OAC Meeting 3  
Friday 6 Juli 2018

Attendance: Deb, Wolfgang, Sergio, Ruben (note taker).

Notes from last time:
The notes about possible split of the OAC is not in the report. This needs to be added.

Caracal questions:
The OAC suggests that a set of core questions should be the same for all courses, so we can compare them across the board. Another, large set of additional questions should be optional. We created a document that summarizes our suggestions (see appendix).

Course Evaluation (based on caracal answers of students):
Advanced Functional Programming:
  There were some issues with the lab assignments.
  Expectation of the exam were not met.
  The teacher acknowledge the needed improvements about peer reviewing
Evolutionary Computing:
  The course material needs improvements.
  The teacher deviated off topic too many times during the lectures.
  The lab assignment can be improved.
  No matching expectations about the final exam.
  No reaction of the teacher.
Big Data:
  The lecture slides could be improved.
  The students appreciated the communication. But the student were discouraged to contact the teacher because he said during one of the first lectures "do not email me". This could have been a poor choice of words. The teacher did react on questions of the student if they stopped by and paid a lot of time during the breaks of directly after the lecture on the students who wanted to ask something.
  More time should be spent on the second paper, not just one lecture.
  Students would like to see more details about the experiments that had to be done for the essay. What is expected of the student and these experiments.
Computational Thinking:
  The general difficulty of the course could be a bit higher.
  Information in OSIRIS should be improved.
Computer Vision:
  Preference of Python over C++ as a programming language.
  This was already noticed by teacher.
Method Engineering:
  In general the course is good.
Experimentation in Psychology and Linguistics:
  This course can be ignored for the moment. Because it is an AI&NM course.
Game Physics:
Concerning the Master program, the lectures are disconnected from application in real life: the lectures mention to little about practical use.
No reaction of the teacher

Multimodal Interaction:
Not much to improve, the course is good
Pluim candidate.

Seminar Serious Gaming:
Only four reactions and a lot of the questions were removed so not much can be said.

Seminar Medical Informatics:
Overall reaction is good.
The difficulty could be a bit higher: that the difficulty level of the course is reflected in how many hours on average the students have spent per week.
No reaction of the teacher.

Software Production:
There were some changes to the course compared to last year.
Limited reading material.
The course really needs a site for information and communication.
The teacher has already noticed this.

Introduction to Business Informatics:
No comments.

Enterprise architecture:
No clear upper limit on student enrolment on the site but it was there. This created tension.
Mixed feelings among the students about organisation, communication and the book. The lectures could improve on this by making more references to the different things and make links between them.
Basically reducing the number of channels for better communication. E.g., Whatsapp or Slack: choose one, not both.

General Comments:
The OAC noticed a couple of courses with a low attendance, and recommends that the program coordinators actively monitor course attendance. If an established course has a low attendance over a couple of years, they could recommend taking it off the curriculum. While exceptions may apply, given the high teaching load in the department, courses with low attendance rates, generally speaking, should not be offered.

Multimodal Interaction will receive a Pluim.

AP Ruben needs to find a new student of GMT to replace him when he takes the COSC student position.

Appendix: Recommendation letter from the OAC about revision of the CARACAL questions
Standard questions in Caracal evaluations GSNS

General remarks: the OAC agrees that there should be some core questions that are not allowed to be modified. This is not only from the perspective of integrity of the evaluations, but also from the practical point that we want to prepare an overview table that stretches across the board (see attached) – this will be impossible if every course has its own set of questions.

In order to facilitate this, we recommend to have one (or a few) general question(s) for each category that are mandatory and cannot be removed, plus a set of optional ones that the lecturers can modify or eliminate from their course survey. We want to prevent exclusion of question the teacher will know he or she will get a bad grading. And this way there will remain a good way to compare courses.

**General** *(these should stay as standard questions):*

- I enjoyed the course
- The course was relevant for my programme
- I learned a lot from this course
- My prior knowledge was sufficient to take this course
- I know the learning goals of this course *(change this to: The learning goals of this course were communicated clearly)*
- The degree of difficulty of this course was
- How many hours per week did you spend on average on this course including classes?

Another option *(different order)*:

- I enjoyed the course
- I learned a lot from this course
- The course was relevant for my programme
- My prior knowledge was sufficient to take this course
- I know the learning goals of this course
  - The learning goals of this course were communicated clearly
- The degree of difficulty of this course was
- How many hours per week did you spend on average on this course including classes?

**Facilities Organisation:**

- What is your opinion about the practical aspects of the course (communication, website, announcements, regulations, etc.) *(Split this question into subquestions, on (a) “static” information such as the organization of the course, (b) overall management of the course, and (c) “dynamic” information such as communication during the course, availability of the teacher/assistant and their responsiveness)*
- Other remarks concerning the organisation of the course:

**Course material** *(make this question modifiable, since some courses don’t have books, slides or lecture notes, and accordingly allow the teachers to reorganise the questions, splitting on books, slides, lectures.....):*

- What is your assessment of the course material (readers, books, literature)?
- What is your assessment of the literature used?
- Other remarks concerning the literature:
Another option (questions with * are mandatory and cannot be deleted by teachers):

- *What is your general opinion about the course material (readers, books, literature, etc. if applicable)?
- What is your assessment of the slides?
- What is your assessment of the literature used?
- ...
- *Other remarks considering the course material:

The lectures:

- The lectures were ... (Vague – Clear)
- How many lectures did you attend? (important question: move this to be the starting question)
- Other remarks concerning the lectures:

The tutorial sessions (make this question modifiable, since in computer science the courses almost always do not have tutorials):

- Did the tutorial sessions help you to better understand the course?
- The tutorial sessions were well guided
- Other remarks concerning the tutorial sessions:

Lab assignments (make this question modifiable, since in computer science the courses almost always do not have lab assignments):

- Did you learn something useful during the lab assignments? (Agree with the suggestion: The lab assignments were relevant for the course)
- The coaching of the lab assignments was...
- Other remarks concerning the lab assignments:

Assessment:

- The exam assessment represented the content of the course well
- The level of difficulty of the exam was in accordance with the level of difficulty of the course (agree with the suggestion: The exam assessment represented the level of difficulty of the course well)
- All aspects of the examination such as form of assessment, content to be learned, grading, etc., were clear to me (this question could also be the first, since it is more about the formalities rather than the actual content)
- Was the final exam in accordance with your expectations? (Delete this one: van be addressed by the question below; it’s also overlaps to some degree with the “level of difficulty” question / not the same, but enough overlap to indeed combine it with the one below)
- Other remarks concerning the final exam assessment:

Finally (keep the whole block mandatory):

- If the course were changed, what should be kept the same?
- What can be improved on the course (e.g., slides, literature, teaching method, content, ...)?
- Which subjects did you expect from the course, but turned out not to be part of it? (Did the course content match your expectation?)
- Other remarks and suggestions:
How would you evaluate the overall quality of this course on a scale of 1 to 10? (move this to be the starting question)