UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

FACULTY OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING, MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE

Minutes
150th PC-AM (OLC-TW)-meeting
Tuesday 20 November 2018, 15:45 hrs.

5   *present:*   Hil Meijer (chairman), Bodo Manthey, Gjerrit Meinsma, Judith Timmer,
Dieuwertje Alblas, Femke Boelens, Linda ten Klooster, Jan Willem Polderman,
Yael Veenstra-Konzizky (B-coordinator), Justus Sleurink (educational officer
Abacus) and Laura Bosdriesz (writing minutes)

10   **1. Opening**
The chairman opens the meeting at 15:46 hrs and welcomes everybody. There is a nice agenda,
not too full but enough issues that require attention.

Regarding point 5, the B-coordinator announces that they still need to make some edits, so a
15   conversation about it can better be postponed. They chairman summarizes that the proposal is to
only provide a short update instead of a full discussion.

2. Minutes 149th meeting 2 October 2018
- Textual corrections:
20   There were no textual corrections.
- Questions or remarks:
p.1 line 24-26: Polderman was not sure about the conclusion of something that Lennart was going
to check. Alblas answers that in previous minutes there was something about an exam, but there
was no conclusion, instead a conclusion about an exam of a different course was made. Since
25   Lennart is not present, it should be checked **[Action Chairman]**.
- Actions:
300: Timmer sent an email to Jaap van der Vegt quite recently. The chairman mentions the
problem that Timmer still needs an appointment with him and now he is in China. Timmer expects
to receive a quick response because for other topics he was also fast in responding to email. Action
30   remains on the list.
304: The B-coordinator questions whether this was not already solved during the previous meeting,
as it was just a simple mistake of the teacher. The chairman mentions that it was done during the
meeting and not while going through the action points. Action can be removed from the list.
305: The chairman thinks this is a similar topic because it is done during last meeting. Timmer
35   responds that in the meantime he talked to Lennart. It was about the "Operation Research" book:
During the meeting it was mentioned that if only a limited number of pages of a book are copied,
then teachers could make them available to the students. However, limited is like 50 pages or so,
but he uses 200 pages. There is also an online version of that book on archive.org. Timmer raises
the questions if this is allowed or not. The chairman answers that the use of ArXiV.org is fully
40   allowed. According to Timmer the teacher was a bit hesitant about whether to use it or not. An idea
is proposed to ask someone from the library about it, because they now it for sure. Timmer agrees
on this because if you do it illegally it is bad and cost you a lot of money. Manthey and Meinsma
think that if it is on ArXiV.org, it is the responsibility of the author. The PD wants to know if people
are sure about that or if they are guessing. The conclusion is that people are quite sure, but that it
45   should be check with Petri if it is legal because it is strange that such an expensive book is online.
The chairman starts a discussion about the number of pages the teacher uses. Last discussion
they talked about 50 pages, and now about 200. Action remains on the list.
306: The advice is written, so can be removed from the list.
307: The chairman says that this action point vanished. They asked the module coordinator
50   Geveling and she explained how this part was used and that it has to stay there. Conclusion is that
this action point is considered to be unnecessary and can be removed from the list.

308: Advice is written, can be removed from the list.
55 309: Advice is written, requires some discussion, but can be removed from the list here.
310: Advice is written, requires some discussion, but can be removed from the list here.
311: Advice is written, can be removed from the list.
312: All documents that were suggested are now on the agenda, so can be removed from the list.

60 **3. Advices/correspondence**
- Advice on Module 1 (137)
  Should be fine now.
- Advice on Module 2 (138)
  Should be fine now.
65 - Advice on Module 3 (139)
  Timmer mentions that the document sent to the program committee concerns the description of the old module (originally module 4), and it has been reshaped, so that has to be redone. The chairman states that there is now a situation in which an advice is provided for a module that doesn't exist and asks how this should be treated. According to the PD a pragmatic
70 solution would be that the program committee will receive the correct program description at the next meeting. Meinsma asks if it is substantial different than the description that is written now and the conclusion is that it is. It is decided to spent no time on the discussion that nobody noticed this. The chairman mentions that next meeting in January is in time, which would still be before the module starts. Comments about the grades is something to care about. The TER
75 states that the highest grade counts and the OSIRIS description contradicts that, which cannot be. That is for module 3 but also for module 4. There was an email from Stoorvogel, the module coordinator, with a very strong opinion that moving the collaboration aspect to any other module than module 4 would be stupid, "a waste of his module" and require to design a completely new project. Timmer wonders what the background is of this advice and the
80 chairman responds it was like action point 300 which was on the list for a long time: Collaboration classes had to come at the appropriate moment. There are already moments of collaboration (e.g. with physic students) before the collaboration assignment in module 4, which feels useless for students. This assignment should move to an earlier module, maybe even to module 1 and do international communicator in a different module. Alblas wonders if it is not an
85 option to combine and merge those soft skills classes, because international communicator is also about collaboration, but then with other cultures. There are doubts about this because the practical parts of this workshop are appreciated while the theoretical parts are not appreciated at all. It may be possible to split those parts and do the theoretical parts later in the curriculum. Alblas proposes to combine it with the practical part of international communicator because
90 everyone already learned how to work together in the first and second module and is bored during the assignment in the third module. The chairman mentions that it has been a discussion point for a very long time, it was an action point from a meeting from June, last academic year. The PD repeats that the background is that the collaboration has to come earlier and mentions that in shared modules it is not easy to do things that is appreciated by
95 only one of the two. The PD and Alblas mention that the practical collaboration part in module 3 is together with physics student in the project group and this will not work if only one part of the group must do this academic skill and the other not. It is necessary to think about a correct position and good motivation for the collaboration line, including the intercultural communicator **[Action PD].**
100 - Advice on Module 4 (140)
  For coming module 4, it is wise not to touch it. Nevertheless, the content description can be more extended.
- Advice on SEQ evaluation items 3.5 (141)
  The PD mentions the question in the second evaluation, about the extent to which students can
105 decide what to learn. It has a low score because students do not experience they can decide what they want to learn, but that doesn't mean that students want that. Probably students honestly answer the question: "How much freedom is there in choosing what to learn?" The chairman thinks that it is then necessary to decide that we do to follow up on that. The projects in every module can be given a fresh look in such a way that students will be more the owners
110 themselves of that project.

According to the PD students do not feel like they are owners of the project, because the question on the second evaluation concerns the whole module. Alblas and Timmer agree that it is (like already discussed before) also the phrasing of the question, which is confusing for students. There follows a discussion about how open to make the project. Students desire to have an open project because of the need to have freedom and do not like precooked project, but it should also not be too open because then it becomes vague and students do not like that either. According the students, the question is filled in based on the test and not on the project. The PD raises the issue that there is the philosophy of student driven learning, which is part of TOM. While it partially exists within AM, it is not like Atlas where students can determine their own learning goals. In the subjects you are free to concentrate on either one aspect or another. Manthey mentions that there are different groups of people, some student like to have someone telling them exactly what to do and others want to have freedom to choose themselves. The chairman thinks that the module teams need to have a person from outside looking at their project to have an open look at it and start discussion. This is what the chairman wrote down and was more like a background and not necessarily an outcome. The PD was triggered by the low score mentioned in the first sentence in the second which blurs the whole suggestion. The suggestion in the advice is fine; something that could come out is that it gets better

4. Announcements
As already mentioned, the programme is a top-programme and this Thursday during the afternoon, everyone is invited to informally gather together and eat a "broodje kroket" and drink milk and juices. Invitations can be sent to all members of Abacus.
Boelens has to leave at 17.15.
The B-coordinator and Alblas mention a few things about the Open Days, which were great. About 300 people visited both days, which is a record. In general, there is a positive correlation between visiting the open days and the amount of enrolments. There were people from Luxemburg, Bulgaria and Greece.
The PD wants to make one more announcement about the central TER where the 0 or 15 EC rule will probably be deleted. This causes serious problems for the programme. Atomic parts of modules need to be defined, with individual codes. Once you have completed an individual part, that will be valid forever. The conclusion of this decision is that the TOM model will be gone. Alblas mentions the discussion about the atomic elements and satellite elements which are a follow-up of this discussion. The PD refers to how it is now, that those parts exist, creating a cohesive module in which you have to complete every part in the same year. This could still be arranged within the new situation, but it will be difficult. There are modules that are well connected but still have separate tests. This is starting next academic year and may have consequences for the whole curriculum.

5. Updated study programme for double degree students AM – TCS cohort 2018
The B-coordinator does not want to have an advice on this now but wants a swap a math course and a project between quartile 5 and quartile 9. In addition, there are plans for moving introduction to mathematical modelling from quartile 7 to 5, as the project needs it. But all this still needs to be discussed more properly. Timmer proposes to withdraw the point and wait till there is a new proposal. The chairman agrees on withdrawing the point but makes a comment about the OSIRIS descriptions. The basics of combinatorics are in module 1 and in module 7 discrete structures and algorithms this come again. The descriptions of module 1 and 7 do not show how these are different. Perhaps the next proposal can state the logical order.
Alblas has a few remarks too: AM students do not need calculus 1a and 1b but need calculus 1 and 2. Now it is stated as an AM component but that is strange since they were only components for Computer Science and double students. Alblas wonders if it is better to make it a CS component. The PD thinks it is fine like it is now. If it becomes a CS component, it will look like it is organised by computer science, while it is not. There follows a discussion between Alblas and the PD about the different calculus courses for different types of students, but no clear conclusion can be drawn because the reason behind this decision is not clear. The chairman responds that the reasoning behind it may be guessed. Vector Calculus in earlier times was not available for Math and module 3. This situation has changed.

6. New course description Applied Queueing Models

The chairman mentions that previous versions were incorrect updates. There are a few comments about the current version:

- Alblas thinks the learning goals are a bit vague but does not have a clear suggestion for improving. The chairman responds that the content is fine and precise enough. Nevertheless, one could argue that test metrics (toetsmatrijzen) with precise weights and questions are required in which case this is not appropriate. The decision is to leave that to the exam committee.
- Manthey has a remark about the grading. In the middle of the first page it states integers with one decimal for one part and integers without decimals for the test. The PD thinks that it means that test results with one decimal are ok, but that the final grade should be rounded. Timmer goes back to the comments that Alblas had and agrees on that. The way it is written that students are expected to have certain knowledge is weird, because it now suggests students already failed beforehand. Conclusion about the course description: positive but rephrase it with the comments. Also include the "able to apply" and leave out "know about it".
- Alblas starts about a discussion that was held before. The sentence: "Thorough knowledge of probability theory and Markov Chains" again is vague. The PD proposes to mention the book by Ross that exactly covers those subjects, so a non-AM student can also find out what it requires. Meinsma and Manthey propose to leave it like this, because they do not need to give a whole topic summary in a course description. Students need to have a general knowledge about probability theory and does not need to know specifically about every topic. The chairman and the PD respond that entering requirements need to be more specific because students can check whether they can follow the course. Adding the book to the description is a good idea. The advice should suggest rephrasing the learning goals so they are more precise and for the assumed previous knowledge to suggest the book **[Action Chairman].**

Timmer notices that in the layout of the learning goals, the final was not numbered as the sixth.

7. New course description Stochastic Models in Production and Logistics

The abbreviation SMiPL stirs up some laughter. The chairman mentions that exactly the same comments apply here. In addition, Boelens observes that the minimum grade for this course is a 0.0. Alblas wonders whether this might be for the assignment if this is not mandatory. Manthey asks whether there is only an exam or also assignments. The chairman says that for the course AQM the minimum grade is a 5.5. A minimum grade is what you need to pass a course so a minimum grade of 0.0 means students get free credits. Manthey has a remark "assignment and/or exam", but there is no "or an exam" appearing in the description. It is unclear how to read the course description. The chairman says that the idea behind it is that there need to be two different codes: one for applied mathematics, and one for AQM. They get different assignments, more theoretical for AM students and more applied for AQM students. With different codes you can justify those. Those courses (SMiPL and AQM) are in fact the same but with different target audiences. However, they are not sufficiently aligned yet. The philosophy is that he final assignment is different, and the preknowledge is also different. Manthey mentions that students have followed different courses before taking this course. Alblas thinks it is a follow-up of a module, which both target groups followed together. The chairman concludes that it must be discussed with Jan-Kees and he is going to write his advice afterwards **[Action Chairman].**

Both courses deserve a positive advice, but with some critical remarks.

8. Course description Spatial Statistics

The chairman repeats the comments that were already given last year: the learning goals in the content description have to be elaborated. The change is now in the box of learning goals in the final three lines; this is what is changed/added with respect to the previous versions. The PD thinks this is a tautology and the chairman mentions that it cannot be accepted as a learning goal, because it says: "after the course, the student has mastered the course". The suggestion is to keep it on hold, don't write an advice and wait for a new version.

Alblas mentions that when the learning goals and content description are swapped, then it is not bad. The chairman responds that that would be ok, but it is still not correct. Timmer already discussed it with the lecturer van Lieshout. She is not familiar with writing these kinds of texts, but now she understands it better and will write a new version within one or two weeks and then will sent it to the PD. Manthey

225 mentions that if it is in the process of revising, there is no point in giving comments now. The chairman agrees. Meinsma asks about the view on which software to use (SPSS or R). Is there a reason to unify it or is to the teacher to decide which software to use? The PD proposes to discuss this within the corresponding taskgroup. The chairman mentions that different fields use different software.

230

9. Evaluations

- Module 8 2017-2018 Panel discussion 2 with reaction lecturer
  Alblas has one comment on the project about the programming in Python: the teacher who supervises the projects does not know Python and this is already a problem for three years

235 now. She thinks that there should be a teacher with knowledge about Python or TA's to help. Boelens adds that the code students receive is not documented. It would be better if there is code that is fully commented, and that there is someone who knows about the code. If you have any questions about the basis of the code, then you could ask about it. Alblas suggests asking someone from last years project to comment the code. The chairman asks the PD about

240 what to do, as this problem is already there for a couple of years. The PD answers that the Python issue is already mentioned to the module coordinator. There were plans, but that it did not happen yet is strange. The chairman responds that, according to the teachers' reaction, such change is not going to happen this way. An advice about the Python part in the project of module 8 needs to be written stating that the teacher needs to take care of comments in the

245 code, as it has been pointed out several times already (also during panel meetings). The chairman asks Alblas and Boelens to critically review the advice **[Action Chairman+ Alblas and Boelens].**

- Module 8 2017-2018 SEQ with reaction lecturer
  The chairman mentions the comment about the low score and that the module coordinator is

250 already aware about this.

- Module 12 2017-2018 panel discussion 2
  Alblas says this has already been discussed in detail during the previous meeting. The chairman agrees with this.

- Module 1 2018-2019 panel discussion 1

255 Meinsma mentions the problems in assigning the groups but expects that this problem can be resolved next year. There were three different lists of students, that were supposed to be the same, which was causing the problem. It appears that the students list is not known that early, but the module team knows how to solve it now, by assigning the groups 2 days later. Timmer always uses the list of the key user. The chairman responds that students can apply till one day

260 before the course, making the number of students clear not earlier than when the course starts. For the rest, module 1 is going well.
  The chairman asks about the remark about the poor English of some staff as it hampers the teaching for Calculus 1. The PD responds that the specific lecturer has a sufficient qualification and every teacher needs to have at least level C1. Manthey thinks the testing is bullshit,

265 because he received level C2, which is better than an average native speaker. The PD doubts the testing is weak, since they check the level of teachers with a checklist. Manthey points out that, although you qualify teachers with level C1 or C2, their English is still not good sometimes. The chairman emphasizes that his point is different; you just want to set a certain level of English from the beginning. The PD concludes that this point is a task of HR, and not of

270 the programme. Meinsma responds that when it influences the level of the programme it is also their responsibility. The chairman emphasizes again that this point is not about the person, but about the problem it causes in general for internationalization, although it seems not to influence the teaching level. After some discussion no concrete suggestions come up.

275 ### 10. Mastermath minutes "OC overleg", October 12th 2018
The chairman sent Mastermath an email that there were no comments, which should be sufficient since they already discussed everything.

11. A. O. B
280 No points were raised.

UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

DATE
15 January 2019

OUR REFERENCE
EWI18/BOZ/7872/MvdK

PAGE
6 of 7

12. Questions before closing the meeting

Nobody has questions, except the chairman: in the UToday, there was an item about "kwaliteitsafspraken" with five items regarding e.g. student counselling and project offices. Is there
285   something we can expect for our programme? The PD wonders if this was about the "basisbeurs" and that the minister promised that with the money she saved by this regulation she wants to improve quality by providing this extra money to universities and asks for the chairman's question again. The chairman responds that very concrete examples were provided in this news and wonders if it is possible that they share it next time? The PD responds that the faculty has its own
290   ideas based on what they collect from the programme committees and individual students. The PD expects to get an update about this and then share it with the PC.

13. Closure

The meeting closes at 17:02 hrs.
295

UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

DATE
15 January 2019

OUR REFERENCE
EWI18/BOZ/7872/MvdK

PAGE
7 of 7

Actions

Nr	Description	Meeting	Responsible
300	Inquire if it is feasible to move the Collaboration classes to (the new) module 3	19/6/2018	Timmer + B-coordinator
305	Inform the coordinator of module 8 about the rules on publishing copies of book segments if only a small part of a book is being used and discuss whether that is an appropriate alternative for the expensive book of Stochastic Models	2/10/2018	PD
313	Check for the missing conclusion on the exam of PDE, that van der Putten was going to check about (written in 149th minutes on p.1 line 26/27)	20/11/2018	Chairman
314	Think about a correct position and good motivation for the collaboration line, including the intercultural communicator in module 3.	20/11/2018	Timmer/PD
315	Discuss descriptions of Applied Queueing Models and Stochastic Models in Production and Logistics with Jan-Kees van Ommeren regarding learning goals, assumed previous knowledge and minimum grade of 0.0, and write a positive advice afterwards	20/11/2018	Chairman
316	Write an advice about the Python part in the project in module 8 for the teacher, who has to do something with the fact that he does not know Python and the code is not commented.	20/11/2018	Chairman
317	Look carefully to the advice written for action point 316	20/11/2018	Alblas + Boelens

300

Advices and correspondence

Nr	Description

Points of attention

Nr	Description