Peer review computer science – public report

Most important conclusions from the peer review

The report of the peer review team mentions a number of strong points of the programme, and also includes suggestions to improve the programme. These suggestions are already processed by the programme in the development plan for the coming period. Below the most important conclusions of the peer review are given.

Strengths of the programme

The programme deliberately chooses a **broad bachelor's programme** with a large core of mandatory courses. The peer review team also considers it a strength that it is a **robust programme**. It supports the idea of the programme to increase the number of elective courses in the bachelor.
The curriculum of both the bachelor's and master's programme has a **strong scientific content**. The peer review team indicates this as a strength of the entire programme. The programme builds on a solid theoretical basis complemented with practical experience. The offered courses build on the expertise present in the various research groups. It shows there is a **strong nexus between research and education** present in the programme. For their bachelor thesis students work in a team on a larger project with a small research component. In the master's curriculum the programme is *research-intensive*. Master's students are actively involved in the research of the different research groups.
The peer review team regards the **quality of the graduates** as a strong point. This is apparent from, among other, the number of publications written by students about the results of their research project or master's thesis.
The programme is characterized by **individual guidance** of students, with frequent (personal) **feedback**. This is accompanied by a great commitment and willingness to listen from the teachers.

Suggestions for further improvement

The peer review team asks the programme to thoroughly take its activities to heart again on various points. The programme needs to work out a **supported vision** in order to be able to make choices and decisions. The programme confronts these challenges in its development plan. They will better reflect the added value of the **management and entrepreneurship option** among the students. A working group is set up to conduct more targeted promotion for the **English master**. Through a more strict intake policy the programme wishes to identify the gaps in the prior knowledge of international candidates. This renewed intake policy will be combined with more support for the incoming students.
The guidelines for the **research project** I and II will be reviewed and reformulated in order to differentiate both subjects more transparently and to make the link with the master's thesis explicit. In addition, all used teaching methods will be listed to find out where **innovative didactic teaching methods** can be introduced. The programme will also take a number of measures to encourage **outgoing mobility** among students and to facilitate this more systematically.
The peer review team acknowledges the intention of the programme to involve alumni and the professional field in a more systematic way through the establishment of a work field committee. This committee needs to be involved in fundamental discussions about the core competences of the programme, the curriculum and its content, and the evaluation of students. The peer review team also recommends the programme to be open to opportunities that may arise from a **collaboration with other faculties**.

Most recent peer review computer science

Timing
The site visit of the peer review team took place **May 7-8, 2018**.

Peer review team
The programme suggested external and internal candidates as members of the peer review team. The student member was suggested by the department of education, with approval of the student association of UAntwerp. The composition of the peer review team was validated on November 22, 2017 by the board of programme evaluation.

Composition of the peer review team computer science:

Chairwoman:
- Ilse Loots, dean faculty Social Sciences

External members:
- Paul De Bra, Computer Science, TU Eindhoven
- Arend Rensink, Software modelling, transformation and verification, UTwente

Internal member:
- Peter Van Petegem, educational sciences

Student member:
- Pieter Deleye, Ma2 business engineering

Result Peer Review
The peer review team decided to **confirm confidence** in the computer science programme.

Creation
With regard to the peer review, the programme made a self-reflection report, describing its vision, good practices, challenges and future prospects. The Department of Education developed a data sheet in consultation with the programme, containing qualitative (learning outcomes, study programme, staff information…) and quantitative data (amount of enrolments, student success rates, cohort analysis,…) about the programme.
In consultation with the Department of Education the programme drew up a time schedule to interview the staff responsible for the programme, students, lecturers, assistants, external partners and alumni. During the interviews between the peer review team and the programme the CIKO staff member of the faculty was present.

The peer review team evaluated the programme based on qualitative and quantitative information, as the interviews and the preparatory documents: the self-reflection report, the data sheet and the education portfolio of the programme.
The peer review took place conforming to the European Standards & Guidelines.

Report and follow up
All findings of the peer review team are written down in a review report. The review report names several strengths of the programme, and some suggestions for further improvement. The programme took these suggestions into account in a development plan.
The integrated report – review report and development plan – was validated together with the public information by the Board of Programme Evaluation on 25 October 2018 and was presented to the Education Board on 18 December 2018 and the Executive Board of UAntwerp on 22 January 2019.