Notulen MOAC

Present: Roland Geraerts, Gerard Vreeswijk, Fabiano Dalpiaz,
Jurriaan Hage Hage, Merle Spekhorst and Iris Renckens.
Absent: Judith Stoef en Floor Aarnoutse

March 6, 2014

1 Opening

Merle Spekhorst is taking the minutes. Fabiano Dalpiaz was late, because he
thought the meeting would start at 2 o’clock.
Incoming document of GMT about the Master Thesis.
Survey is not the right word for rondvraag, next time round of question.

2 Previous meeting records (Provisional MOAC-Notes-24012014.pdf)

The notes are made by Floor Aarnoutse and all the textual comments are sent
to her.

Comments on the next sentence:
"Proposal: if the mark of a thesis is below 6, the mentor should be given credit
nevertheless."
Comment: Jurriaan Hage thinks this will never happen because the university
doesn’t get any money for it.

"We [the OAC] think the listed measures are quite harsh."
Comment: Change harsh in to strict.

"The question remains if it isn’t doing more harm than good."
Comment: Roland Geraerts asked the OC whether they know the consequences
of the new procedure, and the OAC wonders if the procedure was advised after
some success story.

"Advice: the document should be clarified in order for us to truly revise it”
Comment: This sentence is too vague, remove this advice.

"Agenda point: we should discuss the admission details for the master programs
when the specifics are in. We should do this since the section about direct ad-
mission with a bachelor degree of the UU is scratched.”
Comment: Jurriaan Hage is going to look if this is allowed by law, and he is going to investigate this.

"5.14: the sentence 'door anderen laten maken van (delen van) een studieopdracht’ should be complemented with 'pretending it is your own work’ or in Dutch 'en het voordoen als eigen werk”
Comment: It is wrong to change this part into 'en het voordoen als eigen werk’ because then it is possible to undermine this rule. We need to leave this part in its original state.


There are two problems with this document. First problem is that the split between part 1 and part 2 is strange. This split is to arbitrary, for different supervisors may have a very different opinion on when the research in part 1 ends, and the research in part 2 starts. Second problem is about retakes, what will happen if someone passes part 1 but fails part 2? Maybe it is better to do a split after the first 10 weeks and in these 10 weeks you need to do a planning, background research and a research question and this counts for 10 ECTS. After this, a Go or No-Go decision will be made by the supervisor.

Some comments about the part colloquium : For the colloquium you get 5 ECTS, which stand for 140 hours and you need to follow 15 colloquium sessions. These 15 colloquium sessions stand for 30 hours and you need to do a presentation which will cost you another 20 hours for preparation. This will give a total of 50 hours, which is less than 140 hours. A student gets to many ECTS for the . A solution can be to increase the number of colloquium session or to extend in another way.

Action point: Roland Geraerts will communicate our comments about the Master Thesis document.

4 Course evaluation period 2 (OACms - periode 2 (report).pdf; OACms - periode 2.pdf)

Pattern Recognition: Only 50% participated in the exam, it could be that the teachers only submitted the grades of the students that passed the course. Still this is not very high. The report included several complaints about the second part given by Remco Veltkamp.

Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the problem with Pattern Recognition course
Computer Animation: Grades were submitted late.

Computer vision: Teacher uses his own website and sometimes this website was down. He doesn’t work here anymore. A lot of trouble with the framework that is used in this course, but there is nothing to do about this.

Algorithms and Networks: Nomination for Pluim. Students give this course a high grade.

Compilerconstruction: Good course.

Queries and Retrieval (seminar): Grades are too late.
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the grades of the course Queries and Retrieval.

Evolutionary Computing: There were a lot of problems with grades that were late. Also the course has a low score, 6.4 and the teacher didn’t give a reaction.
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the problems with Evolutionary Computing.

Cognitive Systems: Attendance was extremely low, maybe this course could be combine with Logic and language. However, we don’t know if the participants in the "caracal" system are only those that are enrolled in the Beta faculty. Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask if the participants are only betafaculty students, and if so whether this is a problem for the course Cognitive Systems and Logic and Language.

Intelligent agents: Not a lot of participants for Caracal. Positive reactions.

Logic and Language: Same story as Cognitive Systems, course can be too difficult for students of beta faculty.

Seminar Serious gaming: Nomination for pluim.

Software architecture: No grades yet. Several students complained that they didn’t know what to expect of the exam, this wasn’t clear. Overall grade 6.2 still a little bit low, but the course improved significantly since last year.
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the problems with Software architecture.

Advanced research methods: Grades of the assignments where too late.
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the grades of the course Advanced research methods.
5 Euphorus (euporus.txt)

Action point: Jurriaan Hage is going to talk to Sjaak about Euphorus and we will talk about it next meeting.

6 Law and MOAC

Law says nothing about MOAC. MOAC is a delegated form of the OC, MOAC advises the OC and other people. It is up to the OC to see what to do with the advice. They should give an argumentation about why the advice is not taken into account and it is possible to read the notes about what the OC does with the advice.

7 Urgent issues current teaching block

No current issues

Honours program, we can do this by email.
Action point: read the honours and give some advice about it.

8 Round of Questions

No questions

End meeting: 15:00

9 Action points

Action point: Roland Geraerts will communicate our comments about the Master Thesis document
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the problem with Pattern Recognition course
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the grades of the course Queries and Retrieval.
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the problems with Evolutionary Computing.
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask if the participants are only beta-faculty students, and if so whether this is a problem for the course Cognitive Systems and Logic and Language.
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the problems with Software architecture.
Action point: Roland Geraerts will ask Arjan Egges about the grades of the course Advanced research methods.
Action point: Jurriaan Hage is going to talk to Sjaak about Euphorus and we will talk about it next meeting.

Action point: read the honours and give some advice about it.