in Teams (in Danish).

   ISA are constitutional. VPI (company projects) are professional perspective courses. The document from the administration reminds us not not use ISAs designed "ad hoc" for filling ECTS holes (like 2.5) for other purposes than those. The committee will be attentive in catching misuse of ISAs when they need to be approved. The committee does not see the need for more/other "ad hoc" ISAs with specific load for the moment. On the contrary there is interest in decreasing the number of ISAs in our list of courses to only 5 and 10 ECTS versions and to investigate forms of flexibility in defining ISAs. Information will be sought from the administration on the procedure for creating ISAs and on whether a form can be used by the students to define some of the options like assessment mode and type of censorship. Moreover, the committee has agreed that in the new study programs for the Master educations we will limit the number of ECTS earned via ISAs to 20 in total. It was discussed also on the extent of company projects and it was agreed to maintain the maximum extent of those to 30 ECTS.

6. Discussion on exam statistics for Spring 2025. See spreadsheet in Teams.

   The committee will undertake further discussions with relevant teachers to understand the reasons behind low passing rates in some courses. These discussions will be aimed at removing possible mismatch/misalignment between course level and student level.

7. Discussion/update on new/changed study programmes in Vejle and Odense.

   MC presented the work in progress for Vejle. CB expressed concern for the removal of Functional Programming from the Bachelor in AI. It was agreed to ensure that the relevant content of that course enters in the course currently called Programming 2. However, the content must be coordinated with the education in CS where functional programming is a mandatory course. MP, CB and MC will consider the issue.

   JLA presented the Bachelor and Master educations in Odense. The introduction of mandatory courses in the first semester of the Master educations drew concern by JM because of resource availability. JM exhorted the group behind the design of the educations to consider the necessity of having backup teachers for courses that need to be taught every year.

8. Information on project descriptions (JLA).

   JLA presented the content of a discussion thread from the previous months about the task of approving project descriptions, including ISAs and Bachelor and Master thesis projects.
   A summary of the discussion is as follows:

   The project description is made:

- to ensure agreement between student and supervisor about the content of the project, and to ensure that the student has a starting point for his/her work
- to convince the UvU and Head of Studies that the student and supervisor have a reasonable plan for the project, with a proper academic level, and adheres to the learning goals set in the course description.

Normally, it is expected that there is a short list of relevant literature as background for the project, as well as a description of which methods and, where relevant, which data are intended to be used.

The student is not strictly bound by the project description, and may (with guidance of the supervisor) take the project in a different direction if relevant. If the project is radically changed in relation to the submitted project description, a revised project description should be prepared for UvU and the Head of Studies to consider.

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

In particular, 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 title of a project is binding, an application must be made to change it (the title ends up on the diploma).

For ISAs that are used as a way to take a course, project description must be seen as more binding.

We can locally introduce additional rules if we want to.

In case of resubmission of a master's project, the 30% is in relation to what the project description would have looked like at the end of the project.

Project descriptions should be rejected if it is not clear that there is a plan, or there is no or too few references to literature, or is is not aligned with the course description, or most importantly if the project is not on a high enough academic level with the field.

Michael is working on a draft description to explain all this to supervisors. It will be taken up on the UKG as well.

JM asked why a failing student has to work more and why do we have these rules.

In the thread it was pointed out that the Education Executive Order (Uddannelsesbekendtgørelsen) is relevant here. It says "Hvis den studerende ikke afleverer specialet inden for den i stk. 7 fastsatte frist, godkender universitetet en ændret opgaveformulering, der skal ligge inden for samme emneområde, og fastsætter samtidig hermed en ny afleveringsfrist på tre måneder." In the draft of the new version which is expected to hold from first of September, it says explicitly "Afleveres specialet ikke inden for

fristen, udarbejder den studerende en ændret opgaveformulering med faglig bistand fra vejlederen. Universitetet skal sikre, at den ændrede opgaveformulering ligger inden for samme emneområde, og at ændringen svarer til en arbejdsbelastning på tre måneder."

9. Any other business.

   We need to compile a list of courses that can be taken as elective courses in the CS and AI educations. The list is needed for the coming period of registration to courses. The list must specify:

   Recommended courses: Those that the committee recommends as electives for the students from the CS and AI educations

   Other approved courses: Those that the committee would not necessarily recommend, but that the students are eligible to take if they wish, and that they would generally have the qualifications for.

   Since there was no time left, it was agreed that the preparation of this list will be carried out by online correspondence under the initiative of MC.